

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 23 March 2026 14:36  
**To:** Louise Bearcroft; DC Admin  
**Subject:** Objections Planning Application: 2025/61/92713

**CAUTION:** External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Ms Bearcroft

Subject: Objections Planning Application: [2025/61/92713](#)

The above application has recently received additional information/amendments [id1130493].

This plan is now showing the habitable lounge window and conservatory, overlooking this developments boundary, located at 21 Summerdale.

BRE (Building Research Establishment) provides recognised standards for assessing daylight and sunlight impact. They ensure that new developments do not unreasonably reduce natural light to neighbouring properties.

As this planning application is for a new development, the 25-degree rule should be used to assess loss of light and not the 45-degree rule, which should be used for house extensions.

This **25-degree rule** should be used to assess the potential impact any new development will have on the amount of natural light received by neighbouring properties.

**Therefore, the 25-degree rule should be used to assess the impact this new development will have on the daylight that 21 Summerdale will receive.**

The additional information shown on this plan, also confirms that these plans do not comply with the '**25 degree** vertical reference line of light rule' (or test).

When a line is drawn from the centre of the window sill of the habitable window in 21 Summerdale, at a 25-degree angle towards Plot 10, this line does not pass over the ridge level of Plot 10. This means Plot 10 will have a significant impact on the light to 21 Summerdale.

21 Summerdale will experience an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight due to Plot 10's size and location on this development.

On this plan a 34 degree angle is shown from a point where 21 Summerdale's conservatory joins the main house instead of from the centre of the primary habitable window in the gable end. Even though it has been measured from an incorrect point, this 34 degree angle (as stated on the plan) far exceeds the allowable 25-degree angle. Also this 34 degree line has been calculated to a point on Plot 10's **roof**, halfway down, between the ridge level and eaves level. This means that this 34 degree line does not miss the highest point of plot 10's ridge level, as it should do, to comply with this rule.

The measurements shown are very contrived and give a false representation of what impact this development will have on existing residents.

On this plan, the window in the gable end wall of 21 Summerdale has been categorised as a secondary ground floor window to lounge. I can only assume this terminology has been used to try and devalue the importance of this habitable window and to try to use this as justification for not complying with the 25-degree rule. This habitable window measures 1230 mm x 1200 mm. The opening part is 1090 mm x 540 mm. The internal window sill height is 950 mm. All these measurement, far exceed the criteria required for a primary window; therefore, this window **is** a primary window. The two windows in our large through lounge meet primary window classification. This house was built with two primary windows to allow enough natural light into this through lounge. **Therefore the 25-degree rule should be adhered to and measured from this primary habitable window in the gable end of 21 Summerdale.**

I have lived at this house for over 34 years and during that time I have enjoyed 'uninterrupted' light through this window, for more than a continuous 20 year period. As such, I have a prescriptive right to light. This development will be affecting this right, if this planning application is approved.

This development will have a negative impact upon my amenity and the daylight and sunlight that my home enjoys.

This planning application should be refused or more amendments made to it, so that it complies with the necessary standards regarding daylight and sunlight impact.

As stated previously we do have the appropriate legal cover to take this matter further if **necessary**. I have spoken to my solicitor this morning and she has advised me that I must first contact planning to express my concerns, so as to follow planning procedure. She has told me to contact her again if anymore legal assistance is required, as there are other options are open to her.

Regards

cc.....

