

6 DAYLIGHT, SUNLIGHT AND OVERSHADOWING

Introduction

- 6.1 This chapter of the ES reports on the likely significant Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing effects to arise from the demolition and construction stage and the completed development stage of the proposed development.
- 6.2 The chapter describes the Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing policy context; the methods used to assess the potential impacts and likely effects; the baseline conditions at the site and within the study area; the effects taking into consideration embedded mitigation; the need for additional mitigation and enhancement; the significance of residual effects; and inter-project cumulative effects.
- 6.3 The chapter is supported by the following technical appendices in ES Volume 3:
- Technical Appendix 6.1: BRE Guidance & Assessment Methodology;
 - Technical Appendix 6.2: Baseline and Proposed Massing Images
 - Technical Appendix 6.3: Tabulated VSC Results (Baseline vs Proposed)
 - Technical Appendix 6.4: Tabulated No Skyline (“NSL”) Results & NSL Contour Plots (Baseline vs Proposed)
 - Technical Appendix 6.5: Time in Sun Plots (Baseline vs Proposed)
 - Technical Appendix 6.6: Baseline & Proposed + Cumulative Massing Images
 - Technical Appendix 6.7: Tabulated VSC Results (Baseline vs Proposed + Cumulative)
 - Technical Appendix 6.8: Tabulated NSL Results & NSL Contour Plots (Baseline vs Proposed + Cumulative)
 - Technical Appendix 6.9: Tabulated APSH Results (Baseline vs Proposed + Cumulative) and
 - Technical Appendix 6.10: Time in Sun Plots (Baseline vs Proposed + Cumulative).

Methodology

- 6.4 The assessment has been informed by the following legislation, policies and published guidance:
- International Legislation:
 - N/A
 - National Legislation, Policy and Guidance:
 - National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) 2024
 - Regional Policy and Guidance:
 - Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024)
 - Local Policy and Guidance:
 - Manchester City Council Local Development Framework, Core Strategy, July 2012
 - Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document
 - Topic Specific Guidance and Industry Standards:
 - Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guidance Note Site Layout Planning for Daylight & Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2022) (“the BRE Guidance”)
- 6.5 The above acknowledge that town and city centres, and other locations with proximity to transport links, are appropriate locations for higher density of development. Planning policy and the BRE Guidance acknowledge that guidelines regarding daylight and sunlight should be applied flexibly in such locations.

Consultation

- 6.6 Table 6.1 summarises the consultation that has been undertaken with respect to the (topic chapter) assessment.

Table 6.1: Summary of Consultation		
Consultee and Form/Date of Consultation	Summary of Comments	Where in this Chapter Comments are addressed
EIA Scoping Opinion		
	Scoping Opinion notes that the comments (regarding receptors) are acceptable.	N/A
Other Consultation		
None	N/A	N/A

- 6.7 Following a site inspection, additional receptors are identified as worthy of impact appraisal. These buildings are included in the list of buildings noted below in the Technical Scope section.

Assessment Scope

- 6.8 The assessment of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing amenity impacts has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the BRE Guidance, cited above.
- 6.9 Professional judgement and experience have been employed in the identification of sensitive receptors and the interpretation of technical analysis results.

Technical Scope

- 6.10 The assessment of impacts on the daylight and sunlight amenity of the buildings above has been made with reference to the following:
- Vertical Sky Component (“VSC”) – a measure of sky visibility (from which daylight is derived) and daylighting potential, calculated at the midpoint of a window
 - The measurement of the ‘No Sky Line’ (“NSL”) – a contour line separating those parts of a room that receive direct skylight from that part which does not
 - Probable Sunlight Hours received by neighbouring habitable rooms, measured both annually (“APSH”) and during the Winter months (“WPSH”);
 - Time in Sun – the extent to which an external amenity area receives 2 hours of direct sunlight on 21 March. Used to determine whether an external amenity space would appear to adequately sunlit throughout the year and be substantially free of permanent shade.

Spatial Scope

- 6.11 In identifying the Study Area, the BRE Guidance has been used.
- 6.12 The Guidance emphasises the assessment of residential accommodation, specifically habitable rooms within residential buildings. A non-residential building may be assessed if there is a reasonable expectation of daylight and sunlight, such as hospitals or schools. Commercial office buildings are not typically considered to be daylight and sunlight receptors requiring impact assessment.

- 6.13 The appropriate study area has been defined following a Site inspection and research to identify neighbouring buildings of residential use, with the application of professional judgement to consider which neighbouring buildings within 250m of the site rely on the site for the receipt of daylight and sunlight, warranting further technical appraisal.
- 6.14 The technical scope of the assessment has considered the following neighbouring receptors:
- Britton House, 21 Lord Street, Manchester M4 4FN;
 - Jefferson Place, 1 Fernie Street, Manchester M4 4AZ;
 - The Hallmark, 6 Cheetham Hill Road, Manchester M4 4GA;
 - Melia House, 19 Lord Street, Manchester, M4 4AX;
 - Barton Place, 3 Hornbeam Way, Manchester, M4 4AT
 - Masson Place, 1 Hornbeam Way, Manchester M4 4AJ
 - St. Chad’s Presbytery, Stocks Street, Manchester, M8 8GG
 - Area of lawn associated with Britton House
 - Garden and landscaping associated with St Chad’s Presbytery
- 6.15 Rooms within the above buildings that are understood to be of non-habitable use (based on site inspection or room layout research) are excluded from the assessment.

Temporal Scope

- 6.16 The assessment has considered only those impacts arising from the completed development stage which would be expected to be permanent and long-term in nature (i.e. more than 10 years).
- 6.17 Demolition and construction stage impacts on daylight and sunlight amenity have not been assessed, on the basis that they are temporary. Impacts are progressive, in that they evolve as the proposed development is constructed towards the completed development stage impacts identified.

Baseline Characterisation Method

Desk Study

- 6.18 To establish baseline conditions in the study area, relevant data was reviewed and assessed. Data was obtained from the following sources:
- Point Cloud survey
 - Photogrammetric model of the site and surroundings
 - 3D AutoCAD model of the proposed development

Field Study

- 6.19 Site inspection was undertaken to identify the daylight and sunlight receptors assessed as part of this Chapter.

