



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/25/3366064**

**20 Anneforde Place, Bracknell, Bracknell Forest, RG42 2ES**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Alister Flower against the decision of Bracknell Forest Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/00065/FUL.
  - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and front porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. A previous application<sup>1</sup> for a similar proposal to that the subject of this appeal, for a two-storey side extension and a front porch, was refused.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located in a residential area characterised by the presence of two storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings.
5. Houses in the area tend to be set back from the road behind short parking areas and have longer gardens to the rear. The presence of occasional grass verges, trees and hedges provides for a sense of greenery.
6. Unlike the majority of its neighbours, the appeal dwelling does not have a parking area to the front. It is set back from and faces towards, a circa 90-degree bend along Anneforde Place and is separated from the road by a footpath, a triangular-shaped grass verge with a tall mature tree within it and a lamp-post set within the pavement adjacent to the road. Effectively, the grass verge, tall tree and lamppost serve to prevent a vehicle from reaching the appeal property.
7. The bend in the road at this location results in an adjacent terrace of dwellings being set at a 90-degree angle to the terrace within which the appeal dwelling is located. I observed during my site visit that, for apparently similar reasons relating

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference: 22/00549/FUL.

to the presence of the grass verge, neighbouring dwellings in this adjacent terrace do not have parking areas to the front.

8. The proposed two storey development would increase the appeal dwelling's number of bedrooms to four. Whilst a dwelling of this size would normally be required to provide three parking spaces, the Council accepts that there is an existing shortfall and that consequently, only one additional car parking space would be required to support the proposal.
9. However, no additional car parking space is proposed at the property. Rather, in support of his case, the appellant draws attention to the availability of an additional garage for parking. This garage would be located around two hundred metres away from the appeal dwelling. I find that this would not provide for a convenient parking arrangement and consider that there would be times that occupiers of the appeal property would therefore be likely to seek on-street parking as close to the property as possible, rather than park at a garage some considerable distance away.
10. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would result in increased pressure for on-street parking in the immediate vicinity of the dwelling. During my site visit I noted that, due to the majority of dwellings along Anneforde Place having vehicle accesses to the front, there is very little available on-street parking and that much of that which does exist near to the appeal dwelling would result in parking on a bend.
11. Given all of the above, I consider that the proposed development would be likely to result in additional on-street parking demand and that this would be likely to give rise to an increase in illegal, inconsiderate or obstructive parking. This would be to the harm of highway safety.
12. The appeal property is located in a residential area where one would expect the frequent use of pavements and roads by people of all ages, including children and elderly people. I consider that any increase in harm to highway safety in this location would be unacceptable and hence the decision below.
13. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposed development would harm highway safety, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Policy LP62 of the Bracknell Forest Local Plan (2024), which together amongst other things, seek to provide for highway safety.

## **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

*N McGurk*

INSPECTOR