

BRE Client Report

Review of daylight and sunlight, Vastern Court

Prepared for: Reading Borough Council

Date: 13 January 2022

Report Number: P122222-1000 Issue: 1

BRE
Watford, Herts
WD25 9XX

Customer Services 0333 321 8811

From outside the UK:
T + 44 (0) 1923 664000
F + 44 (0) 1923 664010
E enquiries@bre.co.uk
www.bre.co.uk

Prepared for:
Reading Borough Council
Civic Offices, Level 1 North
Bridge Street
Reading
RG1 2LU




Prepared by

Name Dr Paul Littlefair

Position Principal Lighting Consultant

Date 13 January 2022

Signature 

Checked by

Name Gareth Howlett

Position Senior Lighting Consultant

Date 13 January 2022

Signature 

This report is made on behalf of Building Research Establishment Ltd. (BRE) and may only be distributed in its entirety, without amendment, and with attribution to BRE to the extent permitted by the terms and conditions of the contract. BRE's liability in respect of this report and reliance thereupon shall be as per the terms and conditions of contract with the client and BRE shall have no liability to third parties to the extent permitted in law.



Executive Summary

An outline planning application has been submitted to Reading Borough Council for a large mixed use development at Vastern Road Retail Park in Reading. The developer has submitted an Environmental Statement, chapter 10 of which is entitled 'Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Solar Glare'. They have also submitted a report by CHP Surveyors Ltd concerning daylight and sunlight provision within the proposed scheme itself, entitled 'Reading Station Park, Reading: Internal daylight and sunlight review'. BRE have been commissioned by Reading Borough Council to evaluate this chapter and report. The assessment has been carried out using the guidelines in the BRE Report 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice'.

Loss of daylight to some windows and rooms at 87-97 Caversham Road would be outside the BRE guidelines, though the retained levels would be only just outside the recommended values. This would count as a minor adverse impact. The proposed development to the south (Hermes/Reading Metropolitan) would cause an additional cumulative reduction, but not by much. Loss of sunlight would meet the BRE guidelines.

Loss of daylight to 17-49 Caversham Road would be outside the BRE guidelines. This is classified as a major adverse impact to numbers 21-49 as all the windows at the front of the houses would be affected including main living rooms, and the loss of light is well outside the guidelines. Number 51 has not been analysed and its front windows would be expected to have a similar loss of light to number 49. For numbers 17 and 19 the loss of daylight is assessed as a moderate impact. There would be little or no cumulative impact from other proposed schemes. Loss of sunlight would meet the BRE guidelines.

The cumulative assessment has not considered loss of daylight to the Hermes/Reading Metropolitan scheme, or loss of daylight and sunlight to the SSE site across Vastern Road. These should have been addressed in the Environmental Statement.

A large number of living rooms in the proposed development are predicted to have limited daylight. CHP Surveyors have analysed worst case rooms on the lower floors of Blocks B and C. With the Hermes/Reading Metropolitan scheme in place, 79 (44%) of these 177 living rooms would not meet the minimum recommendation for daylight provision. For bedrooms, compliance rates are better with just 14 not meeting the recommended 1%.

Sunlight provision in these rooms on the lower floors would be poor, with just 21 (12% of 180) living rooms and studios analysed meeting the BRE/BS sunlight recommendations with the Hermes scheme in place.

There are no existing gardens in which sunlight could be affected by the proposed development. Sunlight provision in open spaces in the proposed scheme itself varies, with most of the roof terraces and the courtyard to Block B appearing to meet the recommendation, while the courtyard to Block C would not. The results are not clearly labelled, and it is surprising that the results for Blocks B and C are so different when they have a similar design. With the existing surroundings, the Environmental Statement indicates that sunlight in the open spaces between Blocks A and B and between Blocks C and D would meet the recommendation, while the space between Blocks B and C would not. A cumulative assessment of these spaces with the Hermes scheme in place should have been included in the Environmental Statement.