Assessment Method

Demolition and Construction Stage

- 6.20 As any potential daylight and sunlight effects relating to Demolition and Construction stages will gradually increase to the potential effects identified for the completed proposed development, the interim construction effects have not been assessed, as it is considered that the completed proposed development represents the worst-case assessment in terms of likely daylight and sunlight impacts.
- 6.21 During the construction phase, the daylight and sunlight effects will gradually change from the baseline condition to those impacts (where present) with the proposed development in place, which is described below in the operational phase.

Completed Development Stage

- 6.22 The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the BRE Guidance document Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice.
- 6.23 Where appropriate, a technical analysis exercise has been undertaken and the daylight and sunlight conditions, as existing and proposed, have been assessed with reference to the following tests:
- Vertical Sky Component (“VSC”)
 - The No Sky Line (“NSL”)
 - Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (“APSH”) and Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (“WPSH”)
 - External Amenity Space Time in Sun
- 6.24 The BRE Guidance sets out numerical targets for each of the above.
- 6.25 The BRE Guidance states that these numerical targets are not, however, mandatory and that Alternative Targets may be set to reflect the City Centre context of the Site.
- 6.26 It is the opinion of Proximity that Alternative VSC, APSH and WPSH targets can be set for this site, applying BRE principles. Further information on how alternative daylight and sunlight targets have been set is included at Appendix 6.1.
- 6.27 The unmodified BRE targets for daylight and sunlight are set out below, along with the Alternative Targets established for areas of current and future high density, established through application of BRE principles.

Table 6.2: Daylight and Sunlight Targets		
Metric	BRE Target - Unmodified	Alternative Target for High Density Environments
VSC	27%	21.6%
NSL	At least 0.8x baseline	n/a
APSH	25%	20%
WPSH	5%	4%
Time in Sun	2 Hours	N/a

Cumulative Stage

- 6.28 For impact assessment in the Cumulative Condition, the same criteria will be assessed as the Completed Development Stage, with the massing of the relevant cumulative developments included.

Assessment Criteria

- 6.29 The criteria used to assess if an effect is significant or not, is set out in subsequent sub-sections. This is determined by consideration of the sensitivity of the receptor, magnitude of impact and scale of the effect. In considering the significance of an effect, consideration has been given to the duration of the effect, the geographical extent of the effect and the application of professional judgement.

Receptor Sensitivity/Value Criteria

- 6.30 Having identified the relevant receptors, it is necessary to consider their sensitivity to reductions in daylight and sunlight. The general methodology that Proximity has adopted for determining sensitivity to a measured magnitude of change is tabulated below.

Table 6.3: Receptor Sensitivity Criteria	
Sensitivity	Criteria
Low	The receptor/resource has little ability to absorb change without fundamentally altering its present character, or is of international or national importance.
Medium	The receptor/resource has moderate capacity to absorb change without significantly altering its present character, or is of high importance.
High	The receptor/resource is tolerant of change without detriment to its character, is of low or no local importance.

- 6.31 The BRE Guidance emphasises the availability of daylight and sunlight to living rooms and daylight to bedrooms and family kitchens.
- 6.32 The BRE does not impose a hierarchy of habitable rooms, i.e., confirm whether one habitable room should receive more light than another, but in real terms, such a hierarchy does exist and that hierarchy should be borne in mind when considering and evaluating the impact that the proposed development might have on the availability of light in a City Centre environment.
- 6.33 The above general methodology has been developed further below to establish the following window sensitivity matrix, informed in part by the BRE Guidance, and, based on the function or use of the rooms behind each of the windows that have been assessed.

Table 6.4: Receptor Sensitivity Criteria		
Room Use	Daylight Sensitivity	Sunlight Sensitivity
Living Room / Combined Living, Kitchen & Dining ("LKD")	High	High
Kitchen / Dining	Medium	Low
Bedrooms	Medium / Low	Low
Student Accommodation	Low	Low
Communal Kitchens	Low	Low
Circulation Space	n/a	n/a
Toilets / Bathrooms	n/a	n/a
Commercial Uses	n/a	n/a

Impact Magnitude Criteria

- 6.34 It is possible to reduce the amount of daylight and / or sunlight that a window currently receives without that reduction amounting to a material / significant or adverse impact on the existing amenity enjoyed. The following has been used as a methodology for determining the magnitude of impact in evaluating the results of the technical study.
- 6.35 Magnitudes of change are defined below

Table 6.5: Impact Magnitude Criteria	
Magnitude of Impact	Criteria
Negligible	Very little change from baseline conditions. Change barely distinguishable, approximating to a 'no change' situation.

Table 6.5: Impact Magnitude Criteria	
Magnitude of Impact	Criteria
	From a measurement perspective this will include any reduction in amenity of up to 20% less than the existing or baseline values. i.e., retained values in the Proposed condition will be at least 0.8x baseline values.
Low	A minor shift away from baseline conditions. Change arising from the loss/alteration will be discernible/detectable but not material. The underlying character/composition/attributes of the baseline condition will be similar to the pre-development circumstance/situation. From a measurement perspective this will include any reduction in amenity of between 20-30% of the existing or baseline values.
Medium	Loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features of the baseline conditions such that post development character/composition/attributes of the baseline will be materially changed. From a measurement perspective this will include any reduction in amenity of between 30-40% of the existing or baseline values.
High	Total loss or major/substantial alteration to key element/features of the baseline (pre-development) conditions such that the post development character/composition/attributes will be fundamentally changed. From a measurement perspective this will include any reduction in amenity of in excess of 40% of the existing or baseline values.

Scale of Effect Criteria

- 6.36 Impacts have been assessed based on the value/sensitivity of receptors against the magnitude of impact to determine the scale of effect as presented in Table 6.6.

Table 6.6: Scale of Effect Criteria			
Magnitude of Impact	Sensitivity of Receptors		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	Negligible Adverse - Minor	Negligible Adverse - Minor	Minor
Medium	Negligible Adverse - Minor	Minor	Moderate
High	Minor	Moderate	Major

- 6.37 Based on professional judgement, moderate and major effects are considered significant in EIA terms.
- 6.38 In determining the significance of reported effects, consideration has been given to the type of effect i.e. direct, indirect or secondary, the geographical extent of the effect and the duration of the effect i.e. temporary which is considered to be either short term (up to five years) or medium term (5-10 years) or permanent (10 years or more).

6.39 All effects identified in this chapter are permanent, long term and direct. Each impact identified will confirm the significance of the effect and whether it is Negligible, Minor, Moderate or Major.

