Thavies Inn House 3-4 Holborn Circus London EC1N 2HA

020 7936 3668

www.delvapatmanredler.co.uk

Our Ref: AR/sev/13400

16 February 2016

Town Planning Department Hove Town Hall Norton Road Hove Sussex BN3 4GG

Dear Sirs,

Rear extension at 51 Westbourne Villas, Hove – Daylight impact Planning Application Ref: BH2016/00015

I sent a letter to you dated 12 February, on behalf of Mr and Mrs Tyler. I would be grateful if you could replace that with this letter which encloses a more accurate floor plan of 50 Westbourne Villas and therefore makes the relevant point more effectively.

I am writing on behalf of Mr and Mrs Tyler of 50 Westbourne Villas in relation to the daylight and sunlight implications of this planning application. I have carried out an initial assessment of the likely impact of the latest extension proposals at 51 Westbourne Villas on daylight and sunlight to the house at No. 50. Brighton & Hove District Council should ensure that the proposal meets the recommendations of the Building Research Establishment Report "Site Layout Planning for Daylight & Sunlight 2011" in respect of the effect of this application. I do not believe that it will meet that standard and that the Local Authority should require calculations to support this application. It is the case the Checklist for Planning Applications of the council does not require a daylight study for a single storey extension, but the impact in this case is so clearly an adverse impact that I believe it is needed to avoid creating a very badly lit habitable room.

50 Westbourne Villas has a habitable room in the centre of the south elevation that has a single window directly looking towards the rear of No. 51 and directly towards the location of the proposed new conservatory. I attach a plan showing the room in question. The design and layout of that room is such that it has relatively limited access to light with only a single window to one side of the room which at present gives adequate light due to the ability to receive relatively good sky visibility to the rear. The proposed conservatory extension will significantly reduce that sky visibility by being located close to it or directly outside it.

The BRE Guide recommends that the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) to the face of the window should be at 27% or, if lower than that, reduced by not more than 20% from existing. It is clear that this extension will reduce the VSC by more than 20% from existing and fail the standard. In addition, the BRE report advises that the area of a room that can see direct skylight on the working plane, the No Sky Contour, should not be reduced by more than 20% from existing. The area of the relevant room that can see direct sky visibility is limited and is less than half the room at present. This will clearly be reduced by more than 20% and there will be a substantial reduction of the skylight in the room. The result of this is that the room will appear significantly darker and will be adversely affected.

It is therefore appropriate for the Local Authority to require a daylight and sunlight report to be submitted with the planning application and should not determine the application until the planning officer and members of the committee have that information to consider. If the BRE standards are not met then the application should not be granted consent in its current form.

Yours sincerely,

Alistair Redler BSc FRICS

Senior Partner

Alistair.redler@delvapatmanredler.co.uk