

# MEETING NOTE



100 Pall Mall  
London  
SW1Y 5NQ

|                   |                                       |          |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>Attendees:</b> | [REDACTED]                            | LLDC     |
|                   | Catherine Smyth (CS)                  | LLDC     |
|                   | [REDACTED]                            | LLDC     |
|                   | [REDACTED]                            | Arup     |
|                   | [REDACTED]                            | Point2   |
|                   | [REDACTED]                            | HSF      |
|                   | [REDACTED]                            | Populous |
|                   | [REDACTED]                            | DP9      |
|                   | [REDACTED]                            | DP9      |
| <b>Date</b>       | Friday 11 <sup>th</sup> May 2018      |          |
| <b>Subject</b>    | Stratford Gardens – Daylight/Sunlight |          |

## Daylight/Sunlight considerations

**Point2** [REDACTED] outlined that a laser scan survey of the site and surrounding buildings has been undertaken to inform the daylight/sunlight analysis.

**Point2** [REDACTED] confirmed that Point2 has also obtained floor layouts for surrounding residential buildings.

**Point2** [REDACTED] set out the Building Research Establishment assessment methods to measure internal daylight/sunlight levels:

- Vertical Sky Component;
- No Sky Line;
- Average Daylight Factor;
- Annual Probable Sunlight Hours.

**Point2** [REDACTED] outlined that initial analysis has been undertaken to assess the potential impact of the proposed development on lighting levels to surrounding residential receptors.

**Point2** [REDACTED] stated that surrounding student and hotel buildings have not been included in the initial analysis, as these uses are transient in nature and therefore occupiers do not experience the same impacts.

**LLDC-A / Arup** [REDACTED] advised that the impact on surrounding student and hotel buildings (and any other sites with a reasonable expectation of light) should be included as part of the detailed assessment, but

recognised that natural light to these uses may be given less weight than standard residential accommodation.

LLDC-A ■ suggested that example cases of less weight being applied to daylight/sunlight levels to hotel/student uses should be outlined.

There was discussion regarding the planning history of site ref 8 and 9 within the Point 2 pre-app presentation document (to the north east of the Stratford Garden site). A planning application was approved on this land (The Railway Tavern, 131 Angel Lane) on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2017 for redevelopment of the site to provide a 298-room hotel ranging in height from 3 to 8 storeys (ref: 16/02650/FUL). This site falls outside of LLDC's jurisdiction and was determined by LB Newham.

Point2 ■ outlined that the initial analysis demonstrates that the lighting levels to surrounding residential properties (with the proposed development in place) are as follows:

#### *Daylight*

- VSC – of 2065 windows within 38 surrounding properties, 1857 satisfy the BRE Guidance (90%);
- NSL - of 1027 rooms, 994 satisfy BRE Guidance (96.8%)

The better NSL results reflect the fact that many rooms are served by more than one window.

#### *Sunlight*

- APSH – of 1248 windows, 1150 satisfy BRE Guidance (92%)

Point2 ■ advised that impacts will be greater at the lower levels of the Telford Homes Stratford Central building.

LLDC-A ■ advised that the daylight/sunlight assessment should both include and exclude recessed balconies from assessed internal areas.

Point2 ■ advised that the projecting balconies at the Chobham Farm development to the north of the site prejudice light levels to these properties. It was agreed that the daylight/sunlight assessment should both include and exclude these balconies as part of the assessment to demonstrate the impact of the balconies on light levels to the properties.

LLDC-A ■ questioned what the existing daylight/sunlight levels are to the surrounding residential buildings (i.e. existing baseline condition). ■ outlined this information would be provided as part of the detailed daylight/sunlight assessment. **Point2 to include in assessment.**

Point2

Point2 As the site is currently vacant, ■ outlined that it is appropriate to assess the impact of the proposed development against an alternative baseline massing i.e. a building of the same height, size and equal distance away as the massing on neighbouring sites. This 'mirrored baseline' approach accords with the BRE guidance.