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Guidance on daylight and sunlight	5
2.1	Daylight to existing buildings	5
2.2	Sunlight to existing buildings	5
2.3	Daylight and sunlight in new dwellings	6
2.4	Impact assessment	6
3	The proposed development	8
4	Daylight and sunlight to existing properties	10
5	Cumulative impacts	12
6	Daylight and sunlight to new dwellings	13
6.1	Daylight	13
6.2	Sunlight	14
7	Sunlight to open spaces	15
8	Conclusions	16



1 Introduction

- 1.1 An outline planning application has been submitted to Reading Borough Council for a new development at Vastern Road Retail Park in Reading. The proposal is for a large mixed use development, in a series of blocks up to around 75 metres tall.
- 1.2 The developer has submitted an Environmental Statement, chapter 10 of which is entitled 'Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Solar Glare'. They have also submitted a report by CHP Surveyors Ltd concerning daylight and sunlight provision within the proposed scheme itself, entitled 'Reading Station Park, Reading: Internal daylight and sunlight review' dated 6th October 2021. BRE have been commissioned by Reading Borough Council to evaluate this chapter and report. The assessment was to cover the methodology and conclusions, but not verification of the calculations. It addresses the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing aspects of the chapter, but not solar glare. It also addresses the daylight and sunlight aspects of the 'Cumulative Effects' chapter, chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement.
- 1.3 The assessment is based principally on the data supplied in the Environmental Statement and CHP Surveyors' report, together with outline plans by Collado Collins contained in a document 'Reading Station Park redevelopment: Amended outline planning application booklet, amended description of development, application forms & certificates, amended development parameters (schedule and parameter plans)' dated October 2021. No site visit was specifically undertaken for this review, although we did visit the site on 9 May 2019 to assess a proposed neighbouring scheme.
- 1.4 This report gives the results of our assessment.



2 Guidance on daylight and sunlight

2.1 Daylight to existing buildings

- 2.1.1 The Environmental Statement and CHP Surveyors' report have used the guidance in the BRE Report 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice'. This report is widely used by local authorities to help determine planning applications. It was revised in 2011; they have used the latest edition in their assessment.
- 2.1.2 The BRE Report does state that its own numerical guidelines 'should be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances the developer or planning authority may wish to use different target values. For example in a historic city centre or an area with modern high rise buildings a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings.'
- 2.1.3 To assess the impact on the amount of diffuse daylighting entering windows (whether new or existing), the Report uses the vertical sky component (VSC) at the centre of the window. This is one of the quantities calculated in the Environmental Statement.
- 2.1.4 The BRE Report sets out two guidelines for vertical sky component:
- If the vertical sky component at the centre of the window exceeds 27% with the new development in place, then enough sky light should be reaching the window.
 - For an existing window, if the vertical sky component with the new development is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value, then the area lit by the window is likely to appear more gloomy, and electric lighting will be needed for more of the time.
- 2.1.5 The BRE Report also gives guidance on the distribution of light in the existing buildings, based on the areas of the working plane which can receive direct sky light before and after. If this area is reduced to less than 0.8 times its value before, then the distribution of light in the room is likely to be adversely affected, and more of the room will appear poorly lit. In the Environmental Statement appendix 10.2 the relevant data are headed 'NOSKY'. The data are presented in an unusual way; ratios of the areas 'before' and 'after' are not given, and if the area 'before' is more than 80% of the room it is not given, making it impossible to calculate the ratio. Consequently it has not been possible to verify the numbers of compliant rooms in the Environmental Statement.
- 2.1.6 To verify compliance with the daylight distribution guidelines it is necessary to have data on the internal layouts of the affected rooms. Unless CHP Surveyors had access to, or plans of, the existing buildings, the daylight distribution data are subject to uncertainty.