Application of the BRE Guidance in Environmental Impact Assessment

- 6.40 Appendix H of the BRE Guidance outlines how the guidelines within can be applied in the context of Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 6.41 It notes several factors that tend towards a minor adverse impact, including only a small number of windows are affected; loss of light is marginally outside of the guidelines; a receptor has a low-level requirement for daylight or sunlight; other reasons, such as a window standing unusually close to a boundary.
- 6.42 The BRE Guidance also notes factors tending towards a major adverse impact. Such factors include a large number of windows being affected; loss of light is substantially outside of the guidelines; all the windows in a particular property are affected.
- 6.43 Notwithstanding the above generalisation of an impact, a reduction in daylight and sunlight amenity will at all times be subject to the BRE general compliance criteria, as follows:
- If the BRE targets are met in the Proposed condition, then any reduction in daylight and sunlight will not be considered significant.
 - Where the BRE targets are not achieved in the Baseline condition, a retention of 0.8x baseline values in the Proposed Condition will not be considered significant. In accordance with the BRE Guidance, such a reduction is unlikely to be noticed by the room occupants.
 - A 20% reduction of the measured baseline NSL value (i.e., retention of 0.8x baseline value) will not have a material impact, on the grounds that such a reduction would not be noticed by the room occupants.
 - As confirmed earlier in this Chapter, it is the professional opinion of Proximity that a VSC of 21.6% is within an acceptable tolerance of the BRE targets, given the City Centre context of the Site.
- 6.44 As confirmed earlier in this Chapter, it is the professional opinion of Proximity that a 4% winter and 20% annual APSH result is within an acceptable tolerance of the BRE targets, given the City Centre context of the site.

Nature of Effect Criteria

- 6.45 The nature of the effect has been described as either adverse, neutral or beneficial as follows:
- Beneficial – An advantageous effect to a receptor;
 - Neutral – An effect that on balance, is neither beneficial nor adverse to a receptor or is equally beneficial and adverse to a receptor; or
 - Adverse – A detrimental effect to a receptor.

Assumptions and Limitations

- 6.46 Proximity has inspected the site and its surroundings to identify the window provision of the neighbouring buildings that overlook the site (to the extent that such windows are capable of being observed from the adjacent public highways). This has been supplemented with Google Earth Imagery.
- 6.47 The interior of the neighbouring buildings considered as part of Chapter have not been inspected. It has, therefore, been necessary to make assumptions regarding the arrangement of the neighbouring rooms. These assumptions have, where possible, been informed by information available from Manchester City Council’s Public Access Planning Portal, as well as other online sources available in the public domain including Land Registry plans and sales particulars, noted below:

- Britton House – MCC Ref. 82191/FO/2007/N1
- Jefferson Place – Leaseplans available from Land Registry

- 6.48 The height between the internal floor level and the window cill in each room of the neighbouring buildings will influence the position of the working plane, which is the level at which the internal distribution of skylight is measured. The position of the working plane has been assumed.
- 6.49 On the basis that the neighbouring buildings have not been inspected, assumptions have also been made to their use and function. Assumptions have been primarily influenced by observations made during the Site inspection. Neighbouring buildings of residential use have also been identified by reference to Valuation Office Agency records – neighbouring buildings with a Council Tax Band being of residential use.

Baseline Conditions
Existing Baseline

- 6.50 The site is currently an open parcel of land, bounded by Fernie, Street, Lord Street, Cheetham Hill Road and the neighbouring petrol station.
- 6.51 The daylight and sunlight amenity of a given receptor is influenced by the massing of land, buildings and structures surrounding it
- 6.52 On the basis that it is free of any massing, there are no obstructions on the site to daylight and sunlight amenity of the neighbouring buildings.
- 6.53 The area to the west and north of the site is characterised by low-rise, low-density buildings of commercial use. To the east and south of the site are tall buildings, built in close proximity to one another. These buildings have a limiting effect on daylight and sunlight amenity of the area generally due to their height and the density of the local environment.
- 6.54 The measured daylight and sunlight amenity of the neighbouring receptors in the baseline condition is tabulated below:

Table 6.7: Daylight Amenity in Baseline Condition		
Receptors	Windows (%) which achieve VSC target	Windows (%) below VSC target
Britton House	114 windows (43%)	149 windows (57%)
Jefferson Place	258 windows (36%)	458 windows (64%)
The Hallmark	45 windows (24%)	142 windows (76%)
Melia House	0 windows (0%)	75 windows (100%)
Barton Place	2 windows (2%)	95 windows (98%)
Masson Place	3 windows (10%)	27 windows (90%)
St. Chad’s Presbytery	23 windows (92%)	2 windows (8%)

6.55 Sunlight amenity of the neighbouring receptors in the Baseline Condition is tabulated below:

Table 6.8: Sunlight Amenity in Baseline Condition		
Receptors	Rooms (%) which achieve APSH and WPSH targets	Rooms (%) which do not achieve APSH and WPSH targets
Britton House	117 rooms (79%)	32 rooms (21%)
Jefferson Place	n/a	n/a

Table 6.8: Sunlight Amenity in Baseline Condition		
Receptors	Rooms (%) which achieve APSH and WPSH targets	Rooms (%) which do not achieve APSH and WPSH targets
The Hallmark	n/a	n/a
Melia House	n/a	n/a
Barton Place	n/a	n/a
Masson Place	n/a	n/a
St. Chad’s Presbytery	6 rooms (100%)	0 rooms (0%)

Future Baseline

- 6.56 No separate impact assessment has been undertaken for a Future Baseline Condition on the basis that there are no developments with construction ongoing in the vicinity of the Site with potential to affect daylight and sunlight amenity.
- 6.57 Planning approved developments that are close enough to the site to be relevant, but of which construction is yet to commence, are included as massing in the Cumulative impact assessment, covered later in this chapter.

Sensitive Receptors

- 6.58 The receptors identified as sensitive to the construction of the proposed development, and which have been ‘scoped-in’ to the assessment, are the Living Rooms, Living-Kitchen-Dining (“LKD”) rooms and bedrooms of the neighbouring building summarised in Table 6.9.

Table 6.9: Summary of Sensitive Receptors	
Receptor	Sensitivity
Britton House	LKDs - Daylight and Sunlight – High Sensitivity Bedrooms – Low Sensitivity
Jefferson Place	
The Hallmark	
Melia House,	
Barton Place	
Masson Place	
St. Chad’s Presbytery	
External Amenity areas of Britton House and St Chad’s Presbytery	High – Sunlight only

- 6.59 Based on our professional judgement, no other buildings in the vicinity merit impact assessment. This is on the basis that they are either not of residential use or, where residential rooms are present, their spatial relationship with the site means that the proposed development will have a Negligible impact on daylight and sunlight amenity.

