



Unit 1, Tilers Road  
Milton Keynes, MK11 3LH  
UK

Tel: +44 (0)1908 776970  
Fax: +44 (0)1582 470259  
E-mail: [solutions@rwdi.com](mailto:solutions@rwdi.com)

March 12, 2025

To: DNA Uxbridge Ltd

Re: **High Street, Uxbridge, London – RWDI Pedestrian Level Wind Desk-Based Assessment – Ref No: 2404017- Revision B – 27<sup>th</sup> March 2024**

Dear Sir/Madam,

This document provides a detailed response to the following query received regarding the Pedestrian Level Wind Desk Based Assessment undertaken by RWDI:

**Microclimate – Wind**

The submitted wind comfort levels study doesn't demonstrate impacts on surrounding streets (e.g. before and after comparison and impact) and doesn't demonstrate a clear "before" (as existing) and "after" (as proposed) comparison.

Our previous concerns about a wind tunnel effect along the high street have not been adequately addressed.

It is also concerning that the proposed rooftop amenity area is deemed unsuitable for sitting, even in the less windy summer season, despite being intended as a dwell space. Additionally, to a lesser degree, the building's corner at the high street may cause further wind discomfort, the proposed passageways could become wind tunnels, and the courtyard space appears unsuitable for sitting during the windiest seasons.

Lastly, the study appears to be using the upper limit version of the Lawson criteria, rather than the more balanced, broadly accepted limits.

**RWDI response:**

The assessment has considered the wind microclimate impacts on surrounding streets, the conclusion being the Proposed Development would not have an adverse effect on the nearby wind environment. The comparable height of the scheme to other nearby buildings means that it would tend not to push high-speed, high-level winds down to ground level, and as such does not cause the ground level conditions to become meaningfully windier.

With regard to the rooftop amenity area: we would note that it is windier than desired only in the absence of landscaping measures (i.e. a notional worst-case scenario in which there is no shelter against the oncoming winds). With the landscaping in place, we anticipate that wind conditions within the amenity area would be suitable for the intended usage.

With regard to the wind accelerating around building corners: we agree that this kind of wind effect may occur; however, as discussed in our assessment, we anticipate conditions being suitable for 'strolling' at worst, which is appropriate for the use of the area as a pedestrian thoroughfare. Similarly with regard to the passageways, we do anticipate that the wind may blow through these spaces at times, but as per our assessment we anticipate conditions suitable for 'strolling' at worst.

This document is intended for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately.

**[rwdi.com](https://www.rwdi.com)**



The courtyard space is expected to be suitable for 'standing' use during the windiest season and 'sitting' during the summer. These conditions are considered to be appropriate for an outdoor amenity space, for which there is a greater expectation of comfort and usability during the summer. Conditions categorised as suitable for 'standing' in the winter would still be comfortable and usable for some of the time, only less frequently than during the critical summer months (which reflects a realistically lower expectation of usability and comfort during the winter when colder temperatures and increased precipitation are the norm).

The study uses the Lawson Comfort Criteria (LDDC version), which are used for wind microclimate developments throughout the UK and have been for many years, except where a particular alternative is specified for the local area. The more "balanced, broadly accepted limits" referenced in the comments appear to be an amalgamation of several different criteria including the criteria specified for use in the City of London. We would note that the only significant difference between those criteria and the LDDC criteria we have applied in this case is the splitting of the 'sitting' category into 'long-term' and 'short-term' seating, with the other comfort thresholds being essentially the same. With regard to whether particular areas within or around the development would be comfortable for their intended usage, we would not arrive at any different conclusion if we were to use these different criteria.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R Stainton'.

Richard Stainton  
Project Manager  
RWDI

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Z Khan'.

Zain Khan  
Project Engineer  
RWDI