2.2 Sunlight to existing buildings

- 2.2.1 The BRE Report recommends that in existing buildings sunlight should be checked for all main living rooms of dwellings, and conservatories, if they have a window facing within 90° of due south. Access to sunlight should be calculated for the main window of each of the above rooms which faces within 90° of due south. If the centre of the window can receive more than one quarter of annual probable sunlight hours, including at least 5% of annual probable sunlight hours in the winter months between 21 September and 21 March, then the room should still receive enough sunlight. Any reduction in sunlight access below this level should be kept to a minimum. If the available sunlight hours are both less than the amount above, less than 0.8



times their former value, and more than 4% lower than previously, then the sunlighting of the existing dwelling may be adversely affected. This guideline is also used in the Environmental Statement.

2.3 Daylight and sunlight in new dwellings

- 2.3.1 For daylight in new dwellings where room layouts and window designs are known, the average daylight factor (ADF) can be used. The average daylight factor (ADF) is a measure of the amount of daylight in an interior. It depends on the room and window dimensions, the reflectances of interior surfaces and the type of glass, as well as the obstructions outside. Appendix F of the BRE Report 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice' explains that 'it is an appropriate measure to use in new buildings because most of these factors are within the developer's control'. CHP Surveyors have calculated average daylight factors for the new development in their report.
- 2.3.2 Guidance on the levels of daylight to be provided is given in the British Standard on daylight, BS 8206 Part 2. It recommends minimum values of average daylight factor of 1% for bedrooms, 1.5% for living rooms and 2% for kitchens. The CHP Surveyors report has used these recommendations.
- 2.3.3 BS 8206 Part 2 has recently (May 2019) been replaced by BS EN 17037, which has different forms of recommendation for interior daylight and sunlight. CHP Surveyors have also carried out calculations against the recommendations in the new BS. It is assumed that they have used the recommendations in the National Annex to BS EN 17037. This recommends particular internal illuminances to be achieved over at least half the floor area over at least half of daylight hours. These are 200 lux for kitchens, 150 lux for living rooms and 100 lux for bedrooms.
- 2.3.4 BS8206 Part 2 and the BRE Report also give guidance on sunlight in new dwellings. This is based on living rooms receiving 25% of annual probable sunlight hours, including 5% in the winter.
- 2.3.5 Sunlight can also make outdoor spaces more pleasant, particularly where there are activities like sitting out and children's play. Guidance on sunlight in outdoor spaces is given in the BRE Report 'Site layout planning...'. It gives a recommendation for outdoor spaces where sunlight is 'required'; this is stated to include gardens, parks and playing fields, 'sitting out areas such as those between non domestic buildings and in public squares', and 'focal points for views such as a group of monuments or fountains'.
- 2.3.6 The Report recommends that no more than half of such an area should be prevented by buildings from receiving two hours of sunlight on 21 March. Sunlight at an altitude of 10 degrees or less does not count. This assessment has been carried out by CHP Surveyors for open spaces in the proposed development.

2.4 Impact assessment

- 2.4.1 The BRE Report 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice' (Appendix I) also gives guidance on assessing the impact of a proposed development. Where the loss of skylight or sunlight fully meets the guidelines in the document, the impact is assessed as negligible or minor adverse. Where the loss of light is well within the guidelines, or only a small number of windows or limited area of open space lose light (within the guidelines), a classification of negligible impact is more appropriate. Where the loss of light is only just within the guidelines, and a larger number of windows or open space area are affected, a minor adverse impact would



be more appropriate, especially if there is a particularly strong requirement for daylight and sunlight in the affected building or open space.

2.4.2 Where the loss of skylight or sunlight does not meet the guidelines in the BRE Report, the impact is assessed as minor, moderate or major adverse. Factors tending towards a minor adverse impact include:

- only a small number of windows or limited area of open space are affected
- the loss of light is only marginally outside the guidelines
- an affected room has other sources of skylight or sunlight
- the affected building or open space only has a low level requirement for skylight or sunlight
- there are particular reasons why an alternative, less stringent, guideline should be applied.

2.4.3 Factors tending towards a major adverse impact include:

- a large number of windows or large area of open space are affected
- the loss of light is substantially outside the guidelines
- all the windows in a particular property are affected
- the affected indoor or outdoor spaces have a particularly strong requirement for skylight or sunlight, for example a living room in a dwelling or a children's playground.

