

WED10096

31 March 2017

Andres Monsalve
Leslie Clark Construction Consultants
52-54 High Holbon
London
WC1V 6RL

Dear Jonathan Markwell

RBC COMMENTS ON DESKTOP MICROCLIMATE STUDY FOR 52-55 FRIAR ST & 12 GREYFRIARS ROAD

Firstly in relation to RBC's (BRE) feedback to date relating to our microclimate wind study we would like to request that RBC officers provide the report for the 52-55 Friar St & 12 Greyfriars Road development, as this is a standalone development and as such is not related to RBC's (BRE) noted Swan Heights development.

In relation to the robustness and validity of the microclimate study, including its methodology and conclusions, we believe that the point of contention is the use of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) as opposed to a physical wind tunnel test. We would like to stress that the reason CFD was used for this development was due to the wording of RBC's pre-application letter (dated 7th September 2016), specifically the passages that relate directly to microclimate (under **Quality of accommodation for future occupiers & amenity impacts on nearby occupiers** pg 6-7:

"you are also advised to consider microclimate matters (more specifically a wind assessment), in light of the proposed heights of buildings and the limited space between buildings at this point."

And again under **Other matters** pg 14:

"A microclimate assessment is also likely to be required, owing to the nature of the proposals."

Based on our pre-application process and the detailed feedback provided by RBC in their response dated 7th September 2016, it was understood a formal Microclimate Wind Assessment was not a document part of our planning submission requirements detailed in pg 14.

Methods of assessment versus the pre-application advice were discussed by the Client's team and CFD selected as a reasonable method to consider the microclimate and inform the design progression, ahead of the planning application. In support of our approach and intentions we inserted a clarification paragraph which was written into the report to ensure it was not considered a formal Microclimate Wind Assessment but as a design development

tool to demonstrate consideration. We note that BRE specifically highlighted this paragraph in their response. Our experience elsewhere with RBC (for example the Swan Heights development) tells us Microclimate Wind Assessments are favoured as a wind tunnel test rather than CFD for a formal response to the microclimate wind conditions for planning of tall buildings policy and it is not in our interest to miss-lead our Client.

As such the CFD analysis of the development's impact on the local microclimate was undertaken in line with the recommendations of the pre-application advice to consider microclimate. However following submission of the planning application and subsequent review by BRE, the CFD analysis has been deemed as not to comply with RBC's planning regarding a development's impact on microclimate. Policy (and the pre-application advice) does not specifically call for wind tunnel testing to determine the impact on local microclimate, and has only been advised as a requirement following RBC's correspondence of 09/03/17.

Following recent correspondence regarding this matter, the professional team has since engaged with a fluid dynamics consultant to consider undertaking wind tunnel testing at the earliest opportunity in line with a formal Microclimate Wind Assessment Report that is typically issued to support planning applications (e.g. City of London, Local Plan, Policy DM 10.8 Access and Inclusive design) when a wind tunnel test is called for. As such we would request that this matter is progressed in parallel with our Client's planning process to ensure compliance with the received correspondence from RBC planning officers calling specifically for a wind tunnel test.

Yours Sincerely

Ed Healy
Senior Consultant
Hurley Palmer Flatt

On behalf

Paul Scriven
Associate Director
Hurley Palmer Flatt