In reference to the <u>email dated Friday 20th November 2020 at 11.07 am from Mr Lane</u> (appellant's daylight and sunlight consultant), providing revised / updated analysis on the Average Daylight Factor self-testing for Block A, I comment as follows;-

- 1. I concur with the updated tables provided by Mr Lane within his email (Tables within that email are; 'Updated Internal Analysis' and 'Total not meeting minimum ADF Value' my original tables on the left and revised tables presented by Mr Lane on the right). As per my proof, I am reliant on the technical analysis provided by Point 2.
- 2. The tables presented confirm the number of rooms not meeting ADF target criteria which has now reduced from originally 34 No rooms to 28 No rooms (net improvement of 6 No rooms); tables with colour reference on adversity / shortfall to target. A summary table on consideration of adversity was originally presented within my Table 5 'Habitable rooms failing ADF within Block A by rooms use'. I present Table 5 below (both original and updated). Whilst the adversity is similar, this is a slight worsening for living/kitchen/dining rooms (an important key room); there were 2 No. in my viewing needing improvement and 8 No. should improve ideally which based on the revised analysis, I present as 4 No. needing improvement (net increase of +2) and 6 No. should improve ideally (net decrease of -2).

Table 5 - As per my proof of evidence

| Room Use | Total not meeting minimum ADF Value | | Consideration to on extent of shortfall (professional opinion) | | |
|----------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| | Quantity (No) of those failing on Block A | As percentage of those failing in Block A | Need to improve | Should improve ideally | Close to minimum ADF / improvement less essential |
| Bedroom | 21 | 61.8% | 13 | 2 | 6 |
| Living Room | 1 | 2.9% | - | - | 1 |
| LKD | 10 | 29.4% | 2 | 8 | - |
| Kitchen | 2 | 5.9% | - | - | 2 |
| Total | 34 | 100% | 15 | 10 | 9 |

Table 5 – revised updated (based on Mr Lane's revised submission):-

| Room Use | Total not meeting minimum ADF Value | | Consideration to on extent of shortfall (professional opinion) | | |
|------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| | Quantity (No) of those failing on Block A | As percentage of those failing in Block A | Need to improve | Should improve ideally | Close to minimum ADF / improvement less essential |
| Bedroom | 14 | 50.0% | 12 | - | 2 |
| Living Room | - | - | - | - | - |
| LKD | 10 | 35.7% | 4 | 6 | - |
| Kitchen | 2 | 7.15% | - | - | 2 |
| Kitchen Diner | 2 | 7.15% | - | - | 2 |
| Total | 28 | 100% | 16 | 6 | 6 |

- 3. In summary, there remains 90 No habitable rooms within Block A applicable for review, and based upon the revised analysis, 28 No rooms do not meet the minimum values of ADF which relates to 31% of habitable rooms within Block A (albeit I'm highlighting a slight increase in adversity to living/kitchen/dining rooms for those not meeting ADF target). I consider on balance, nothing fundamental has changed.
- 4. As a final comment, within Mr Lane's covering email of 20th November 2020 this highlights various changes to the ground, 1st & 2nd floors. It would appear on the core documents that within CD8 Revised drawings, I note only a revised plan for basement and ground floor for Block A perhaps Mr Lane could provide some further background on these other changes he is referring to and as to whether other revised drawings should be submitted / background on this?