

From: Alex Dawson

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 11:53

To: Sanger, Jane

Cc: Lucky Dave

Subject: Fw: Re: PL/2026/00753 - Mill Ground, 30 Mill Road, Worton

Dear Jane,

You may like to consider this from my clients before you write your report:

We were shocked to learn that refusal of our planning application is being considered and would like to respond to the objections raised, as they contain a number of inaccuracies and unsubstantiated claims which risk misleading the assessment of the proposal.

Firstly, our neighbours have provided incorrect information regarding their property, stating that their lounge is served by only one side window. This is not accurate. We have already submitted photographic evidence clearly showing that the room also benefits from double patio doors, which provide a significant source of light. The suggestion that the side window is the sole source of light materially overstates the potential impact of the proposal and should not be relied upon.

Secondly, the objection refers to unsubstantiated “advice” suggesting that there is a difference in ground levels between the two properties which would result in “light tunnelling” and increased dominance. This claim is simply not correct. There is no meaningful difference in ground levels between the two plots. No evidence has been provided to support this assertion, and it appears to have been introduced to strengthen the objection rather than reflecting actual site conditions. As such, it should be afforded no weight in the decision making process.

Thirdly, reference is made to the Prescription Act 1832 and Building Research Establishment guidance, both of which relate to *significant* loss of light. BRE guidance typically considers a reduction of more than 20% to be material. However, the existing conditions must be properly understood. As demonstrated in the photographs and time lapse evidence we have submitted, there is only a very limited period of early morning sunlight reaching the side window and patio area. For the majority of the day, these areas are already overshadowed by the neighbouring property’s own built form, with sunlight only returning later in the day.

In that context, it is not accurate to suggest that the proposed development would result in a significant loss of light. The baseline level of light is already constrained, and the proposal does not materially alter that situation to the degree claimed. We do not accept that the proposal would result in anything approaching a 20% reduction in overall light levels.

More broadly, the objection relies heavily on emotive and exaggerated language such as “overbearing”, “domineering”, and “almost unusable”, which does not reflect the actual scale or design of the proposal. Planning decisions should be based on measurable impacts and factual site conditions rather than subjective descriptions.

We also note that the current pattern of sunlight and shading to the neighbouring garden is largely determined by the orientation and form of their own property, which blocks sunlight for much of the day. The proposal does not fundamentally change this existing relationship.

Finally, while we understand that the proposal has prompted concern from our neighbours, the points raised in objection are not supported by accurate information or evidence. In particular:

- *

the incorrect claim that the living room has only one window

- *

the unsupported and inaccurate assertion of differing ground levels and “light tunnelling”

- *

the overstated interpretation of rights to light and BRE guidance without proper baseline context

We have taken care to provide factual evidence to address these concerns and respectfully ask that the application is considered objectively, based on the submitted plans, verified site conditions, and relevant planning policy and guidance.

Best Regards,

Alex Dawson