

**65 - 69 Parkhurst Road: Response to Residents**

Consulted	Address	Topic	Detailed Comment	Response
<b>Gemma Daborn</b>	<b>Flat 3, Holbrooke Court, N7 0PW</b>	Holbrooke Court Petition	List of residents who object to the proposals on the basis of height and proximity. Representative of the Tenants & Residents Association of Holbrooke Court. Feel that the development will severely compromise views and the amount of sunlight reaching flats and communal garden's and children's play areas. Also concerned about overlooking from balconies.	The reductions in sunlight from the existing position are generally very small and less than 4% of total annual sunlight (APSH). All rooms within Holbrooke Court meet the BRE Guidelines for sunlight across the whole year when the overhanging balconies above the windows are disregarded, except for two living rooms and a bedroom, which will retain good levels of sunlight with the proposal in place. Sunlight to bedrooms is considered less important according to the BRE Guidelines and therefore, given the flexibility allowed within the BRE Guidelines, the Holbrooke Court flats will retain good levels of sunlight with the proposal in place and sufficiently close to be considered compliant with planning policy. The proposals do not face directly on to the buildings in Holbrooke Court, as such it is not considered that overlooking to Holbrooke Court will be an issue.
<b>Geoff Carmichael</b>	<b>7 Moriarty Close</b>	Parking	Concerned about parking in the area and that new residents may use spaces on Moriarty Close.	The development will be 'car free' and residents will not be able to obtain parking permits for on street parking. Residents will not be able to use Moriarty Close to park, and this will be regulated by parking attendants and will be a matter for the police should a problem arise.
<b>Pauline Duffy</b>	<b>61 Holbrooke Court, N7 0PN</b>	Overlooking, sunlight, height	Supportive of the TA site being redeveloped but feel the proposals will jeopardise the amenity space to the rear of Holbrooke Court and overlooking from balconies. Also feel the orientation of the development will cut out most of the sun from the amenity area. Feels that Block D and E are in the wrong place and too high.	The sunlight to the grassed amenity spaces in and around Holbrooke Court will be fully planning compliant. The BRE planning guidelines seek to ensure that at least 2 hours of sunlight is enjoyed by 50% of each amenity space on March 21st. Drawing number 0970-27 included in appendix 4 demonstrates that area 2, the closest and most likely to be affected grassed amenity space within the Holbrooke Court estate, will still enjoy 99.9% of its area receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight to 50% of its space on March 21st, unchanged from the existing position. Therefore, the proposal is fully planning compliant in relation to sunlight to the grassed amenity spaces around Holbrooke Court. The proposals do not face directly on to the buildings in Holbrooke Court, as such it is not considered that overlooking to Holbrooke Court will be an issue.
<b>Miss Carla Sever</b>	<b>62 Moriarty Close</b>	Privacy, noise, sunlight, overlooking	Residents of the new development would be able to look directly into the skylights of her home. The height of the proposals is not in keeping with the area or conservation area. Concerned about the dust and noise during construction. Also has concerns about traffic and car parking in an area that is already very busy, and is worried about security and people climbing over the wall.	The Velux windows within the roof of 61-62 Moriarty Close do not face within 90° due south and so do not require analysis according to the BRE Guidelines. Therefore, following the BRE planning guidelines' recommendations, there is no requirement in relation to sunlight for these windows and therefore there is no valid planning concern in relation to loss of sunlight to them. Whilst the original scheme was considered to be an appropriate design response to the site, the height and massing of the proposals has been significantly reduced following concerns raised during consultation. The development will be 'car free' as required by Islington policy. New residents will not be able to obtain parking permits. The developer will abide by the Code of Construction practice to try and ensure disruption and noise is kept to a minimum. Furthermore, any construction noise will be mitigated through best practice measures as outlined in the submitted noise assessment. It is not anticipated that the development will be the catalyst for any antisocial behaviour, indeed developing the previously vacant land will provide a greater degree of surveillance and improve the feeling of security.
