30th August 2023
SE1019-01_G01_DH

Simon Jones
SJ Design Limited - Chartered Surveyors
The Old Co-Op Building
Church Street
Hayfield
High Peak
SK22 2JE

Dear Simon

Re: Shade Modelling Analysis at 26 Wood Gardens, Hayfield: Planning Application Reference: High Peak Borough Council HPK/2022/0533

As discussed by email, I write to update you with the findings of our shade analysis for 26 Wood Gardens, Hayfield, as it impacts on the neighbouring property at 27 Wood Gardens.

Our team have reviewed the following statement in the Planning Decision Notice for Refusal dated 23rd January 2023 for this application:

> *"The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its height, scale and positioning, along with its orientation and juxtaposition to No.27 Wood Gardens, would resulting an unacceptable relationship with that property. The proposed relationship is considered to be un-neighbourly and would give rise to adverse loss of light to habitable rooms; overshadowing, overbearing to the property and its private amenity space; and an unacceptable loss of outlook. As such, the development would have a detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by residents of that property. The development proposals would therefore be contrary to Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016, the High Peak Residential Design SPD (2005), and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 of the NPPF."*

To address this issue, an analysis has been made (using Google Sketchup Pro Version 6.0.515) of the shade pattern produced by the existing building – this has then been compared to the shade pattern predicted for the two development options – Duo-pitch Option A and Duo-pitch Option B. This sun shading assessment has been prepared with reference to the BRE guidance document – Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a Guide to Good Practice (BR 209 2022 ed).

This analysis illustrates that, because the proposed extension to 26 Wood Gardens is off-set to the south-east of the property at 27 Wood Gardens, the additional shading on 27 Wood Gardens will be minimal, relative to any existing shading. This is primarily because the proposed extension to 26 Wood Gardens is to the north of the existing structure. In this situation, when the sun is lowest (in the morning/ evening and at the beginning and end of the year), shade is generated principally by the silhouette of the existing structure at 26 Wood Gardens.

Figures 1 and 2 below, showing the sun at its highest at midday in January and Figures 3 and 4, showing the sun in the morning at 07:00 hrs in March, illustrate this point. Using these examples – of midday at the beginning of the year and early morning in Spring – show that there is no discernible difference between the shade of the existing structure and the shade of the house with the proposed extension. This is also true in the evenings and mornings throughout the year.

Figure 1: Existing Building (January, 12:00 hrs)

Figure 2: Option A (January, 12:00 hrs)



Figure 3: Existing Building (March, 10:00 hrs)



Figure 4: Option A (March, 10:00 hrs)





The principal concern is the potential loss of incident light available to the property at 27 Wood Gardens, from the shadow created by the proposed extension structure. This loss will last at most for approximately one hour just before midday in the Spring and Autumn, with additional shade across the rear ground-floor window (**Figures 5** and **6)**. After midday, there is no additional loss of light - as the sun moves to a position at right angles to this window and then to the other (west) side of the house. There will also be an additional small area of shade to the rear garden of the property at 27 Wood Gardens (**Figures 7, 8** and **9**). This small additional loss of light is lower under Option B (**Figure 7**).

Figure 5: Existing Building (March 12:00 hrs) Rear Perspective



Figure 6: Option B (March 12:00 hrs) Rear Perspective



Figure 7: Option B (March, 12:00 hrs)



Figure 8: Existing Building (January, 12:00 hrs)



Figure 9: Option A (March, 12:00 hrs)



As the sun climbs toward its zenith at the middle of the year, the shade becomes more vertical, and immediately north of the existing property at 26 Wood Gardens. At this time the shade cast by the proposed extension is then only over the patio to the rear of 27 Wood Gardens. (***Figure 11*** shows the existing situation and ***Figures 10*** and ***12,*** Option B and Option A, respectively)

Figure 10: Option B (June, 12:00 hrs)



Figure 11: Existing building (June 12:00 hrs)



Figure 12: Option A (June, 12:00 hrs)



In summary, the analysis shows that there will be a small loss of light to the property at 27 Wood Gardens from the proposed extension of 26 Wood Gardens, but that this loss is at its most manifest as additional shading across the rear ground floor window at 27 Wood Gardens for approximately 1 hour, just before midday, in Spring and Summer. There will also be a small amount of additional shading over the rear garden at this time. This loss is lower under proposed extension Option B.

Yours sincerely

Dr David Hackett, BSc (Hons), MLD, PhD MCIEEM, CEnv
Landscape Architect and member of the Landscape Institute
Founding Director, **Biora**