2.4.4 Some councils use an alternative classification of impact which is applied on a window by window basis (see tables 10.4-10.8 of the Environmental Statement). Relative losses of 20-30% are classed as minor adverse, 30-40% moderate adverse, and 40%+ major adverse. This is an objective set of criteria, and, except for daylight distribution, the boundaries of the categories are reasonable, but the results need careful interpretation. For example a large relative loss of light to a secondary window, or a window with a large overhang above it, would not be as serious as the same loss of light to a main living room window.

2.4.5 Table 10.3 of the Environmental Statement gives alternative criteria for 'high' 'medium' 'small' and 'very small' magnitudes of impact. These do not have any basis in published guidance. However this classification does not appear to have been applied in the Environmental Statement, so this table may be discounted.

3 The proposed development

3.1 Figure 1 shows the development site and its surroundings.



Figure 1. Maximum parameter plan by Collado Collins showing the development in light brown, and annotated to show surrounding buildings. North is at the top of the plan.

3.2 The development site is at the corner of Caversham Road (to the west) and Vastern Road (to the north). There are dwellings that could be affected by it along both roads. To the south of the proposal development is 80 Caversham Road, currently a Post Office sorting depot. This would be expected to have a lesser requirement for daylight than residential buildings would. However the site is currently the subject of an application for outline planning permission for a large, predominantly residential scheme (Reading Metropolitan, referred to as the Hermes development in the Environmental Statement). To the north across Vastern Road is 53-55 Vastern Road, currently an office block, for which loss of daylight may not be as important an issue. This site too has been the subject of a planning application for a predominantly residential scheme, 'River Gate', referred to as the SSE development in the Environmental Statement. At the time of writing this proposal has been refused permission by Reading Borough Council but is understood to be the subject of an appeal.

3.3 Figure 2 is a 3D view showing CHP Surveyors' model, including the sites of the two proposed developments. For the 80 Caversham Road (Hermes/Reading Metropolitan) site the massing shown appears to relate to what is proposed for that site. For the 53-55 Vastern Road (SSE) site the massing in Figure 2 appears different and possibly slightly smaller than what was proposed for that site.

bre

Figure 2. Drawing by CHP Surveyors showing the proposed development (maximum parameters) in blue and the proposed massing for the Reading Metropolitan/Hermes development behind it. To the left is the site of the proposed River Gate/SSE development.



4 Daylight and sunlight to existing properties

- 4.1 The Environmental Statement has assessed the loss of light to existing dwellings. It has analysed loss of light to residential properties at 87-97 Caversham Road (odd numbers only) and 17-49 Vastern Road (odd numbers only). 51 Vastern Road has not been analysed, and should have been; although the ground floor may have been in commercial use in the past, it is understood that there are now flats at this address. The loss of light to the front windows would be expected to be similar to that for number 49 next door.
- 4.2 There appear to be no other existing residential properties that could be significantly affected. Other nearby buildings are in commercial uses for which loss of light would be less important.
- 4.3 It is understood that loss of light has been calculated using the maximum parameter plans. This is a reasonable approach. If the massing of the final proposed development turns out to be less than this, there would be less loss of light to surrounding properties.
- 4.4 87-97 Caversham Road (odd numbers only) are flats above shops and a restaurant. Assessed against the existing baseline, loss of vertical sky component to three windows in 87-89 would be outside the BRE guidelines, though the retained values would be only just below the recommended 27%. The impact on daylight distribution would be outside the BRE guidelines for all but one of the second floor rooms, though only marginally in the case of number 91. There appears to be a mistake in tables 10.17, 10.19 and 10.21 of the Environmental Statement which show all these rooms as complying with the daylight distribution guideline; this does not agree with the detailed data in their Appendix 10.2. However, these results may be subject to uncertainty if room layouts are not known. The loss of daylight would count as a minor adverse impact to these flats (not negligible as stated in the Environmental Statement).
- 4.5 Loss of sunlight to 87-97 Caversham Road would be within the BRE guidelines for all windows, and classified as negligible.
- 4.6 17-51 Vastern Road (odd numbers only) are houses, some of which may be divided into flats. Loss of vertical sky component to all windows on the Vastern Road would be well outside the BRE guidelines, with relative losses in the 33-45% range. Retained vertical sky components would be in the 21-26% range. Although these values might be typical of a dense urban area, Vastern Road is unusually wide and residents could legitimately expect to retain more light for that reason. Contrary to what is stated in paragraph 11.200 of the Environmental Statement, the Reading Station Area Framework masterplan would have a much lower impact on daylight to these dwellings.
- 4.7 According to the table in the Environmental Statement, loss of daylight distribution to 36 of the 50 rooms analysed would also be outside the BRE guidelines. Overall the loss of daylight would be assessed as major adverse to 21-49 Vastern Road, and probably number 51 too. This is because all the windows on this side are affected, the loss of light is well outside the guidelines and the affected windows would be expected to include main living rooms. For 17 and 19 Vastern Road the loss of light is a little lower and could be classified as moderate adverse.
- 4.8 All windows in these properties would meet the BRE guidance on loss of sunlight. Loss of year-round sunlight would be classified as negligible. Loss of winter sunlight would be classified as