<b>Miss Marian O'Gorman</b>	<b>32 Moriarty Close, N7 0EF</b>	Height, traffic, parking, noise	Height of development will impact on privacy and daylight, there are no other buildings of this height in the area. Concerned about the increase in traffic and traffic noise during construction and thinks that contractors may try to use Moriarty Close to park their vehicles. Does not want any noisy work done in the mornings or evenings, and thinks Saturday work should end at 1pm and there should be no work on Sundays.	All rooms/windows within 31-36 Moriarty Close meet the BRE Guidelines in terms of daylight and sunlight and so are fully planning compliant. Furthermore the height of the proposed development has been significantly decreased as a response to residents concerns. As stated above, the developer will be required to abide by the Code of Construction Practice and noise during construction will be appropriately mitigated so as to reduce the disruption during the construction phase. Contractors will be clearly briefed that Moriarty Close is not an appropriate location for parking and any breaches of this will be dealt with by the transport authorities.
<b>Mr Andrew Harbert</b>	<b>38 Moriarty Close, N7 0EF</b>	Height, parking	Don't feel that the developer has adequately shown how they intend on cladding the building. Thinks the height of the development far exceeds the surroundings. During the consultation event the developers agreed to reduce the height of the buildings, tier the remaining stories and remove balconies from the elevations facing Moriarty Close - the submitted plans do not reflect the changes they agreed to make. Does not feel that the transport plan addresses the impact on motorcycle parking in the area. As they do not require parking permits the development will increase pressure for existing motorcycle bays.	Details on cladding are provided in the Design and Access Statement. The height and scale of the development has been significantly reduced following consultation. Furthermore, the upper levels on all blocks have been set back to reduce the visual impact. The balconies to Block A have been relocated to face inwards, and not towards Moriarty Close. Motorcycle parking has been considered and it is not felt that the proposals will have a significant negative impact on the existing provision in the area.
<b>Mr Andrew Randell</b>	<b>30 Parkhurst Court, N7 0SD</b>	Scale, privacy, transport	Supports the idea of redeveloping the site, however does not like the proposals in their current format. Feels that the scale is too big and 150 units is too many. The height far exceeds anything close by and would suggest a redesigned scheme that is 4 storeys. Living room and bathroom windows will not have the same level of privacy as they do now. Thinks the new units will negatively impact on parking and the construction phase and associated vehicles will affect traffic and the local transport infrastructure.	Whilst the original scheme was considered to be an appropriate design response for the site the proposed scheme has been reduced in height and scale to address concerns raised during consultation, and now only provides 112 units. The height varies from 4 to 6 floors, however all upper floors are set back to reduce the visual impact. The development will be 'car free', as is required by Islington policy. Parking permits will not be allowed for new residents. The developer will abide by the Code of Construction Practice which aims to minimise the disruption caused by development. Furthermore, construction noise will be mitigated as set out in the submitted noise assessment and any impacts from construction traffic are considered to be negligible, temporary and short term.
<b>Jake Beaumont-Nesbitt</b>	<b>61 Moriarty Close</b>	Height, privacy	Didn't know anything about the development until a neighbour told him about the consultation event. The development is out of keeping and is only a few feet from his main windows. Thinks the development is intentionally over the top compared to neighbours. Doesn't want to lose privacy, peace and quiet.	The development is not considered to be over the top. The proposed scheme has been developed following close consultation with Council Officers, statutory consultees, and local residents. The height and massing of the building has been reduced to address concerns raised during the consultation process. In addition, the building line fronting Moriarty Close has been moved back and balconies have been relocated to face in towards the development. It is considered that these measures will significantly reduce the impact on the residents of Moriarty Close.

Mr Paul Chennell	19 Moriarty Close	Supporter	Supports the application so long as disabled access to and from existing and new buildings is maintained to a high standard.	All of the proposed buildings will be accessible by disabled users. In addition, two disabled parking bays will be provided on site. A site manager will be on site at all times and will ensure that the buildings and surrounding areas are maintained to a high standard.