Assessment of Effects

Demolition and Construction Effects

- 6.60 As any potential daylight and sunlight effects relating to Demolition and Construction stages will gradually increase to the potential effects identified for the completed proposed development, the interim

construction effects have not been assessed, as it is considered that the completed proposed development represents the worst-case assessment in terms of likely daylight and sunlight.

- 6.61 During the construction phase, the daylight and sunlight effects will gradually change from the baseline condition to those impacts (where present) with the proposed development in place, which is described below in the operational phase.

Completed Development Effects - Daylight

- 6.62 Impacts on daylight amenity of St Chad’s Presbytery are considered to be Negligible Adverse and Not Significant. All rooms would achieve the VSC target; all rooms would pass the NSL test.
- 6.63 Impacts on daylight amenity that merit a more in-depth review and consideration have been identified to the following neighbouring buildings:
- Britton House
 - Jefferson Place
 - The Hallmark
 - Melia House
 - Barton Place
 - Masson Place
- 6.64 Impacts on daylight amenity of these neighbouring buildings are explained in greater detail below.
- 6.65 A summary of the VSC results in the proposed condition for the neighbouring buildings is tabulated below:

Table 6.10: VSC values in Proposed Condition		
Receptors	Windows (%) which achieve VSC target OR Retain at least 0.8x Baseline VSC Values	Windows (%) below VSC target AND which are below 0.8x Baseline VSC values
Britton House	154 windows (59%)	109 windows (41%)
Jefferson Place	487 windows (68%)	229 windows (32%)
The Hallmark	166 windows (89%)	21 windows (11%)
Melia House	66 windows (88%)	9 windows (12%)
Barton Place	67 windows (69%)	30 windows (31%)
Masson Place	26 windows (87%)	4 windows (13%)
St. Chad’s Presbytery	25 windows (100%)	0 windows (0%)

6.66

Britton House

- 6.67 In the Baseline Condition, 114 windows (43%) would achieve the BRE’s VSC target of 27%. 149 windows (57%) would not achieve the 27% VSC target. Those windows which do not achieve the target in the Baseline Condition are limited in VSC by the massing of the adjacent Jefferson Place and Barton Place buildings.
- 6.68 In the Proposed Condition, 154 windows (59%) achieve the VSC target, or retain VSC values that are at least 0.8x baseline values.
- 6.69 A further 3 windows (1%) would achieve VSCs of at least 21.6% and therefore achieve the Acceptable Tolerance Alternative Target set with reference to the City Centre / City Centre Fringe location.

- 6.70 106 windows (40%) would not achieve the Acceptable Tolerance Target of 21.6%. The majority of these windows (81 of 106 windows) would experience Major magnitudes of change. These windows typically serve two bedrooms and two LKD rooms located in that part of Britton House directly overlooking the site. Regarding these impacts:
- 6.71 Given the site is free of any massing, major magnitudes of change are reasonably contemplated and likely unavoidable in any redevelopment of the site in keeping with the adjacent buildings.
- Bedrooms are a low sensitivity daylight receptor and even major magnitudes of change to low sensitivity receptors are considered a to be of a Minor Adverse Significance of Impact.
- 6.72 All LKD rooms are also served by other windows which do not overlook the site and which receive daylight from other directions. All of these LKD rooms, bar one, pass the NSL test. The LKD which does not experiences only a low magnitude of change in NSL.
- Impacts on these LKD rooms (a high sensitivity daylight receptor) are considered to be Minor Adverse.
- 6.73 Of the 192 rooms appraised in Britton House, 163 rooms (85% of rooms appraised) would pass the NSL test, experiencing negligible reductions in NSL which are unlikely to be noticeable to the room occupants.
- 6.74 Of the 29 rooms which do not pass the NSL test:
- one is an LKD room which experiences a low magnitude of change.
 - 28 are bedrooms. 14 of these experience a low magnitude of change, 14 would experience a major magnitude of change.
 - On the basis that bedrooms which are a low sensitivity receptor 53 rooms (26% of rooms appraised) would experience major magnitudes of change in NSL.
- 6.75 Overall, given the localised nature of the impacts, which are predominantly present to bedrooms (a low sensitivity receptor), the proposed development will result in a **Minor Adverse** effect on the daylight amenity of Britton House.

Jefferson Place

- 6.76 In the Baseline Condition, 258 windows (36%) would achieve the BRE's VSC target of 27%. 458 windows (64%) would not achieve the 27% VSC target. The VSC of those windows which do not achieve the target in the Baseline Condition are limited by:
- the massing of the adjacent Britton House buildings; and
 - projecting parts of its own massing and the presence of balconies both of which reduce sky visibility and therefore VSC in the baseline condition.
- 6.77 In the Proposed Condition, 487 windows (68%) achieve the VSC target, or retain VSC values that are at least 0.8x baseline values.
- 6.78 A further 48 windows (7%) would achieve VSCs of at least 21.6% and therefore achieve the Acceptable Tolerance Alternative Target, set with reference to the City Centre / City Centre Fringe location.
- 6.79 181 windows (25%) would not achieve the Acceptable Tolerance Target of 21.6%. Of these 181 windows:
- 49 would experience low magnitudes of change;
 - 38 would experience moderate magnitudes of change;
 - 94 would experience a high magnitudes of change.
- 6.80 Of the 401 rooms appraised in Jefferson Place, 374 rooms (93% of rooms appraised) would pass the NSL test, experiencing negligible reductions in NSL which are unlikely to be noticeable to the room occupants.
- 6.81 Of the 27 rooms which do not pass the NSL test:

- 15 would experience a low magnitude of impact.
- 12 would experience a medium magnitude of impact.

- 6.82 The impact on the majority of this neighbouring building, being those parts which do not overlook the site directly, is either of Negligible or Minor Adverse significance.
- 6.83 There are impacts on rooms in Jefferson Place that are of a moderate and major Scale of Effect, typically localised to those parts closest the site.
- 6.84 Whilst these rooms are a minority of the building as a whole, when considered with reference to the BRE Guidance, these rooms:
- Are more than a 'small number' of windows and rooms; and
 - Would experience high magnitudes of impact are 'substantially outside of the guidelines'.
- 6.85 On that basis, it is considered that the effect on Jefferson Place is **Moderate Adverse** and therefore significant.