minor adverse, as the windows would lose most of their winter sun, while retaining above the recommended 5%.



5 Cumulative impacts

- 5.1 The 80 Caversham Road (Hermes) site to the south and the 53-55 Vastern Road (SSE) site to the north are expected to be redeveloped in the future (Figure 2), and both developments are expected to include residential buildings.
- 5.2 This type of situation gives rise to three different issues:
- The three developments together might have a cumulative daylight/sunlight impact on existing properties nearby
 - The Hermes and SSE developments might restrict daylight and sunlight to the proposed Vastern Court development
 - The Vastern Court development might limit daylight (though not sunlight, as it lies to the north) to the Hermes development; and might limit both daylight and sunlight to the SSE development.
- 5.3 The Environmental Statement has addressed the first of these issues. CHP's report deals with the second issue. The third issue, the impact of the proposed Vastern Court development on future occupiers of homes on the Hermes and SSE sites, has not been considered, and should have been addressed. It is understood that illustrative schemes are available for both sites, and therefore an analysis would be possible.
- 5.4 To assess the cumulative impact on existing buildings the Environmental Statement has calculated daylight and sunlight comparing the situation with all three schemes in place with that for the existing baseline with no site redeveloped. This gives the total cumulative impact of all the schemes, but does not give information on how much of the loss of light is due to each one. In this case this does not matter much as the Hermes and SSE developments would only have a very minor impact on the residential properties being considered. The SSE scheme would have virtually no impact on any of the properties, so if the Environmental Statement has not modelled it correctly that would not matter much.
- 5.5 With all three developments in place, there would be an increased number of windows (nine in all) in 87-93 Caversham Road that would not meet the BRE vertical sky component guidelines. There is a mistake in table 10.35 of the Environmental Statement; the number of minor impacts should be zero, not six. The impacts on daylight distribution would be similar to that for the Vastern Court on its own; there are more mistakes in tables 10.36, 10.40 and 10.44 which erroneously imply that all rooms would meet the guidelines when five would not. Overall the cumulative impact on daylight to 87-97 Caversham Road would be classified as minor adverse. Loss of sunlight would be within the guidelines.
- 5.6 For 17-49 Vastern Road the other developments make very little difference to the loss of light. The overall daylight impact of all three schemes would be moderate adverse for numbers 17 and 19, and major adverse for numbers 21-49 and probably number 51 too. Loss of sunlight would be within the BRE guidelines.



