



Unlocking potential for a better built environment

DAYLIGHT & SUNLIGHT

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES REPORT

Land to the West of Barnhill Street, Moss Side

Caddick

04 July 2025

GIA No: **22912** Fee Quote: FP01

PROJECT DATA:

Client

Architect

Project Title

Project Number

Caddick

MCAU

Land to the West of Barnhill Street, Moss Side

22912

REPORT DATA:

Report Title

GIA Department

Dated

Fee Quote

Prepared by

Checked by

Type

Daylight & Sunlight

Daylight Department

04 July 2025

Fee Proposal No. 01

MH

MH

Draft 01

Revisions	No:	Date:	Notes:	Signed:

SOURCES OF INFORMATION:

Information Received

Release Number

Issue Number

Site Photos

GIA Survey

3D models

OS Data

IR-02

Rel_21992_01_01_DS

01

Google

N/A

VU.City

FIND Maps

DISCLAIMER:

N.B This report has been prepared for Caddick by GIA as their appointed Daylight & Sunlight consultants. This report is intended solely for Caddick and may contain confidential information. No part or whole of its contents may be disclosed to or relied upon by any Third Parties without the express written consent of GIA. It is accurate as at the time of publication and based upon the information we have been provided with as set out in the report. It does not take into account changes that have taken place since the report was written nor does it take into account private information on internal layouts and room uses of adjoining properties unless this information is publicly available.



CONTENTS

1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2

2

THE SITE

4

3

POLICY & THE WIDER CONTEXT

6

4

BRE GUIDELINES & CONTEXT
METHODOLOGY

7

5

DAYLIGHT & SUNLIGHT IMPACTS TO
NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES

9

6

CONCLUSIONS

14

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX 01
ASSUMPTIONS
- APPENDIX 02
PRINCIPLES OF DAYLIGHT, SUNLIGHT & OVERSHADOWING
- APPENDIX 03
DRAWINGS
- APPENDIX 04
RESULTS OF BRE COMPLIANT PROPERTIES
A: VSC, NSL & APSH
B: NSL CONTOURS

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GIA have assessed the MCAU’ scheme (the “Proposed Development”) for Land to the West of Barnhill Street, Moss Side to understand the potential changes in light to the relevant sensitive receptors.

- 1.1

GIA have been instructed by Caddick to assess the potential effect the Proposed Development will have upon the surrounding residential properties, in particular any habitable rooms (i.e. living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens; bedrooms are also assessed although they are considered less important.
- 1.2

The technical analysis has been undertaken with reference to the criteria and methodology within the Building Research Establishment’s publication: ‘site layout and planning for daylight and sunlight; a guide to good practice; third edition; 2022’ (“the BRE Guidelines”)
- 1.3

There is only one residential property within sufficient proximity to the Proposed Development to warrant detailed consideration, namely; Princess Road Apartments, which are 4-5 storey blocks of flats located directly south of the site.
- 1.4

As a result of the Proposed Development, the windows rooms on the north elevation of Princess Apartments experience some reductions that exceed the default BRE Guidelines, however this is principally because the windows largely look across a mostly-vacant site and therefore receive uncharacteristically high levels of existing daylight,
- 1.5

The BRE Guidelines recognises in its introduction that: *“...a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings.”* (BRE Guidelines, paragraph 1.6).
- 1.6

Accordingly, notwithstanding there are some inevitable reductions in daylight from the existing condition, the levels of daylight retained are appropriate in context and can be considered acceptable in planning terms.

INTENTIONALLY BLANK PAGE

2 THE SITE

THE EXISTING SITE

- 2.1 The existing site is an island plot bounded by Princess Road, Moss Lane East, Barnhill Street and Raby Street.
- 2.2 Figure 02 below illustrates the existing site. Further drawings are enclosed at Appendix 03 of this report.



Figure 01: 3D model of the existing site

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 2.3 The description of the Proposed Development is contained within the Design and Access Statement and comprises the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a residential-led scheme.
- 2.4 GIA's understanding of the Proposed Development is illustrated in Figure 03 and further drawings are enclosed at Appendix 03.