Christine Delon	61 Parkhurst Road	Interested party - not objector or supporter	Feels that Islington Council should have taken the land to provide social and affordable housing. Does not think that there is enough on site parking for visitors of residents. Thinks that the buildings that are right on Parkhurst Road should be as tall as possible - 5 or 6 stories or perhaps higher	Social and affordable housing is provided within the scheme. The development is 'car free' which is in line with Islington's policies. The building fronting Parkhurst Road is 3 floors, with a set back 4th floor. This has been discussed extensively with Council Officers and is considered to be the best solution to ensure the building is in keeping with other buildings on Parkhurst Road.
Mr Michael Brooks	11 Holbrooke Court	Height, density	Thinks the height, density and massing of proposed development will be of serious detriment to the adjacent residential development in Holbrooke Court.	Following consultation the proposed development has been reduced in height and scale to address concerns raised by residents. All rooms within Holbrooke Court meet the BRE Guidelines for sunlight across the whole year when the overhanging balconies above the windows are disregarded, except for two living rooms and a bedroom, which will retain good levels of sunlight with the proposal in place. As such, it is not considered that the proposals will have a detrimental impact on Holbrooke Court.
Miss Anne E Cox	9 St George's Place, Moriarty Close, N7 0EF	Parking, traffic	Concerned that the lack of parking facilities will result in people parking in Moriarty Close and also think the entrance to Moriarty Close might be mistaken for the entrance to the new development. This will increase traffic flow in the cul de sac and compromise privacy and safety.	The development will be 'car free' and residents will not be able to obtain parking permits for on street parking. Residents will not be able to use Moriarty Close to park, and this will be regulated by parking attendants and will be a matter for the police should a problem arise. The entrance to Parkhurst Gardens will be made very clear so as to avoid any confusion with the entrance to Moriarty Close.
Carolyne Hodkin	30 Huddleston Road	Daylight, sunlight, height, overlooking, parking, construction	Owner of 49 Moriarty Close. Concerns about daylight and sunlight impact and has 2 windows that will be directly affected. The impact of daylight is down to the height of the proposed buildings and their proximity to Moriarty Close. The balconies will mean new residents will have a direct view into the flat. Also concerned that digging the foundations may compromise the foundations of Moriarty Close and cause structural damage. Issue of parking and new residents using Moriarty Close and the dust and disturbance caused during construction. In addition, not happy with the overlooking of the Willow Early Years Centre garden and the loss of daylight/sunlight. <b>Please read full letter.</b>	The report referred to by Carolyne Hodkin is dated 6th December 2013. This has been superseded by the report dated 7th February 2014. The VSC results for the two windows to her flat facing the site, now referenced as W3 and W4 on the first floor, now retain 20.38% and 22.6% VSC respectively for the January 2014 scheme. Carolyne Hodkin confirms that the room is actually open plan, with an arch between the kitchen part of the room and the dining/living area. Hallways have no requirement for daylight or sunlight in planning terms. Although we acknowledge there is a reduction in VSC to windows W3 & W4 facing the site, the daylight distribution results show that the whole room will be very well lit as 100% of its area will see the sky at desk height with the proposal in place, unchanged from the existing position. The BRE Guidelines also acknowledge that where there are a number of windows serving the same room, the VSC may be averaged to 26% VSC, only marginally different to the 27% considered ideal by the BRE Guidelines, further demonstrating that the level of daylight to the rooms as a whole will remain good. In relation to the Children's Day Centre, it is untrue to say that a 1-2% reduction beyond a 20% reduction is unacceptable. On the contrary, the BRE Guidelines acknowledge that where results are very close to the numerical guidelines, these are likely to be acceptable in an urban location. Indeed, the results demonstrate that the Children's Day Centre will remain very well daylight with the proposal in place. The development will be 'car free', as is required by Islington policy. Parking permits will not be allowed for new residents. The developer will abide by the Code of Construction Practice which aims to minimise the disruption caused by development. The balconies facing Moriarty Close have been relocated to face in towards the centre of the development, thereby reducing of overlooking. The surrounding buildings have been considered in terms of construction impact and the proposals will not damage the foundations of Moriarty Close.
