

Our ref: 2108/JN

Your ref:

Date: 7 June 2023

Harpinder Bahra,  
GA&A Design, Suite 1, First Floor,  
Aquasulis, 10-14 Bath Road  
Slough, SL1 3SA

Dear Mr Bahra,

**Proposed Development at 47 Sweetcroft Lane, Uxbridge, UB10 9LE – DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT STATEMENT**

We have been asked by you to produce a daylight and sunlight statement with the regards to the proposed development at 47 Sweetcroft Lane, Uxbridge and its potential impact upon the amenity of the surrounding properties.

Normally, we would undertake detailed assessments, but having reviewed the drawings of the proposed development and its juxtaposition to 43 and 51 Sweetcroft Lane, we conclude that detailed assessments are not necessary here.

51 Sweetcroft Lane

This dwelling is located too far away to be materially affected. The main rear windows will continue to enjoy ample daylight from down its rear garden with the development in place.

43 Sweetcroft Lane

We have obtained floor plans of this property from the local planning portal. We refer you to the attached drawing 1995/DSO/01 and report as follows: -

We took the current ordnance survey map of the existing profile of #47 (black) and overlaid the proposed development profile on top (blue). Next, we overlaid the approved drawings of #43, which has now been built out. And last, we constructed a mirror image profile of #43 and overlaid that on the land of #47 (magenta), more on that below. On a technical point, the drawings of #43 have the north and south axes swapped, which is why it is shown as upside down, (north is by default straight up).

Jonathan Nash LLB (Hons)/Director T. 0845 052 1146 M. 0770 238 1040 E. [j.nash@daylightandsunlight.co.uk](mailto:j.nash@daylightandsunlight.co.uk)



---

At ground floor level to #43, there are no windows serving habitable rooms to the return elevation. At first floor level, there are three non-openable, obscured windows to consider. One of these windows to the northern end (W4) serves a bathroom. In accordance with the BRE Guidelines it need not be assessed. W3 at the southern end is a small, secondary side window to a bedroom, which is also served by large full height window to south elevation W4. This small side window will face directly onto the proposed development, however, whatever the potential impact to this window, it may not be reasonably concluded that the bedroom as a whole will be materially affected. This is because ample daylight and sunlight will be retained by the southern main window.

This leaves W3 to the central portion of the property, which serves a walk-in dresser. A walk-in dresser is not a habitable room for the purposes of the BRE Guidelines, so it need not be assessed.

Nonetheless, we thought it would be useful to show that the proposed development would still conform with the BRE Guidelines. First, the glazing to the walk-in dresser is obscured so sight of the proposed development is not an issue. The relationship of the window to the room means that although there will be some reduction in light to the top right hand corner, most of the light will still come from the west and northwest, as shown by the green arrows, to the central and bottom areas (where the proposed development could not be seen anyway). Light and outlook would therefore be maintained to the majority of the room.

### The Mirror Image Profile

Then we have what is known as the mirror image profile. It was introduced in 2011 to promote fairness and deal with an issue that plagued consultants, namely, unfairly weighted protection to single aspect side windows facing directly over undeveloped development land. For example, where there was a 4-storey building with a ground floor side window facing over adjacent land, under the 20% loss recommendations, only perhaps a single storey with a pitched roof could be built, which was of course unfair to the developer. So, the BRE introduced the mirror image profile, that allows the same or equivalent proposed building an equal distance from the boundary to be built, notwithstanding the potential impact to the side windows in question. To put it another way, a like for like development. In the above example, a similar 4-storey building could have been built.

Applying that principle here, we outlined the first floor profile of #43 (magenta) and mirrored it an equal distance across the boundary on the application site. It is obvious that this mirror image would impact the W2 much more than the proposed development, which although taller, is set back away from the window. Given that the mirror image profile would be BRE compliant, it naturally follows that the proposed development would be too.

---



---

Regarding sunlight, the south facing windows of #43 would far exceed the BRE criteria, namely, 25 Suns throughout the year, 5 of which must be in the winter months. (The side windows are almost exactly west facing and not within 90 degrees of due south, so they need not be assessed).

Regarding overshadowing, the area north of #43 is a tarmac parking area so again it need not be assessed.

Accordingly, whichever way one looks at it, the proposed development will be BRE compliant and detailed test are not required here.

We trust that is sufficient for your present purposes.

Yours sincerely

Daylight & Sunlight

Enc. 2108/DSO/01 and Proposed Development Drawings of 43 Sweetcroft Lane.

---