



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/W/25/3370140

Bokhara, 58 Wellington Road, Crowthorne, Bracknell Forest RG45 7LD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr C Condon against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00794/PADAS.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Class AA – enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storey'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

2. Under Article 3(1) Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO) planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by the construction of additional storeys. Development is permitted under Class AA subject to limitations and conditions and a requirement that the developer, before beginning the development, applies to the local planning authority for prior approval.
3. Paragraph AA.2.(3)(a) of Class AA requires prior approval to be sought for matters including (i) impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light; and (ii) the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of (aa) the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and (bb) any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway.
4. The Council's main concerns relate to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of The Hollies, through overlooking of the garden and the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. Therefore, the main issue is whether prior approval should be granted under Class AA of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the GPDO considering the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, The Hollies, with particular regard to overlooking; and
 - the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

Living conditions

5. The proposal would introduce first floor accommodation, which would include first floor windows to the front and rear elevations of the dwelling. The openings to the rear elevation would serve bathrooms and a landing area and could therefore be obscure glazed to prevent any direct overlooking of the adjoining properties to the rear. However, the proposed 4 first floor openings to the front elevation would serve bedrooms.
6. The additional storey would introduce a higher vantage point, in close proximity to the side boundary with The Hollies. Due to the staggered nature of the properties, the outlook from the proposed first floor windows towards the ground floor window in the side wall of The Hollies would be at an oblique angle and so would avoid any direct overlooking of the window. Nonetheless, the proposed bedroom windows would give rise to direct overlooking of the garden of the property. Consequently, the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the adjoining private amenity space at The Hollies.
7. The appellant contends that any potential overlooking of the neighbouring garden would be limited, given the intended use of the first-floor rooms as bedrooms, where it is suggested, occupants are unlikely to spend a significant proportion of their time. However, bedrooms are classified as habitable rooms and may reasonably be used for a range of domestic activities beyond sleeping, including general living. In the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, it has not been demonstrated that the designation of these rooms as bedrooms would materially reduce the degree of overlooking likely to arise from the windows serving these spaces.
8. Moreover, while I recognise that a degree of overlooking is not unusual within a built-up residential context, the siting of The Hollies in relation to the neighbouring properties affords it a considerable level of privacy, with very limited overlooking from windows in surrounding properties.
9. For the foregoing reasons I find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, The Hollies, with particular regard to overlooking. As such, it would fail to comply with paragraph AA.2(3)(a)(i) of the GPDO

External appearance

10. The appeal property comprises a bungalow, set back from the highway to the front of the site, to the rear of the properties fronting Wellington Road. While the dwellings within the immediately adjoining cul-de-sac are single storey, with a high degree of visual uniformity, the wider area is characterised by an eclectic mix of buildings that vary in height, age and architectural style, including a range of materials, architectural detailing and window arrangements.
11. The introduction of an additional storey would increase the overall scale and mass of the host property, resulting in a 2 storey dwelling which would exceed the height of the neighbouring properties to either side of the site. The overall design of the additional storey would reflect the simple, traditional pitched roof design of the existing brick and tile bungalow. While the side elevation of the dwelling, which is

visible on the approach to the property from the driveway, would be devoid of first floor windows, this, together with the window arrangement in the side and rear elevations, would not detract from the appearance of the property or be significantly at odds with other 2 storey residential properties nearby. Furthermore, the absence of such would not be readily apparent in the street scape given the position of the property set back from the highway.

12. Consequently, given the varied character of the surrounding built form, the proposal would not appear unduly discordant within its context. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not result in harm to the external appearance of the host property or to the character and appearance of its immediate surroundings. As such, it would accord with paragraph AA.2 (3)(a) (ii) of the GPDO.

Conclusion

13. While I have found that the proposed development would not harm the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, it would harm the amenity of the adjoining premises. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Worley

INSPECTOR