Brooke Vincent & Partners. On behalf of owners of Moriarty Close.	Enterprise House, The Crest, London, NW4 2HN	Daylight and Sunlight	<b>Please read full report - contains detail on Daylight/Sunlight report.</b> Concludes that an adverse effect in relation to daylight and sunlight will occur as a result of the proposals. Also states that Waldrams report does not deal with overshadowing and this could have an adverse effect on the amenity space to the rear of 41 - 60 Moriarty Close.	Although BVP do not refer to which report they are reviewing, since their note is dated 7th February 2014, it is assumed that they are reviewing a previous version of our daylight and sunlight report. In relation to 25-36 Moriarty Close, all windows facing the scheme have now been analysed. The upper and lower results for windows follow the BRE Guidelines recommendations for ADF, whereby the portion of the window below 85cm is deemed to have a lower contribution to ADF (15%) than the upper part above 85cm from the floor. The BVP report draws attention to ADF, however, the windows analysed in this building are fully compliant for VSC which is the primary test, above ADF, according to the BRE Guidelines and, as such, are fully compliant with the BRE Guidelines. Since the internal layouts are not known, this furthermore reinforces the need to analyse the VSC for this property, rather than results pertaining to room layouts such as ADF. The VSC results demonstrate, irrespective of the room areas, that the scheme is daylight compliant to this building. In relation to 42-60 Moriarty Close, as clarified in the above point to Carolyne Hodkin, she confirms that the rooms are open plan and therefore do enjoy mitigating daylight. It is therefore untrue, particularly in relation to Carolyne Hodkin's flat, that the kitchen is reliant solely on W3 for daylight in our 7th February report. As clarified above, although we acknowledge there is a reduction in VSC to windows W3 & W4 facing the site, the daylight distribution results show that each of these rooms served by windows W3-W5 will be very well lit as 100% of their area will see the sky at desk height with the proposal in place, unchanged from the existing position. The BRE Guidelines also acknowledge that where there are a number of windows serving the same room, the VSC may be averaged to 26% VSC, only marginally different to the 27% considered ideal by the BRE Guidelines, further demonstrating that the level of daylight to the rooms as a whole will remain good (except on the ground floor, where the existing VSC is already low). We disagree, therefore, that there will be a significant adverse effect. In relation to the rooms facing south, these retain close to 100% of their daylight distribution, proving that these rooms will retain very good daylight penetration and will therefore be very well daylight with the proposal in place. The massing has been reduced from the time of the BVP report. The effect of overshadowing has indeed been fully covered in our report, since detailed sunlight amenity results are included in Appendix 4.

Mr Colm Kelly & Mrs Michele Kelly	77a Tabley Road	Parking, design, unit sizes, affordable housing.	Wants to ensure that the scheme is 'car free' as required by Core Strategy Policy CS10. Believes that the building facing Parkhurst Road does not conform to the Core Strategy which requires new buildings to be sympathetic in scale and appearance. Also has concerns about the size of units and believes they should reduce the number of units and increase the size of them. Considers the social housing element to be low and urges the Council to seek more. <b>Please read full response.</b>	The development will be car free and new residents will not be able to obtain parking permits. The building facing Parkhurst Road has been reduced in height and is considered to be appropriate in scale to the other buildings on Parkhurst Road. The units have been designed to meet current standards in terms of size. The number of units has been reduced and the development will now provide 112 units. The affordable housing provision is considered to be acceptable.