Figure 02: 3D Perspective View of the Proposed Scheme

3 POLICY & THE WIDER CONTEXT

3.1 Below we have detailed sections from the following documents as they are, in our opinion, the most pertinent in relation to daylight and sunlight matters and how we have approached the effects of the Proposed Development on the relevant neighbouring properties:

- National Planning Policy Framework (2023); and
- National Planning Practice Guidance (updated ` 2021).

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (2023)

3.2 The NPPF (September 2023) states that local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land. The discussion in relation to daylight and sunlight highlights the Government’s recognition that increased flexibility is required in response to the requirement for higher density development:

“Local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards)”.

NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE (JUNE 2021)

- 3.3 In light of the update to the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance, GIA have considered the relevant paragraphs which relate to daylight and sunlight.
- 3.4 Paragraph 6 of the NPPG (Ref ID: 66-006-20190722) acknowledges that new development may cause an impact on daylight and sunlight levels enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers. It requires local authorities to assess whether the impact to neighbouring occupiers would be “unreasonable”.
- 3.5 Paragraph 7 (Ref ID: 66-007-20190722) refers to the wider planning considerations in assessing appropriate levels of daylight and sunlight. The test is whether living standards are ‘acceptable’ and recognises that acceptability will depend to some extent on context.

INTENTIONALLY BLANK PAGE

4 BRE GUIDELINES & CONTEXT METHODOLOGY

The Building Research Establishment (BRE) have set out in their handbook 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice (BR209, 2022)', guidelines and methodology for the measurement and assessment of daylight and sunlight.

BUILDING RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENT GUIDELINES (BR209, 2022)

- 4.1 The BRE Guidelines note that the document is intended to be used in conjunction with the interior daylight recommendations found within the British Standard BS EN 17037 Daylighting in Buildings and the Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE) LG 10 Daylighting – a guide for designers.
- 4.2 The BRE Guidelines "is intended for use in rooms in adjoining dwellings where daylight is required, including living rooms, kitchens, and bedrooms. Windows to bathrooms, toilets, storerooms, circulation areas, and garages need not be analysed. The guidelines may also be applied to any existing non-domestic building where the occupants have a reasonable expectation of daylight; this would normally include schools, hospitals, hotels and hostels, small workshops, and some offices."
- 4.3 The BRE Guidelines provides two methodologies for daylight assessment of neighbouring properties, namely;
- The Vertical Sky Component (VSC); and
 - The No Sky Line (NSL).
- 4.4 There is one methodology provided by the BRE Guidelines for sunlight assessment, denoted as Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH).
- 4.5 It is an inevitable consequence of the built-up urban environment that daylight and sunlight will be more limited in dense urban areas. It is well acknowledged that in such situations there may be many planning and urban design matters to consider other than daylight and sunlight.
- 4.6 Paragraph 4.5.10 notes that "numerical values given are purely advisory. Different criteria may be used based on the requirements for solar energy in an area viewed against other site layout constraints. Another important issue is whether the existing solar panels are reasonably sited, at a sensible height and distance from the boundary. A greater loss of solar radiation may be inevitable if panels are mounted close to the ground and near to the site boundary."¹

- 4.7 Appendix 02 of this report elaborates on the mechanics of each of the above assessment criteria, explains the appropriateness of their use and the parameters of each specific recommendation.
- 4.8 The following table provides a summary of the criteria set out within the BRE Guidelines for daylight and sunlight. For daylight and sunlight, the BRE Guidelines outline the approach within the accompanying Appendix I, in terms of assigning criteria to assess the effects:

"Adverse impacts occur when there is a significant decrease in the amount of skylight and sunlight reaching an existing building where it is required...The assessment of impact will depend on a combination of factors, and there is no simple rule of thumb that can be applied."

"Where the loss of skylight or sunlight fully meets the guidelines, 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 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."

