

Ralph Pederson
Development Director
House of Social 1 Limited
Horseshoe Farm
Elkington Way
Alderley Edge
Cheshire
SK9 7GU

Our Ref:
1073

19 April 2023

Dear Ralph,

Plot 10B – Daylight & Sunlight Amenity Impact Assessment

Following the submission of a planning application for construction of a 14 storey PBSA building on Plot 10B First Street (MCC planning application reference 136170/FO/2023), we are advised of changes in the design of the Proposed Development.

Of these design changes, the widening of the building is, potentially, an influence on the daylight and sunlight amenity impacts identified and reported on in the ES chapter submitted (referred to henceforth as the “Previous Assessment”).

We are instructed to undertake a technical analysis of the revised massing of the Proposed Development (“the Revised Assessment”) in the following scenarios:

- > Baseline vs 10B
- > Baseline vs 10B + Cumulative
- > Baseline vs 10B + 10A
- > Baseline vs 10B + 10A + Cumulative

For each of these scenarios we have assessed the impact of the Proposed Development on the same receptors as previously, with reference to the following:

- > VSC (daylight / sky visibility from midpoint of a window)
- > NSL (daylight / sky visibility from within the room)
- > Winter and Annual APSH (sunlight)

The information relied upon, assumptions and limitations all remain as previously communicated in the ES chapter submitted.

We have summarised the analyses results of the Revised Assessment below.

In summary, changes to the massing of the Proposed Development result in negligible differences in daylight and sunlight amenity impact to the receptors.

Notwithstanding very minor changes to some of the measured daylight and sunlight values, these differences, where present, do not amount to a change in magnitude or significance of impact to the vast majority of receptor windows and rooms appraised.

We have set out below in more detail where small differences between the Previous Assessment and the Revised Assessment impact are identified.

To clarify here, if a receptor achieves the BRE target in the Revised Assessment then we concluded that the change is negligible (i.e. it still achieves the targets), regardless of any actual differences in measured impacts.

We have also concluded differences to be negligible if, for example, there is no uplift in the magnitude of change between impacts identified in the Previous and Revised Assessments.

Baseline vs 10B

There are negligible changes in impact on the daylight and sunlight amenity of the following receptors:

- > City South
- > Chorlton Mill
- > Manchester Student Village and
- > Cambridge Mill

The following neighbouring receptors would experience changes in daylight and sunlight amenity impacts. These differences in impact are summarised below.

Plot 11

Negligible differences in measured VSC values between the Previous and Revised Assessments.

In terms of NSL, 1 room moves from negligible impact previously to a low magnitude of change. It retains 0.78x baseline value (vs a target of 0.8x) and, being only a single room this change is, in the context of this large development, negligible and not significant.

Macintosh Mill

Negligible changes to VSC and APSH. In NSL terms, there are negligible changes throughout, save for one bedroom that would move from low to medium magnitude of change.

This difference is, in real terms, different by only 5%. In context of Macintosh Mill as a whole this is not significant.

Baseline vs 10B + Cumulative

Results and conclusions are as above, save for the single NSL result noted for Macintosh Mill.

The magnitude of change to this room is no different between the Previous Assessment and the Revised Assessment in the cumulative condition.

Baseline vs 10B + 10A

Negligible change in impacts on VSC, NSL and APSH to:

- > City South
- > Manchester Student Village and
- > Cambridge Mill

Plot 11

There are negligible differences in VSC values between the previous and revised analysis.

In terms of NSL, 8 rooms move from negligible impact in the Previous Assessment to a low magnitude of change in the Revised Assessment.

All 8 rooms retain circa 0.77x baseline values (against the BRE target of 0.8x), and differences compared to the previous assessment impacts are less than 3% of each room's area.

In summary, there is a small uplift in impact to 8 rooms of this neighbouring receptor in the Revised Assessment. This uplift is however, in the context of this large development as a whole, negligible and not significant.

Macintosh Mill

Changes in impacts are as set out above for Baseline vs 10B.

Chorlton Mill

There are negligible differences between Previous and Revised Assessments in VSC & APSH impacts.

One lounge, kitchen, diner (LKD) which would pass the NSL test in the Previous Assessment appraisal would experience a low magnitude of change in the Revised Assessment. This room would however retain 0.79x baseline values (against a target of 0.8x), which is negligibly difference to a room that achieves the target.

Baseline vs 10B + 10A + Cumulative

As set out above for the 10B + 10A analysis scenario.

Conclusions

The impacts on daylight and sunlight amenity of the revised 10B massing (i.e. the Revised Assessment) are, overall, negligibly difference to those reported in our ES chapter (i.e. the Previous Assessment).

There are localised, very minor uplifts in impact, as noted above. These are, however:

- > Amounting to a very small minority – of each receptor and of all rooms appraised – and therefore not significant; and
- > very small in real terms changes to VSC, NSL and APSH. Uplift in magnitudes of change for rooms or windows, where present in the Revised Assessment, are typically due to a Previous Assessment result being very close to the threshold value that defines/differentiates the magnitude of change. A very small difference in real terms between Previous and Revised Assessments can then tip the magnitude of change into the next band without being materially different from one another.

Overall, there is negligible difference in the impacts identified. Our conclusions regarding daylight and sunlight amenity impacts remain as previously stated, and we do not consider that revision of the ES chapter is merited.

Yours sincerely

Jerome Muir

Senior Surveyor

jerome@weareproximity.co.uk

07932 373544