6 Daylight and sunlight to new dwellings

6.1 Daylight

- 6.1.1 CHP Surveyors' report deals with daylight provision within the scheme itself. Although this is an outline scheme, for which internal drawings would not normally be available, CHP have calculated the average daylight factors (ADF) inside specific rooms, based on the illustrative scheme design. This is a reasonable approach, although as the final scheme may be different it is recommended that the council require a full daylight and sunlight study at the detailed planning stage.
- 6.1.2 CHP have listed their assumptions about glass transmittance, and room reflectance. Room reflectances are reasonable provided that the rooms are actually decorated like this. Glass transmittances and frame factors are unusually high, and no dirt correction appears to have been applied, so the calculated ADFs may be overestimates by 20% or so in relative terms.
- 6.1.3 CHP have analysed a subset of the proposed rooms on lowest three floors of Block B and C. These would be expected to be the worst lit blocks as they have enclosed courtyards and other blocks on either side. In principle this is a reasonable approach. Blocks A and D would be expected to have more access to daylight overall, but may still have some residential rooms not meeting the BRE guidelines, for example where they face the other blocks or into the courtyard of Block A. (Block D may or may not be residential in the final design).
- 6.1.4 Using CHP's data with the current surroundings, of the 177 living rooms analysed in Blocks B and C, 66 (37%) would not meet the minimum 1.5% ADF for a living room. Another 41 (23%) would have an ADF over 1.5% but below the 2% recommended for a kitchen. 70 (40%) would meet both recommendations. Bedrooms have a better compliance rate, with only 8 not meeting the recommended 1%.
- 6.1.5 With the Hermes/Reading Metropolitan scheme in place, daylight provision would be worse. These data are perhaps the most relevant because it is likely that there will be a large development on this site in the future. 79 (44%) of the 177 living rooms would not meet the minimum 1.5% ADF. Another 49 (28%) would have an ADF over 1.5% but below the 2% recommended for a kitchen. Only 49 (28%) would meet both recommendations. 14 bedrooms would not meet the recommended 1%.
- 6.1.6 The results assessed against the BS EN 17037 National Annex criteria are similar although slightly more rooms would not meet the recommendations.
- 6.1.7 These figures represent poor levels of daylight provision in the living rooms. Although the upper floors of Blocks B and C and most of Blocks A and D would be expected to have more light, having such a large number of living rooms below the minimum standard is unsatisfactory. Special design will be required on these lower floors to ensure adequate light; these could include enlarging windows, changing room layouts or moving or omitting balconies.
- 6.1.8 As this is an outline scheme, one potential way forward would be to impose a condition requiring all, or a certain (large) proportion, of the rooms to meet the recommendations in BS EN 17037.



6.2 Sunlight

- 6.2.1 CHP Surveyors have given sunlight data for the proposed development. However they have only analysed living rooms and studios with a window facing within 90° of due south. With the current surroundings, they predict 40 rooms meeting the BRE/BS recommendations of 25% annual probable sunlight hours and 5% in the winter. This represents just 22% of the total 180 living rooms and studios on these floors. Another 15 rooms, or 8% of the total, would meet the winter target but not the year round one.
- 6.2.2 With the large Reading Metropolitan/Hermes development to the south, these figures are even lower. Just 21 (12% of the 180) would meet both recommendations. Another 8 would meet the winter recommendation only, and another 7 would meet the summer recommendation only.
- 6.2.3 These are very poor levels of sunlight provision. Although the Reading Metropolitan/Hermes development to the south clearly makes some difference, even without it less than a quarter of the rooms would meet the recommendations. This is largely because the distances between the blocks and within the courtyards are small compared to the heights of the blocks. In a final scheme there would be little way of markedly improving sunlight provision apart from removing balconies above windows.



