



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/25/3368840

1 Goddard Way, Warfield, Bracknell Forest, Bracknell, Berkshire RG42 2JR

- 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 Mrs Rajender Kaur against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00818/FUL.
 - The development is a retrospective planning application for installation of front gates with part new fence installation to the boundary, include the addition of hardstanding to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of the development used in this appeal decision was taken from the Council's decision notice as it includes reference to the new area of hardstanding and therefore more accurately describes the development.
4. The front gate, fence and hardstanding are in place and the appeal has been considered on this retrospective basis.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the development on 1) the character and appearance of the street scene and local area; and 2) flood risk.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on a corner plot, with a front garden and driveway. The property is located on a residential estate where the dwellings are set back from the road behind front gardens or driveways. Boundary treatments mainly consist of low hedges or open post and rail fences providing a sense of openness to the estate.
7. The front gate has been constructed across the driveway of the appeal property and is set back from the road. The gate has been constructed using black metal railings. It consists of a pedestrian access gate, an automatic sliding gate for

vehicles and a section of railings. Whilst gating the property does detract somewhat from the openness of the frontage, the choice of railings and the set back from the road mean it does not feel enclosed and views in and out of the property are still possible. The gate is also a modest height, and this coupled with the choice of materials and set back mean it does not appear prominent or detract from the appearance of the appeal property.

8. Whilst I did note that no other properties in the immediate area have gated entrances, the appeal property has a different relationship with the street to other properties on the estate being a corner plot with the access set back from the road and to the side. The majority of the front of the property is bound by a hedge which reflects the boundary treatments used in the wider estate.
9. The new section of hardstanding modestly extends the driveway in front of the property. The materials chosen blend well with the existing driveway and do not affect the street scene or the wider appearance of the estate. The Council have referred me to the intentions of the original hard and soft landscaping scheme for the wider estate. I have however considered this appeal as a standalone planning application as applied for.
10. With regard to the new fence installation, a small section of closed board timber fence has been added between the appeal property and the neighbouring property. The new section of fence adds a short extension to the length of an existing fence. Unless standing very close to it, the new section of fence is partially screened from view from the footpath and road by a mature tree. This screening coupled with the fact only a very small section of fence has been added to the boundary mean no real sense of space or openness has been lost by its construction.
11. I am satisfied that the gate, the fence and the new area of hardstanding on the driveway are appropriate and not out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. On this basis, the development accords with policy LP 28 and LP 50 of the Bracknell Forest Local Plan 2020-2037 (adopted March 2024) (the BFLP) which seek, amongst other things to ensure development is of a high-quality design and has regard to the character of the area. Policy LP 50 also requires that development relates well to its surroundings and provide appropriate boundary treatments. No conflict has been found with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to ensure development is of high-quality design and adds to the overall quality of an area.

Flood Risk

12. A watercourse runs within the site adjacent to the front boundary of the appeal property. It was clear from my site visit and the photo evidence provided as part of the appeal that both the new section of fence and front gate have resulted in the installation of fence posts and rails within this watercourse.
13. I note that the appeal property is in an area at very low risk of flooding, and effort has been made to design the fence and gate to facilitate the movement of water and wildlife. I also note that the new section of driveway at the appeal property has been constructed with permeable materials to aid drainage. However, although the appellant asserts that the development does not obstruct the flow of water in the watercourse, this has not been corroborated by detailed flood risk assessment or drainage proposals, and I do not have sufficient evidence before me to conclude that no increase in flood risk has occurred.

14. I acknowledge that the appellant would be willing to accept a condition for any works to ensure the fence and gate structures do not obstruct the watercourse, but without any details for consideration, I cannot be satisfied that this is a practical or appropriate approach to overcome the flood risk concerns.
15. The appellant has referred me to a number of Council managed culverts along the watercourse in close proximity to the site, the appellant considers that these culverts are comparable in scale and form to the gate and fence openings in the watercourse. However, these culverts will be subject to management and maintenance by the Council and have been designed in accordance with appropriate standards and cannot be compared to the appeal scheme which is for an entirely different purpose. There is no details or mechanism before me to ensure the ongoing management and maintenance of the watercourse and culvert at the appeal site in perpetuity.
16. Based on the evidence presented, the development results in an unacceptable impact on flood risk. It is contrary to Policy LP 33 of the BFLP which seeks, amongst other things to reduce flood risk. It is also contrary to the Framework and Planning Practice guidance which seek to ensure development does not increase the risk of flooding.

Other Matters

17. Whilst I understand the benefits of the development to the appellant, including through enhanced privacy, security and more usable amenity space, the appeal development is unlikely to be the only means of achieving these objectives and none of these matters outweigh the harm I have found in this case.
18. No objections were received from the highway authority, Parish Council or any local residents at the planning application stage and it is noted that no adverse highway safety impacts have been identified. These are not factors which weigh in favour of allowing the appeal and do not diminish the harm that I have found in relation to flood risk.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. The development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR