

Aidan Robson
Danescroft Land Limited
4th Floor
40-42 Parker Street
London
WC2B 5PQ

19 September 2019

Dear Aidan

Re: (ROL00143 Reading Gasworks)

Following the receipt of further queries as to our analysis of the proposed scheme, we set out in this letter our thoughts on the comments made and an explanation of our approach.

The main points we have been asked to clarify were as follows:

- Regarding our analysis of the daylight and sunlight analysis of the light condition within the proposed residential accommodation, to confirm that the window reveals and balconies have been taken into consideration.
- Our approach to the truncation of kitchen when dealing with large mixed-use rooms with internalised kitchens.

Window reveals and balconies

We confirm that our model is based of the architect's Revit and Sketch-Up model of their proposed scheme. Therefore, the reveals for the windows have all been included within our modelling and the windows test points located on the inner face of the wall.

Regarding the balconies, all balcony slabs have been modelled into the analysis to replicate the overhanging nature of the obstruction. The balconies have been designed with railing balustrades, purposely to allow light to pass through to the windows and rooms beyond. If the balustrade of the

4 Chiswell Street, London EC1Y 4UP T: 020 7065 2770

Also at 3 Temple Row West, Birmingham B2 5NY T: 0121 667 9902

ansteyhorne.co.uk

Chartered Surveyors | Rights of Light | Party Walls | Building Surveying | Neighbourly Liaison

expertise
applied

Anstey Horne is the trading name of Anstey Horne & Co Ltd, a company registered in England and Wales number 05543524. Registered address 4 Chiswell Street, London EC1Y 4UP. Regulated by RICS.

balcony was specified as glass, we would have modelled this as a solid obstruction, as one cannot guarantee the maintenance of the glass. This is not clearly stated in the BRE guidelines, but a reasonable assumption to make. However, where railings are specified, such as those for this development, they have been excluded from the model as the file size will be significant and, as they allow light to filtrate through to the window, there will be negligible impact on the light the rooms receive.

In addition, as per section C10 in the BRE guideline appendix, when carrying out ADF analyses, glazed doors leading onto balconies are split into two panels. The lower glazed panel below working plane height (850mm) has an addition factor applied to it, to take into account the reduced effectiveness of the lower part of the glazing. The balustrade is proposed to be a maximum height of 1100mm and therefore any effect of the railings would be predominantly to the lower glazed panel ADF calculation, which, given the additional factor applied, will have even less of an effect to the overall ADF calculated for the room.

We therefore consider the query on the railings irrelevant to the assessment results and reconfirm the window reveal has been taken into account, ensuring our assessment is robust.

Notional truncation of kitchens

The BRE also commented on our approach to the truncation of living/kitchen dining rooms (LKD). As we had already highlighted in our original report, the guidelines at paragraph 2.1.14 states “*Non-daylit internal kitchens should be avoided wherever possible, especially if the kitchen is used as a dining area too. If the layout means that a small internal galley-type kitchen is inevitable, it should be directly linked to a well daylit living room.*” The design is such that the vast majority of the kitchen are small, effectively internal galley-style spaces, with the dining and living areas adjacent.

In our industry, the common interpretation of the guidance above is to therefore create hypothetical living/dining spaces by notionally truncating the room, setting aside the kitchen for the purposes of the ADF test. The notional truncation allows us to isolate the light levels to the living/dining area to make a judgement as to whether the kitchen is directly linked to a well daylit living area, as per the guidance above. We therefore consider our approach is both fair and reasonable.

There was also a comment that the results were overstated. We highlight that the BRE guidelines set out a simplistic ADF formula that can be applied and in the definition of the formula components it states A is the total area of the room surfaces including all walls, ceiling, floor and windows. The request from BRE regarding the complexity of reflectance values for one wall is



therefore unreasonable, given the simplistic nature of the formula. Furthermore, the results for the living/dining rooms all far surpass the 1.5% target, with the lowest being 2.81%. Therefore, it is considered unreasonable to scrutinise these results in this level of detail when the principle has been clearly demonstrated.

We trust the above gives a suitable explanation of the queries, and our responses. Should you have any questions regarding this, please do not hesitate in contacting us.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Anstey Horne". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Anstey Horne