The Hallmark

- 6.86 In the Baseline Condition, 45 windows (24%) would achieve the BRE's VSC target of 27%. 142 windows (76%) would not achieve the 27% VSC target. Those windows which do not achieve the target in the Baseline Condition are limited in VSC by the massing of the adjacent Jefferson Place and projecting parts of its own massing adjacent to windows. This adjacent massing limits sky visibility and therefore VSC values in the Baseline Condition.
- 6.87 In the Proposed Condition, 166 windows (89%) achieve the VSC target, or retain VSC values that are at least 0.8x baseline values.
- 6.88 21 windows (11%) would not achieve the 27% VSC target, nor the Acceptable Tolerance Target of 21.6%. Of these:
- 11 would experience low magnitudes of impact;
 - 3 would experience moderate magnitudes of impact;
 - 7 would experience a high magnitudes of impact.
- 6.89 All 127 rooms appraised (100%) in The Hallmark, would pass the NSL test, experiencing negligible reductions in NSL which are unlikely to be noticeable to the room occupants.
- 6.90 Overall, the effect on The Hallmark is **Minor Adverse** and therefore Not Significant. Impacts, where present, are to a small number of rooms and of those only a small portion are of medium and high magnitude of impact. Given the small number of windows affected, in accordance with the BRE Guidance these effects are considered to be a 'tending towards a minor adverse impact'.

Melia House

- 6.91 In the Baseline Condition, none of the 75 windows appraised (100%) achieve the BRE's VSC target of 27%. These windows are limited in VSC by the massing of the adjacent Britton House, Jefferson Place and adjacent projecting parts of Melia House's own massing. This adjacent massing limits sky visibility and therefore VSC values in the Baseline Condition.
- 6.92 In the Proposed Condition, 66 windows (88%) would retain VSC values that are at least 0.8x baseline values.
- 6.93 9 windows (12%) would not achieve the VSC target of 27% nor the Acceptable Tolerance Target of 21.6%. Of these 9 windows
- All 9 of these serve rooms also served by another window which retains a high proportion of Baseline VSC.

- 8 serve rooms that experience only a low magnitude of impact in NSL (i.e. daylight distribution within the room).
 - Reductions in VSC are, in real terms, small and between 1% and 5%.
- 6.94 43 rooms of 55 appraised (78%) in Melia House, would pass the NSL test, experiencing negligible reductions in NSL which are unlikely to be noticeable to the room occupants.
- 6.95 Of the remaining 12 rooms, 11 would experience only low magnitudes of impact in NSL; one would experience a medium magnitude of impact.
- 6.96 Overall:
- These rooms assessed are a minority of Melia House rooms as a whole;
 - Effects on VSC and NSL are predominantly of low magnitude of impact, or are to rooms served by more than one window
- 6.97 In accordance with the BRE Guidance, these factors tend towards a minor adverse impact. The Scale of Effect on daylight amenity of Melia House is therefore **Minor Adverse** and not significant.

Barton Place

- 6.98 The majority of windows and rooms in Barton Place would have no view of the proposed development. Impacts assessment of Barton Place focusses on those window and rooms which will see the proposed development between Jefferson Place and Britton House.
- 6.99 In the Baseline Condition, 2 windows (2%) would achieve the BRE's VSC target of 27%. 95 windows (98%) would not achieve the 27% VSC target. Those windows which do not achieve the target in the Baseline Condition are limited in VSC by the massing of the adjacent Jefferson Place, Britton House and Melia House. These adjacent buildings limit sky visibility and therefore VSC values to windows of Barton Place in the Baseline Condition.
- 6.100 In the Proposed Condition, 67 windows (69%) either achieve the VSC target, or retain VSC values that are at least 0.8x baseline values.
- 6.101 30 windows (31%) would not achieve the 27% VSC target, nor the Acceptable Tolerance Target of 21.6%. Of these:
- 14 would experience low magnitudes of impact;
 - 7 would experience moderate magnitudes of impact; and
- 6.102 9 would experience a high magnitude of impact.
- 6.103 All windows experiencing a high magnitude of change in VSC have low to very low baseline VSC values (2% to 10%). This means that even small, 'real terms' reduction in VSC appear proportionally more significant. Reductions in VSC of these windows is generally small (less than 5%). Further, the rooms served by these windows (bar one) are each served by at least one other window.
- 6.104 33 rooms of 78 rooms appraised in Barton Place (42%), would pass the NSL test, experiencing negligible reductions in NSL which are unlikely to be noticeable to the room occupants.
- 6.105 45 rooms (58%) would not pass the NSL test, experiencing reductions that could be noticeable to the occupants.
- 6.106 Of these 45 rooms which do not pass the NSL test:
- 8 would experience a low magnitude of impact.
 - 11 would experience a medium magnitude of impact.
 - 26 would experience a high magnitude of impact.

- 6.107 Overall, the Scale of Effect of the proposed development on daylight amenity of Barton Place is considered to be **Moderate Adverse**. Whilst the majority of this neighbouring building will experience Negligible or No adverse impact on daylight amenity, impacts of up to medium and major significance will be experienced by a small but significant minority of its rooms.

Masson Place

- 6.108 The majority of windows and rooms in Masson Place would have no view of the proposed development. Impacts assessment of Masson Place focusses on those window and rooms which will see the proposed development past Barton Place and between Jefferson Place, Britton House.
- 6.109 In the Baseline Condition, 3 windows (10%) of the 30 appraised would achieve the BRE's VSC target of 27%. 27 windows (90%) would not achieve the 27% VSC target. Those windows which do not achieve the target in the Baseline Condition are limited in VSC by the massing of the adjacent Barton Place and Melia House and, to a lesser extent, Britton House. These adjacent buildings limit sky visibility and therefore VSC values to windows of Masson Place in the Baseline Condition.
- 6.110 In the Proposed Condition, 26 windows (87%) either achieve the VSC target, or retain VSC values that are at least 0.8x baseline values.
- 6.111 4 windows (13%) would not achieve the 27% VSC target, nor the Acceptable Tolerance Target of 21.6%. Of these:
- 3 would experience low magnitudes of impact.
 - 1 would experience moderate magnitude of impact.
- 6.112 All four of these windows achieve very low VSC levels in the Baseline Condition. As a result of the proposed development, VSC reductions to each of these four windows is less than 1% VSC. In real terms such small reductions in VSC are unlikely to be noticeable to room occupants.
- 6.113 4 rooms of 10 rooms appraised in Masson Place (40%), would pass the NSL test, experiencing negligible reductions in NSL which are unlikely to be noticeable to the room occupants.
- 6.114 6 rooms (60%) would not pass the NSL test, experiencing reductions that could be noticeable to the occupants.
- 6.115 Of these 6 rooms which do not pass the NSL test:
- 1 would experience a low magnitude of impact.
 - 2 would experience a medium magnitude of impact.
 - 3 would experience a high magnitude of impact.
- 6.116 Overall, the Scale of Impact of the proposed development on daylight amenity of Masson Place is considered to be **Minor Adverse** and not significant.
- 6.117 The significant majority of this neighbouring building will experience Negligible or No adverse impact on daylight amenity, and of those parts where impacts are present these impacts are, in real terms, small.

