DATE / REF

14th September 2017
0123-sw

ADDRESS

2 COMMERCIAL ST
MANCHESTER
M15 4RQ

CONTACT

TEL 0161 672 5100
MAIL@GIA.UK.COM

WWW.GIA.UK.COM

By Email

Ms R Fieldhouse
Iceni Projects
That Space
31 Princess Street
Manchester
M2 4EW

Dear Rebecca

Bridge Street, Manchester – Daylight & Sunlight

Further to our conversation, you have asked GIA to provide a review of the daylight and sunlight position regarding the proposed development at 62 Bridge Street, and the adjacent commercial premises at 64 Bridge Street.

The gable wall of 64 Bridge Street includes secondary windows that overlook the proposed development site at 62 Bridge Street. The windows are located at ground, first, second and third floor.

There are no formal standards adopted within Manchester City Council's UDP or LDF, but it is accepted that daylight and sunlight amenity needs to be reviewed objectively. Our review has therefore been considered in the context of the following best practice standards:

- Building Research Establishment (BRE) Report "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – a guide to good practice, 2nd Edition, 2011" ("the BRE guide")

- BS8206 – Part 2:2008 Code of Practice for Daylighting

The BRE guide is principally aimed at residential buildings, rather than commercial buildings, and there are no prescribed targets for commercial buildings. Whilst the Guide does state that some offices may require assessment, the inference is that only non-residential buildings with a particularly sensitive use, or unusual requirement for daylight and sunlight, require assessment. In our experience, it is very unusual to have to assess daylight and sunlight levels to office buildings, and I cannot think of a recent example in Manchester where we have been asked to complete an assessment.

We are not aware that there are any particularly sensitive uses to 64 Bridge Street, or that the occupiers have an unusual requirement for daylight that would mean that this building requires assessment.

The Wood Street elevation contains the principle windows to the rear elevation. The sky visibility to these windows will be unaffected by the proposed development on 62 Bridge Street, and any obstruction will be limited to the secondary windows that overlook the development site.

The windows to the gable wall of 64 Bridge Street are not shown on either the existing or proposed drawings submitted in application 105436_FO_2014_C1, with the exception 2no. windows at the third floor. We also understand that the ground floor windows are boarded internally.

The windows to the gable wall of 64 Bridge Street do not face within 90° of due south, and so in line with the BRE Guide, do not have a reasonable expectation of direct sunlight, and so would not require assessment. In addition, direct sunlight is generally not welcome in office buildings, as it interferes with computer screens. Irrespective of this, the BRE Guide does not require the assessment of sunlight in offices.

To summarise, it is our experience that office buildings do not require detailed assessment, and the sky visibility will unaffected to the principle windows in the rear elevation of 64 Bridge Street.

Kind regards.

Yours sincerely
For and on behalf of GIA



Sam Wallis
Managing Partner
sam.wallis@gia.uk.com