Metropolis Planning and Design LPP. On behalf of residents of Moriarty Close.		Design, closeness to site boundaries, harm to amenity, internal layouts, housing mix.	States that the development is out of context with the surrounding area and does not relate to the conservation area. Also believes the scheme would result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents including sense of enclosure, loss of privacy, overlooking and loss of daylight/sunlight. Internal layouts are poorly designed in terms of orientation and would provide sub standard accommodation. There are too many 1 bed units which is contrary to Islington policy. The development is too close to site boundaries and places the highest and most intrusive parts of the scheme in the most private and sensitive part of the site. <b>Please read full report.</b>	As detailed above, the daylight and sunlight results to Moriarty Close are either fully compliant to the BRE Guidelines or sufficiently close to be considered acceptable given the flexibility allowed in the BRE Guidelines in urban locations. In particular, the daylight to 41-60 is proven acceptable by virtue of the very good retained daylight distribution results to all rooms, demonstrating that they will retain a very high level of daylight penetration, compliant with BRE Guidelines levels. In relation to 41-60, the BVP report confirms the Velux windows mainly serve bathrooms, which have no requirement for daylight and sunlight, or open plan space with mitigated light from away from the proposal. In relation to alleged overshadowing to the Children's Day Centre playground, our sunlight amenity analysis confirms that the sunlight to this playground will be fully planning compliant, since it retains over half its area able to see 2 hours of sunlight on March 21st. Inevitably, in relation to internal sunlight to the proposal, it is usual for some units to face in a northern direction. In our opinion, the sunlight to the scheme itself is satisfactory and compliant with policy DM3.4. The proposals have been designed in relation to Islington policy and the unit mix is considered to be appropriate. The proposed development has been reduced in height and scale, and building lines have been brought back to address concerns raised by residents.
Gerard Maguire	6 & 29 Holbrooke Court	Scale, height, daylight/sunlight, overshadowing	Thinks that the front building onto Parkhurst Road is acceptable but overall too many blocks are proposed. Thinks that the 6 storey front building would cause overshadowing and a loss of light. Thinks that a tall building next to the children's play area could lead to anti social behaviour and things being thrown from the windows. It would also suffer from a loss of light and would need new floodlighting to compensate.	The BRE Guidelines are designed to protect daylight and sunlight amenity to neighbouring buildings. Our daylight & sunlight report demonstrates that the retained level of daylight with the proposal in place will either meet the BRE Guidelines in all cases or be sufficiently close to ensure that Mr Maguire will be materially unchanged in terms of reading ability within his premises. Furthermore the results demonstrate that the Children's Day Centre will remain very well daylight with the proposal in place.
Unknown	6 Parkhurst Court, N7 0SD	General	Does not think there is any point in responding and that the consultation is purely a PR exercise.	N/A
Anita Fuki	59 Moriarty Close	Sunlight, structural damage, height, noise, construction	Anita is a Director on the Board. Windows of the flat look directly out onto the TA Centre and thinks that the proposals will significantly affect the amount of sunlight they receive. States that they have now commissioned John Carter a specialist in 'right to light' who will submit report to accompany the objections of residents of Moriarty Close. The initial report shows that the dining area of the flat will suffer significantly from a loss of light. Concerned that the digging of foundations will cause structural damage to her block. The height of the development will dominate the surrounding area and the flat roofs are not in keeping. Worried that residents of the new development will park in Moriarty Close. Also has concerns about the noise and dust involved in construction and the potentially dirt that will effect the walls of Moriarty Close.	Response to BVP letter above. The development will be 'car free' and residents will not be able to obtain parking permits for on street parking. Residents will not be able to use Moriarty Close to park, and this will be regulated by parking attendants and will be a matter for the police should a problem arise. The proposed development will not negatively impact on the foundations of Moriarty Close. Furthermore, the height and massing of the development has been significantly reduced following consultation. The developer will also abide by the Code for Construction Practice so as to reduce the disruption of the construction phase.