Completed Development Effects – Sunlight to Buildings

- 6.118 In accordance with the BRE Guidance, windows serving habitable rooms have only been appraised if they face within 90 degrees of due south.
- 6.119 Windows that are more than 90 degrees from due south (i.e., north-west, north and north-east facing) have a limited expectation of direct sunlight due to their orientation, and do therefore not merit sunlight amenity impact appraisal.
- 6.120 In accordance with the BRE Guidance, where the proposed development is wholly to the north (i.e. more than 90 degrees from due south) of neighbouring main window, the proposed massing will have no impact on sunlight amenity.

- 6.121 Britton House and St Chad’s Presbytery are the only receptors that have rooms served by south facing windows that merit impact appraisal.
- 6.122 The windows of all other receptors are either:
- 6.123 Located to the south of the site, meaning that they do not receive direct sunlight over the site; or
- are oriented more than 90 degrees from due south, meaning that they have limited capacity to receive direct sunlight and, in accordance with the BRE Guidance, do not require impact assessment.
- 6.124 The effect on the proposed development on the sunlight amenity of these neighbouring receptors is therefore **Negligible Neutral** and Not Significant.
- 6.125 St Chad’s Presbytery and Britton House are assessed in more detail below.

St Chad’s Presbytery

- 6.126 In the baseline condition, all 6 rooms (100%) would achieve both the annual and winter sunlight targets.
- 6.127 In the Proposed Condition, all 6 rooms (100%) would continue to achieve the Winter and Annual sunlight targets. The effect of the proposed development on sunlight amenity of the rooms of this building are **Negligible Adverse** and therefore Not Significant.

Britton House

- 6.128 In the Baseline Condition, 117 rooms (79%) of 149 appraised would achieve both the annual and winter sunlight targets. 21 rooms (14%) would achieve either the annual or winter sunlight target, but not the other. 11 rooms (7%) would achieve neither sunlight target.
- 6.129 In the Proposed Condition, 138 rooms (93%) would achieve the Annual sunlight targets or retain at least 0.8x baseline sunlight values. 10 of these remaining rooms are LKD rooms experiencing high magnitudes of impact; one is a bedroom experiencing low magnitude of impact. Of these 11 rooms:
- Two LKDs and one bedroom achieve APSH values of 21% - a figure that is within a perceived ‘Acceptable Tolerance’ of the BRE target of 25%, given the high density City Centre environment.
 - The remaining 8 LKD rooms are served by multiple windows. The only south facing window to each of these rooms is, however, located immediately adjacent to a projecting ‘stepped out’ part of Britton House with a balcony present to each floor level. These design features of Britton House are an obstruction to direct sunlight and they place an inherent limitation on the receipt of direct sunlight for part of the day (and therefore the sunlight amenity of these rooms).
- 6.130 On the basis that the site is currently an open parcel of land, it is reasonably foreseeable that any development of the site will result in the presence of High magnitudes of impact.
- 6.131 All 148 rooms appraised (100%) would achieve the Winter sunlight targets or retain at least 0.8x baseline winter sunlight values.
- 6.132 Overall, as a result of the construction of the proposed development, the Scale of Effect on the sunlight amenity of Britton House in **Minor Adverse** and therefore not significant.
- 6.133 The proposed development will have an effect on sunlight amenity of a small number of rooms, and in accordance with the BRE Guidance, this tends towards a minor adverse impact.

Completed Development Effects Sunlight to External Amenity Spaces

- 6.134 The gardens associated with St Chad’s Presbytery and the areas of lawn associated with Britton House are identified as external amenity spaces in the vicinity of the site worthy of Time in Sun Impact assessment.
- 6.135 In the Baseline Condition both spaces are well sunlit, achieving 2 Hours Time in Sun to 100% of their respective areas.

- 6.136 In the Proposed Condition, neither space will experience any reduction in the extent to which they achieve 2 Hours Time in Sun. Effects of the proposed development on the sunlight amenity of these external spaces is **Negligible Neutral** and not significant.

Assessment of Residual Effects

Additional Mitigation

Demolition and Construction Stage

- 6.137 N/A

Completed Development Stage

- 6.138 None proposed.

Enhancement Measures

- 6.139 No enhancement measures are proposed in respect of Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing.

Demolition and Construction Residual Effects

- 6.140 Not applicable.

Completed Development Residual Effects

- 6.141 As no additional mitigation is contemplated, the residual completed development effects remain as reported in the assessment of effects section.

Summary of Residual Effects

- 6.142 Table 6.10 provides a tabulated summary of the outcomes of the assessment of the proposed development.