Point2 ■ outlined that the assessed alternative baseline mirrors the massing to the south-east and the north of the site on the opposite sides of the railway (i.e. Stratford Central/Telford Homes and Chobham Farm schemes). ■ confirmed the initial analysis indicates that generally, the impact of the proposed sphere massing on daylight/sunlight levels to the assessed surrounding residential

Point2 properties is less significant in comparison to the impact of the alternative baseline mirror massing.

LLDC-A  
/ LLDC-B

■ questioned whether the assessed alternative baseline mirror massing would be approved by LLDC, i.e. that the mirror massing may not be acceptable in design terms.

HSF

■ stated the mirrored baseline approach is an accepted methodology within the BRE guidance.

HSF

■ advised that developing an alternative baseline condition which strays from the BRE guidelines would not be legally robust and therefore could be subject to legal challenge. In this context, ■ advised that assessment of the proposed scheme should seek to accord with BRE guidance.

HSF

HSF

■ explained that the purpose of the mirror analysis is not to assess what scale of hypothetical development would be likely to be granted planning permission on the site, but to take account of windows on neighbouring sites that already take "more than their fair share of light" due to the design of the existing building. The BRE guidance indicates that one way to demonstrate in such cases whether or not the main factor in the relative loss of light is the presence of a balcony, recessed window or projecting wing on the existing building, is to carry out an additional calculation without the obstruction in place. What the BRE Guide is concerned with in these cases is whether a larger relative reduction in VSC may be unavoidable even with a relatively modest obstruction opposite.

Arup

■ outlined that the mirrored baseline approach / removal of obstructions should form part of the assessment, in addition to assessing the impact of the proposed massing against the existing baseline condition / without obstructions removed. ■ added that he was not sure there would be any daylight / sunlight issues due to the shape of the proposed building and that alternative baselines may not in fact be necessary given that about 90% of windows would satisfy the BRE guidance anyway.

Arup

Point2

■ confirmed the daylight/sunlight assessment would analyse:

- The impact of the proposed massing against the existing baseline condition;
- The impact of the proposed massing + cumulative schemes against the existing baseline condition;
- The impact of the proposed massing against the alternative baseline condition / without obstructions;
- The impact of the proposed massing + cumulative schemes against the alternative baseline condition / without obstructions;

Arup

■ said that Arup has a standard pro forma for capturing the required information to be presented within the daylight/sunlight assessment. ■ to circulate. Arup

Arup

■ advised that ADF levels should also be provided within the daylight/sunlight assessment.

It was agreed that a cutback analysis would not be necessary or appropriate given the unique proposed design of the development as a sphere.

Point2

CS advised that the impact of the proposed massing on surrounding open spaces should be assessed.

■ confirmed this would form part of the daylight/sunlight assessment.

Point2

■ confirmed that the next daylight/sunlight meeting should be held at Point2 offices. DP9 to coordinate.

### Light Pollution

**Point2** ■ advised that the emission of light from the building façade and associated impact on neighbouring properties will be assessed in accordance with Institution of Lighting Professionals – Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light. The analysis will need to take account of moving images potentially having less impact than a static continuous light source.

**Point2** ■ to confirm which Environmental Zone the scheme is to be assessed against. **Point2 to confirm.**

**Populous** ■ confirmed that the lighting design of the building is still being worked on and that the analysis of light pollution from the sphere exterior is an iterative process which will be discussed with Network Rail and considered in the context of rail safety, surrounding residential properties etc.

**Populous** ■ advised that the MSG team is likely to be in a position to discuss light pollution with LLDC in 4-6 weeks' time.

**LLDC-B** ■ said that there is a need to understand what the sphere looks like from the inside of surrounding properties. ■ also suggested that the visual impact of the proposed development might be considered in the context of examples of other buildings across the world where relevant, e.g. spherical buildings in Gothenburg, Shanghai and at the Astana Expo site.

**Arup** ■ advised that the health impacts of light pollution / intrusion need to be considered as part of the Environmental Statement.

**Arup** ■ also advised that the ES would need to include a solar glare / reflection study and queried how much information on this would be included within the ES coping report. **Trium to confirm.**