7 Sunlight to open spaces

- 7.1 There are no existing gardens which could be affected by the proposed development. The proposed development would have little impact on sunlight in open spaces in the Hermes/Reading Metropolitan and River Gate/SSE proposed developments.
- 7.2 For proposed open spaces, the BRE Report 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice' has a guideline based on 50% of the space receiving at least 2 hours sunlight on March 21.
- 7.3 The Environmental Statement has analysed sun provision in the gaps between blocks within the maximum parameter scheme. The diagram in appendix 10.3 is not labelled properly but appears to show that with the current low rise building to the south, the spaces between Blocks A and B and between Blocks C and D would meet the BRE guidelines. The diagram also appears to show (though there may be some sunlit area missing) that the space between Blocks B and C would not meet the guidelines.
- 7.4 The Environmental Statement does not give a cumulative assessment of the impact of the Hermes/Reading Metropolitan scheme on these open spaces. This should have been undertaken. It would be expected to reduce the sunlight provision to them significantly.
- 7.5 CHP Surveyors' report assesses sunlight provision to courtyards and potential roof terraces in Blocks B and C of the proposed illustrative scheme. Again, the diagrams are not labelled properly but the results show that most of the roof terraces and the courtyard to Block B would meet the BRE guidelines. The courtyard to Block C would not. The difference in predicted sunlight provision between the two courtyards is surprising given that the two blocks are of similar design, and this should be checked.
- 7.6 CHP Surveyors have done a cumulative assessment including the impact of the Hermes/Reading Metropolitan scheme on these courtyards and roof terraces. This does reduce the predicted level of sunlight provision, but not by much. Again, most of the roof terraces and the courtyard to Block B are predicted to meet the BRE guidelines, while the courtyard to Block C would not.



8 Conclusions

- 8.1 This report has reviewed the Environmental Statement chapter on 'Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Solar Glare' for a new development at Vastern Road Retail Park in Reading. It has also reviewed a report by CHP Surveyors Ltd concerning daylight and sunlight provision within the proposed scheme itself, entitled 'Reading Station Park, Reading: Internal daylight and sunlight review'. The assessment has been carried out using the guidelines in the BRE Report 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice'.
- 8.2 Loss of daylight to some windows and rooms at 87-97 Caversham Road would be outside the guidelines, though the retained levels would be only just outside the recommended values. This would count as a minor adverse impact. The proposed development to the south (Hermes/Reading Metropolitan) would cause an additional cumulative reduction, but not by much. Loss of sunlight would meet the BRE guidelines.
- 8.3 Loss of daylight to 17-49 Caversham Road would be outside the BRE guidelines. This is classified as a major adverse impact to numbers 21-49 as all the windows at the front of the houses are affected including main living rooms, and the loss of light is well outside the guidelines. Number 51 has not been analysed, and its front windows would be expected to have a similar loss of light to number 49. For numbers 17 and 19 the loss of daylight is assessed as a moderate impact. There would be little or no cumulative impact from other proposed schemes. Loss of sunlight would meet the BRE guidelines.
- 8.4 The cumulative assessment has not considered loss of daylight to the Hermes/Reading Metropolitan scheme, or loss of daylight and sunlight to the SSE site across Vastern Road. These should have been addressed in the Environmental Statement.
- 8.5 A large number of living rooms in the proposed development are predicted to have limited daylight. CHP Surveyors have analysed worst case rooms on the lower floors of Blocks B and C. With the Hermes/Reading Metropolitan scheme in place, 79 (44%) of the 177 living rooms would not meet the minimum recommendation for daylight provision. For bedrooms, compliance rates are better, with 14 not meeting the recommended 1%.
- 8.6 Sunlight provision in these rooms on the lower floors would be poor, with just 21 (12% of 180) living rooms and studios analysed meeting the BRE/BS sunlight recommendations with the Hermes scheme in place.
- 8.7 There are no existing gardens in which sunlight could be affected by the proposed development. Sunlight provision in open spaces in the proposed scheme itself varies, with most of the roof terraces and the courtyard to Block B appearing to meet the recommendation, while the courtyard to Block C would not. The results are not clearly labelled, and it is surprising that the results for Blocks B and C are so different when they have a similar design. The Environmental Statement indicates that sunlight in the open spaces between Blocks A and B and between Blocks C and D would meet the recommendation, while the space between Blocks B and C would not. A cumulative assessment of these spaces with the Hermes scheme in place should have been included in the Environmental Statement.