Table 6.11: Summary of Residual Effects								
Receptor	Description of Residual Effect	Additional Mitigation	Scale and Significance of Residual Effect **	Nature of Residual Effect*				
				+ +/- -	D I	P T	R IR	St Mt Lt
Demolition and Construction								
N/A								
Completed Development								
St Chad’s Presbytery	Reduction in daylight amenity	None proposed	Negligible Adverse	+/-	D	P	IR	Lt
Britton House	Reduction in daylight amenity	None proposed	Minor Adverse	-	D	P	IR	LT
Jefferson Place	Reduction in daylight amenity	None proposed	Moderate Adverse	-	D	P	IR	LT
The Hallmark	Reduction in daylight amenity	None proposed	Minor Adverse	-	D	P	IR	LT
Melia House	Reduction in daylight amenity	None proposed	Minor Adverse	-	D	P	IR	LT

Table 6.11: Summary of Residual Effects								
Receptor	Description of Residual Effect	Additional Mitigation	Scale and Significance of Residual Effect **	Nature of Residual Effect*				
				+	D	P	R	St
				+/-	I	T	IR	Mt
				-				Lt
Barton Place	Reduction in daylight amenity	None proposed	Moderate Adverse	-	D	P	IR	LT
Masson Place	Reduction in daylight amenity	None proposed	Minor Adverse	-	D	P	IR	LT
Britton House	Reduction in sunlight amenity	None proposed	Minor Adverse	+/-	D	P	IR	LT
St Chad’s Presbytery	Reduction in sunlight amenity	None proposed	Negligible Adverse	+/-	D	P	IR	LT
Britton House – Lawn	Reduction in sunlight amenity	None proposed	Negligible Neutral	+/-	D	P	IR	LT
St Chad’s Presbytery - Gardens	Reduction in sunlight amenity	None proposed	Negligible Neutral	+/-	D	P	IR	LT
Notes: * - = Adverse/ + = Beneficial/ +/- = Neutral; D = Direct/ I = Indirect; P = Permanent/ T = Temporary; R = Reversible/ IR = Irreversible; St = Short-term/ Mt = Medium-term/ Lt = Long-term. **Negligible/Minor/Moderate/Major								

- 6.143 In general terms, the proposed development aligns with the broader principle of high density found in the immediate vicinity of the Site. The neighbouring buildings of the Green Quarter, clustered between Cheetham Hill Road to the west and Redbank to the east, are also of high density and low spacing to height ratio.
- 6.144 It is therefore reasonably contemplated that any redevelopment of the site with buildings of comparable scale to the other buildings of the Green Quarter is likely to result in adverse impacts on daylight amenity. Per planning policy and the BRE Guidance, guidelines for daylight and sunlight amenity should be flexibly applied in such circumstance.

Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Effects

- 6.145 As explained in Chapter 2: EIA Process and Methodology, intra-project cumulative effects are discussed in Chapter 10: Cumulative Effects.

Inter-Project Effects

- 6.146 Table 6.11 provides a summary of the likely cumulative effects resulting from the proposed development and the cumulative developments within the study radius for daylight and sunlight.

Table 6.12: Inter-Project Cumulative Effects		
Cumulative Development	Completed Development	
	Cumulative Effects Likely?	Reason
No.1 Park Place	Yes	Massing may affect daylight and sunlight to some of the same windows and rooms as the proposed development. There is however a limited or no view of this proposed building from many of the receptor windows.
33-41 Cheetham Hill Road	Yes	This proposed building is directly overlooked by the windows of Jefferson Place and seen through windows of Hallmark and Britton House. Its massing and the proposed development massing will together affect daylight amenity of these buildings
Red Bank Victoria	No	The majority of windows through which the proposed development will be seen have either limited or no view of the massing of this Cumulative development.

- 6.147 All other planning approved developments in the vicinity are either too far away from the identified receptors, or will not be seen due to other massing, meaning that they have no material influence on the Cumulative Assessment.

Demolition and Construction Cumulative Effects

- 6.148 As above, effects of the Demolition and Construction Stages have not been considered.

Completed Development Cumulative Effects - Daylight

The overall proportion of windows and rooms which achieve the BRE targets is compared below. From this it can be seen where cumulative effects are present. Table 6.13: Proposed vs Cumulative Condition – Windows which achieve BRE targets.			
Receptors	Windows (%) which achieve VSC target	Cumulative Windows (%) below VSC target	Possible Cumulative Impact on VSC (Y/N)
Britton House	154 windows (59%)	113 windows (43%)	Yes
Jefferson Place	487 windows (68%)	205 windows (29%)	Yes
The Hallmark	166 windows (89%)	91 windows (49%)	Yes
Melia House	66 windows (88%)	59 windows (79%)	Yes
Barton Place	67 windows (69%)	67 windows (69%)	No
Masson Place	26 windows (87%)	26 windows (87%)	No
St. Chad’s Presbytery	25 windows (100%)	23 windows (92%)	Yes – Minor

- 6.149 A summary of the NSL results is tabulated below:

Table 6.14: Proposed vs Cumulative Condition – Windows which achieve BRE targets.			
Receptors	Proposed Rooms (%) which pass NSL test	Cumulative Rooms (%) which pass NSL test	Possible Cumulative Impact on NSL (Y/N)
Britton House	163 rooms (85%)	162 rooms (84%)	No – Negligible change
Jefferson Place	374 rooms (93%)	297 rooms (74%)	Yes

Table 6.14: Proposed vs Cumulative Condition – Windows which achieve BRE targets.			
Receptors	Proposed Rooms (%) which pass NSL test	Cumulative Rooms (%) which pass NSL test	Possible Cumulative Impact on NSL (Y/N)
The Hallmark	127 rooms (100%)	127 rooms (100%)	No
Melia House	43 rooms (78%)	37 rooms (67%)	Yes
Barton Place	33 rooms (42%)	33 rooms (42%)	No
Masson Place	4 rooms (40%)	4 rooms (40%)	No
St. Chad’s Presbytery	6 rooms (100%)	6 rooms (100%)	No

- 6.150 Based on the above, Cumulative Effects on daylight amenity will be experienced by Britton House, Jefferson Place, The Hallmark and Melia House. Overall, there would be no uplift in Effect on the daylight amenity of Britton House, the Hallmark and Melia House. In general terms the change in results does not warrant an uplift in the Residual Effect overall.
- 6.151 In the Cumulative Condition there is an uplift in effect on daylight on Jefferson Place. This building would experience an increase in the number of windows and rooms, including high sensitivity Living Rooms, which do not achieve the BRE targets.
- 6.152 The localised Moderate and Major adverse effects resulting from the proposed development would, in the Cumulative Condition, be experienced by a greater proportion of this neighbouring building. The Cumulative Impact on daylight amenity is therefore **Major Adverse**.
- 6.153 This uplift is principally due to addition of the massing at 33-41 Cheetham Hill Road, which the windows of Jefferson Place look towards.
- 6.154 The windows of Jefferson Place overlook parcels of land with single storey structures. This means that any redevelopment of these lands with buildings of high density, as at 33-41 Cheetham Hill Road, will result in elevated magnitudes of impact compared to the baseline condition, and therefore an elevated adverse effect.

