Reason for appeal.
We are appealing the councils decision to refuse planning permission for this rear single storey extension on the basis that it's judgement was unduly weighted by the number of objections received.

Policy documents, AG1, AH7 and the Development Control Standard No3 'Extensions and alteration to dwellings' quoted in the decision, clearly show that Proposals "should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an *unacceptable* extent." Also it says "the fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties *should not be dominated* by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive."
The wording of these policies makes it essential for councils to make a judgement, case by case, about the extent to which an application unacceptably reduces light and intrudes.
It is obvious that this type of judgement will be affected by other factors, including the views of neighbours. Indeed the council has received 6 letter of objection to this application. We believe the force of these objections means that the council has judged the proposal to be contentious. Hence the extension has been judged more critically.

The 6 letters of objection were received by the council. Of the six letters three were from the same address. Six areas of concern are listed in the planning officers report. Four of these, while being important concerns have no bearing on the planning application. These issues are all addressed under, standard planning conditions and or the statutory requirement of building control or Party wall law. Two of the letters specifically apply to the original proposal to convert the loft using small dormer windows on the front and rear elevations. The concern over loss of privacy was also connected with the loft conversion. Because of these objections and after consultation with the planning officer the application was amended, retaining only the rear single storey extension.
The planning officer wanted the applicant to withdraw the application completely and build the rear extension under permitted development. In our letter and accompanying drawing that was sent to the council date 20 Feb 2014 we presented our reason for continuing with the extension in its present form. This letter accompanying the drawing was not added to the documents list registered on the website. The argument presented were thus not available for consideration by all the parties concerned. We have included the letter among the documents in the appeal, but in case this is not accepted as part of the original application we briefly present the thoughts below.

Letter 20 Feb 2014 summary.
The drawing sent along with the letter showed the height of the existing boundary fence between 6 &7 Thatch Court. Because the fence follows the natural rise of the ground the extension becomes less visible above the fence the further away from the building. The proposed fascia level is @2.1M above the DPC.

The proposal has been set back 400mm from the boundary fence, deliberately to mitigate impact and also to make sure that the fascia and the entire guttering is behind the existing fence.
The low pitch full hipped roof has the least impact possible.
The top of the ridge is a maximum of 3.7M above the DPC.
By means of 3D modelling the shadowing caused by the new proposal on the adjoining property was examined. Because of the orientation of the block of houses, it was not possible to identify any time when a direct shadow will be cast over the rear windows of No6.
To reduce the size of the proposed extension to 3M would compromise its purpose as a dinning /kitchen area.
A 3M deep extension can be built as permitted development. The additional meter depth which the planning application would allow is the part of the extension that is almost out of view from the neighbours side.

The councils view implied, has been that the 3M depth of extension that permitted development allows is sufficient space. However according to the "Good practice guidance notes" as adopted by the Council the minimum total floor space expected for a 3 bedroom home is 93M2. An extension under permitted development would be 91M2. Clearly seeking the additional space is not being unreasonable.
The council have accepted that an extension 3M deep can, and probably will be built under permitted development. The wall on the boundary could be up to 3M high, this is considered acceptable. However because the application has been judged to be contentious the council has refused permission for an extension that has less visual impact and is far less overbearing although it extends 1M further.
It has not been possible to show by 3D modelling that the proposed extension would cause direct shadow to the rear of No6. The policy document uses the wording"loss of light to an unacceptable extent" Without direct shadowing, loss of light must be minimal. To judge that minimal loss of light is unacceptable must include other factors beyond the position of the sun as a light source.
Conclusion.
The council has refused permission for the application because it appears to be an unpopular decision. The councils positive and proactive approach to negotiate a satisfactory way forward, was a recommendation to with draw the application and build the extension under permitted development. This will absolve the council from any further responsibility in the matter, but will not address or assist the local residence in any of the grievances they have raised. Without planning approval the council have no specific control over design. The standard planning conditions such as prescribed work hours are not binding. And the local community losses a level of protection and arbitration to help resolve issues that may arise.
We therefore want the appeal to examine if the design is indeed unreasonable and unacceptably overbearing and not weather it is simply unpopular.