Bryan Healing	Lives directly across from the National Youth Theatre development site	Noise, height	Property faces onto the Youth Theatre scheme and at the rear looks directly towards the Parkhurst Rd scheme. Concerned about the noise from the large number of flats and associated balconies. It is already quite noisy in the area in the summers and this will only be made worse. Thinks the height of the development is too much and would prefer 5 storeys. Also noted a couple of errors in the Site Location Plan. Where the building is marked as a store it is actually a sub station.	The noise that will be generated by the site has been considered and it is not believed that it will cause a significant negative impact for neighbouring occupiers. In addition, a number of the balconies have been relocated to face in towards the centre of the development. This will assist in reducing any noise impact. The height and massing of the buildings have been reduced, with the maximum height now a set back 6th floor. The setting back of levels further reduces their visual impact.
Michelle Delon & Marc Delon	61A & C Parkhurst Road	Height, overshadowing, privacy, noise, traffic	Height of development is not in keeping with the conservation area and will overshadow neighbouring properties. The plans show a balcony facing her property which will have a big impact on privacy. Also concerned about the noise the new development will generate and also the noise the construction will cause. The pedestrian and vehicle traffic caused by the development will be an ongoing concern.	The height and massing of the proposals have been significantly reduced during the consultation process. Furthermore, the building lines have been brought back, all of which reduces the issues of loss of privacy and overlooking. The majority of balconies are now inward facing which will decrease the noise heard by neighbouring residents. The developer will also abide by the Code for Construction Practice so as to reduce the disruption of the construction phase. The development will be car free and no parking permits will be allowed for new residents. As such it is not considered that the proposals will increase traffic around the site.
Jonathan Ward	Unknown	Impact on Willow's Children's Centre	Objecting due to the impact on the Willow's Children's Centre. The development would cause the garden to be in shadow for a high proportion of the daylight hours of the year. A full shadow assessment should be carried out. There is no evidence of a wind assessment having been carried out, the deflection of winds down into the garden of the children's centre will exacerbate the discomfort felt by a lack of sunlight. Thinks the overlooking of the garden by the new units is inappropriate. The site layout makes no provision for pedestrian permeability and a link to the north would offer a direct route towards Tufnell Park Tube Station, Whittington Park and the new pedestrian routes through the National Youth Theatre site. The u shaped massing of the proposal creates an increased number of rooms with substandard daylight in the corners of the floor plate. Access to cycling and waste facilities is poor. The energy strategy fails to address a key opportunity in shower waste water heat recovery. There is a further cost effective opportunity to use the flat roofs as blue roofs.	As already stated above, the effect on the Children's Centre in daylight and sunlight terms is not considered to be significant. It is also considered that any overlooking of the park will be minimal and is more likely to occur out of operational hours. A north - south link has been built into the design and can be opened up in the future. At the present time, and following the guidance of Secure by Design Officers, it was not considered appropriate to open this link now. A Daylight and Sunlight report has been submitted with the application which demonstrates that the proposals are satisfactory in this regard. Furthermore, the energy strategy has been prepared in line with best practice and has been agreed with the Council. The location of cycle and waste facilities has also been discussed and amended following discussions with Council Officers.
Paul Wilton	59 Parkhurst Road	Design, privacy	The development will be out of character with the surrounding buildings. The flats will look directly onto our garden which will result in a loss of privacy.	Whilst the original scheme was considered to be an appropriate design response for the site the proposed scheme has been reduced in height and scale to address concerns raised by residents. The TA centre will be located to the rear of 59 Parkhurst Road, and the flats beyond that. The block to the east will be a considerable distance away from the rear of 59 and a number of trees in between will provide a degree of screening. It is not considered, therefore, that there will be an issue of overlooking or loss of privacy as a result of the new units.

<b>Julian Gregory - Lib Dem Campaigner in St George's Ward</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	Privacy, loss of light	Concern that the proposed buildings would loom over neighbouring properties. It would lead to a lack of light and overlooking.	The developer has taken into consideration the concerns of residents and consequently significantly reduced the height, bulk and scale of the proposed development. It is not considered that the development would loom over neighbouring buildings. Balconies have been moved to reduce overlooking and a significant amount of work has been done to ensure the development does not have a significant negative impact on the daylight/sunlight receipt of neighbouring properties.