Completed Development Cumulative Effects – Sunlight to Buildings

- 6.155 The overall proportion of windows and rooms which achieve the BRE’s Annual and Winter sunlight targets is compared below. From this it can be seen where cumulative effects are present

Table 6.15: Proposed vs Cumulative Condition – Rooms which achieve Annual sunlight targets.			
Receptors	Rooms (%) which achieve APSH target	Cumulative Rooms (%) which achieve APSH target	Possible Cumulative Impact on APSH (Y/N)
Britton House	138 rooms (93%)	135 rooms (91%)	No – Negligible change
St. Chad’s Presbytery	6 rooms (100%)	6 rooms (100%)	No

Table 6.16: Proposed vs Cumulative Condition – Rooms which achieve Winter sunlight targets.			
Receptors	Rooms (%) which achieve WPSH target	Cumulative Rooms (%) which achieve WPSH target	Possible Cumulative Impact on WPSH (Y/N)
Britton House	149 rooms (100%)	139 rooms (93%)	Yes – Minor Adverse
St. Chad’s Presbytery	6 rooms (100%)	6 rooms (100%)	No

- 6.156 In the Cumulative condition there is no uplift in Effect on sunlight amenity of the neighbouring buildings.

Completed Development Cumulative Effects – Sunlight to External Amenity Spaces

- 6.157 There is no cumulative effect on sunlight amenity of external amenity spaces appraised. Both the Britton House lawn and the St Chad’s Presbytery gardens will remain well sunlit in the Cumulative Condition, with the entirety of each area continuing to achieve 2 Hours Time in Sun on 21 March.

Summary of Assessment (NTS) Background

- 6.158 This chapter has detailed the potential Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing effects due to the construction and completed development stages of the proposed development. The assessment of construction and completed development stages has been undertaken taking into account the relevant national and local guidance and regulations.
- 6.159 The assessment has been undertaken with reference to provisions contained within the BRE Guidance¹. This document is the industry standard guidance for assessment of daylight and sunlight amenity impacts.
- 6.160 The impact of the proposed development on the daylight and sunlight amenity of the following neighbouring buildings assessed:
- Britton House, 21 Lord Street, Manchester M4 4FN;
 - Jefferson Place, 1 Fernie Street, Manchester M4 4AZ;
 - The Hallmark, 6 Cheetham Hill Road, Manchester M4 4GA;
 - Melia House, 19 Lord Street, Manchester, M4 4AX;
 - Barton Place, 3 Hornbeam Way, Manchester, M4 4AT
 - Masson Place, 1 Hornbeam Way, Manchester M4 4AJ
 - St. Chad’s Presbytery, Stocks Street, Manchester, M8 8GG
 - Area of lawn associated with Britton House
 - Garden and landscaping associated with St Chad’s Presbytery
- 6.161 The focus of the BRE Guidance is on assessment of habitable rooms, such as bedrooms, kitchens and living rooms within neighbouring buildings. In accordance with the BRE Guidance, rooms within neighbouring buildings above that are not of habitable use (for example circulation spaces, WCs), or other neighbouring buildings of commercial use, have not been impact assessed.

¹ Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guidance Note Site Layout Planning for Daylight & Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2022)

Demolition and Construction Effects

- 6.162 As any potential daylight and sunlight effects relating to Demolition and Construction stages will gradually increase to the potential effects identified for the completed proposed development, the interim construction effects have not been assessed, as it is considered that the completed proposed development represents the worst-case assessment in terms of likely daylight and sunlight.
- 6.163 During the construction phase, the daylight and sunlight effects will gradually change from the baseline condition to those impacts (where present) with the proposed development in place, which is described below in the operational phase.

Completed Development Effects – Daylight

- 6.164 Construction of the proposed development will result in reduced daylight and sunlight over the Site to windows and rooms of the neighbouring buildings.
- 6.165 The Scale of Effect on the daylight amenity of Jefferson Place and Barton Place is Moderate Adverse. Parts of these neighbouring buildings will experience a reduction in daylight and in accordance the BRE Guidance this would tend towards a Significant Impact.
- 6.166 The Scale of Effect on the other neighbouring buildings are not significant, on the basis that
- the windows and rooms continue to achieve the respective daylight targets;
 - where reductions are present, they are of Minor Adverse effect; or
 - adverse effects are to a localised and small minority of the neighbouring building.
- 6.167 In accordance with the BRE Guidance and its application to Environmental Impact Assessment, these impacts are considered to be either Negligible or Minor Adverse and therefore not significant.

Completed Development Effects – Sunlight

- 6.168 St Chad’s Presbytery and Britton House have been sunlight impact appraised.
- 6.169 Windows of the other neighbouring building are either
- 6.170 south of the site, meaning that they do not receive direct sunlight over it; or
- oriented north-west, north or north-east facing, meaning that these windows and the rooms they serve have limited capacity to receive direct sunlight.
- 6.171 In accordance with the BRE Guidance, rooms fulfilling the above criteria need not be impact assessed, on the basis that construction of the proposed development will have no significant impact on sunlight amenity.
- 6.172 Impacts on sunlight amenity of St Chad’s Presbytery are Negligible Neutral. Impacts on sunlight amenity of Britton House are, overall, Minor Adverse. On that basis the impact of the proposed development on the sunlight amenity of these buildings is not significant.
- 6.173 Overall, it is considered that the completed proposed development would result in adverse effects on the Daylight and Sunlight amenity of the identified receptors, and as such would give rise to the significant effects on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing covered in more detail above.

Cumulative Effects

- 6.174 There would be cumulative impacts on the daylight amenity of the following buildings:
- Britton House
 - Jefferson Place
 - The Hallmark
 - Melia House

- St. Chad’s Presbytery

- 6.175 Effects on all buildings apart from Jefferson Place in the cumulative scenario will be as stated for the proposed development in isolation. i.e. there would be no cumulative uplift in effect.
- 6.176 In the Cumulative condition the impact on Jefferson Place would be Major Adverse. This is due to an increase in the prevalence of moderate and major adverse effects, compared to those identified for the proposed development alone. The increased prevalence of adverse impacts is principally due to inclusion of the proposed massing at 33-41 Cheetham Hill Road, which the windows of Jefferson Place face directly.
- 6.177 There are no Significant Cumulative effects on the sunlight amenity of Britton House, St Chad’s Presbytery or either of the external amenity spaces associated with these neighbouring buildings.