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

- Only a small number of windows are affected;
- The loss of light is only marginally outside the guidelines;
- An affected room has other sources of skylight or sunlight; and
- The affected building only has a low level of requirement for skylight or sunlight."
- There are reasons why a less stringent target should be applied

5 DAYLIGHT & SUNLIGHT IMPACTS TO NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES

This section details the daylight and sunlight impacts in relation to the relevant properties neighbouring the Site.

- 5.1 A three-dimensional computer model of the Site and surrounding properties was produced based on photogrammetry. Where available we have included floor plans of the relevant properties and this context model has been used to carry out the technical assessments. All relevant assumptions made in producing this model can be found in Appendix 01.

RELEVANT SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

- 5.2 As discussed earlier, there is only one receptor within sufficient proximity from the Proposed Development to warrant detailed assessment and consideration, namely:

- Princess Apartments (south of the site)



Figure 03: Image of Princess Apartments

- 5.3 We have sourced room layouts for the property, which shows there are 59 windows relevant windows for assessment, which serve a total of 40 habitable rooms, comprising 16 Living Kitchen Dining Rooms (LKDs) and 24 bedrooms.
- 5.4 Where a room has more than one window, the weighted averages of their VSCs have been taken.
- 5.5 Of the 40 rooms that face the site, 28 experience proportional changes in VSC and NSL $\leq$ 20% their existing value and therefore fully meet the default numerical criteria suggested by the BRE Guidelines.
- 5.6 The remaining 12 rooms experience proportional changes between 21% up to 45% in VSC and between 27% and 55% in relation to NSL.
- 5.7 The vast majority of the changes are relatively minor, and, where larger proportional changes occur it is as a consequence of the window/room being positioned either beneath a balcony overhang or adjacent to a projecting part of the building massing. In such cases, the BRE Guidelines recognises that larger proportional reductions are "unavoidable" (see BRE Guidelines paragraphs 2.2.13 & 2.2.14).
- 5.8 As noted in the Executive Summary, the larger proportional reductions are also inevitably brought on by the fact the windows currently look across a nearly completely cleared site, meaning the existing values are uncharacteristically high. In recognition of this, the BRE Guidelines states that within its introduction that "...a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings." (BRE Guidelines, paragraph 1.6).
- 5.9 The Proposed Development has sought to follow the height of the Princess Apartments and thus the resulting position provides consistent, equitable and subsequently appropriate levels of daylight within both the Princess Apartments and the Proposed Development itself.
- 5.10 In conclusion, notwithstanding there will be some inevitable changes in daylight that might be noticeable, the retained daylight levels are appropriate in context and can be considered acceptable in planning terms.
- 5.11 Sunlight (APSH) is not a consideration in this case as the windows facing the Proposed Development face directly north and therefore not material for assessment against BRE Guidelines.

¹ Littlefair, P. (2022). Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice. Hertfordshire: HIS BRE Press, p 29 para 3.3.17

INTENTIONALLY BLANK PAGE

6 CONCLUSIONS

GIA have undertaken a daylight and sunlight assessment in relation to the Proposed Development known as Land to the West of Barnhill Street, Moss Side. The technical analysis has been undertaken in accordance with the BRE Guidelines.

- 1.7 The technical analysis has been undertaken with reference to the criteria and methodology within the Building Research Establishment's publication: 'site layout and planning for daylight and sunlight; a guide to good practice; third edition; 2022' ("the BRE Guidelines")
- 1.8 As a result of the Proposed Development, the windows rooms on the north elevation of Princess Apartments experience some reductions that exceed the default BRE Guidelines, however this is principally because the windows largely look across a mostly-vacant site and therefore receive uncharacteristically high levels of existing daylight,
- 1.9 The BRE Guidelines recognises in its introduction that: *"...a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings."* (BRE Guidelines, paragraph 1.6).
- 1.10 Accordingly, notwithstanding there are some inevitable reductions in daylight from the existing condition, the levels of daylight retained are appropriate in context and can be considered acceptable in planning terms.