<b>Ishbel &amp; James Rose</b>	<b>61b Parkhurst Road</b>	Loss of light	Didn't know anything about the development until they saw a sign on a lamppost outside their house. Believe that permission has already been granted. Concerned about loss of light and it might make them consider moving from the area.	The development has not yet been granted permission. A revised scheme is being prepared which addresses concerns raised by residents. The daylight and sunlight report submitted with the planning application included daylight and sunlight results for all rooms and windows facing the proposals within 61 Parkhurst Road. The results show that the scheme is fully compliant with the BRE Guidelines and thus planning policy to this property.
<b>Leninha Maria De Assis</b>	<b>63 Parkhurst Road</b>	Loss of light, overshadowing, privacy	Live in lower ground flat and use the garden regularly. The development will reduce light and cause overshadowing in the garden and overlooking. The building will be overbearing and claustrophobic. Thinks they are entitled to protection from the Human Rights Act.	The daylight and sunlight report submitted with the planning application included daylight and sunlight results for all rooms and windows facing the proposal within 63 Parkhurst Road. The results show that the scheme is fully compliant with the BRE Guidelines and thus planning policy to this property. The scheme is located primarily to the north of the rear garden to 63 Parkhurst Road and the sun tracks across the southern sky in the UK, this meaning that the proposal cannot materially impact the rear garden at 63 Parkhurst Road in terms of additional shadow. As already stated above, the height and scale of the development has been significantly reduced following consultation and it is not considered to be overbearing.
<b>Marianne &amp; Paul Delon</b>	<b>63 Parkhurst Road</b>	Height, loss of light, privacy	Believes that when they were shown the plans the block proposed next to their property was 4 storeys, but in the submitted plans was increased to 7 storeys. Concerned about the impact of the loss of light to house and garden. The analysis shows up to a 30% reduction in ADF and up to 38% loss of VSC. Also concerned about being overlooked and a loss of privacy. Worried about the amount of people that will be passing their garden and the associated noise.	The proposals were not increased between the consultation stage and submission of the application. Indeed, there was actually a reduction in height. The height has been further reduced since submission as a direct response to concerns raised. The building lines have also been brought back and balcony locations changed to reduce any negative impact with regards to overlooking and privacy. The daylight and sunlight report submitted with the planning application included daylight and sunlight results for all rooms and windows facing the proposal within 63 Parkhurst Road. The results show that the scheme is fully compliant with the BRE Guidelines and thus planning policy to this property. The scheme has been reduced and set back in massing from the time of this objection. VSC is the primary test for acceptability of daylight and the results for the current scheme are now fully compliant in relation to VSC (i.e. loss less than 20%). The ADF change is now very small and is less relevant. The scheme is located primarily to the north of the rear garden to 63 Parkhurst Road and the sun tracks across the southern sky in the UK, this meaning that the proposal cannot materially impact the rear garden at 63 Parkhurst Road in terms of additional shadow. Therefore, the rear garden will not be in shade practically all the time and will see good levels of sunlight, particularly in the evening when it is unaffected by the scheme. The main obstruction to winter sunlight is the building at 63 Parkhurst Road itself. There is some additional morning shadow, however, the scheme is still fully compliant in relation to the BRE Guidelines and thus planning policy for shadow.
<b>Ms Goodall</b>	<b>Parkhurst Court</b>	Height, density	Thinks 150 units is excessive in an already overpopulated area and also thinks the proposals should not exceed the height of the original buildings.	The proposed development has been reduced in bulk and scale, and will now provide 112 units. The heights have also been reduced with upper floors set back to further reduce their visual impact.
<b>Ronan Fox</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	Objector	No comments provided	N/A