



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/25/3372520

1 Coningsby, Bracknell, Bracknell Forest, RG12 7BE

- 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 Amit Kedia against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00272/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension together with internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension together with internal and external alterations at 1 Coningsby, Bracknell, Bracknell Forest, RG12 7BE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00272/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 2504-S9A-AR-DR-PR-001 (Location Plan & Block Plan), 2504-S9A-AR-DR-PR-1000 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan), 2504-S9A-AR-DR-PR-1001 (Proposed First Floor Plan), 2504-S9A-AR-DR-PR-1002 (Proposed Roof Floor Plan), 2504-S9A-AR-DR-PR-2000 (Proposed Elevations_01) and 2504-S9A-AR-DR-PR-2001 (Proposed Elevations_02).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match the external materials used elsewhere in the existing dwelling.

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 development above is taken from the Council's decision notice, rather than the original application form. While there is nothing before me to indicate that the revised description was agreed between the main parties, it is nevertheless the description which was used in the Council's consultation, and it accurately describes the proposal.

4. Although I observed on my site visit that some works are already underway at the appeal site, my recommendation is based on the proposal as shown on the plans before me.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
- i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and,
 - ii) the living conditions of any occupiers of the host dwelling, in terms of the size and the layout of the garden.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey dwelling located in a predominantly residential area. Coningsby is in Bracknell New Town and is mostly characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings. The pairs are gable-fronted and are generally matching in terms of their appearance, including dark brown or black horizontal cladding at the first floor and lighter coloured brickwork at the ground floor. The consistent design and form of the pairs give the street scene a strong visual coherence which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
7. However, the appeal property is detached. It is separated from the matching pairs by another detached dwelling which has a different design to the pairs. It also occupies a corner plot where it is viewed alongside buildings which have a more varied appearance. This includes Glenfield House opposite the site, which is a large building with varying roof forms and a significant amount of white cladding. Therefore, the appeal property does not form part of the same immediate context as the matching pairs of dwellings along Coningsby.
8. In this context, the dark grey roof tiles and the anthracite grey windows would not be overly noticeable additions to the host dwelling and would not be conspicuous in the street scene. Although the cladding would be vertical and its colour has not been confirmed, if it has a similar appearance to that currently used at the dwelling, its dark brown colour would be sympathetic to the area. Also, and on the basis that the render is consistent with what is currently used, it would be similar in colour to Glenfield House and would not significantly contrast with the surroundings. The proposal would therefore be appropriate in its context and importantly, it would not erode the coherence of the matching pairs of dwellings in the street scene.
9. I also acknowledge from the Council's officer report that planning permission for various extensions was granted previously at the site, and that the current appeal proposal seeks further works. However, despite any previous approval, and for the reasons I have explained above, I find that the scheme before me would be acceptable on its own individual planning merits in terms of its effects on the character and appearance of the area.
10. Accordingly, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would comply with Policies LP 28 and LP 50 of the Bracknell Forest Local Plan (2024) (LP), and Policies HO 7 and HO 8

of the Bracknell Town Neighbourhood Plan (2021) (NP), which amongst other matters, require that developments relate well to their location and respond to, and enhance the appearance of the area.

Living conditions

11. Given the site's corner plot location, the proposal would provide a garden area to the side and rear of the dwelling. The evidence before me indicates that it would cover an area of approximately 148 square metres, which is a reasonable size. In terms of the layout of the garden, it would have a sizeable section leading out from the living room. It would also have a larger section to the side of the dwelling.
12. These areas together would be sufficient for the likely number of occupants of a dwelling of this size. They would also provide sufficient space for typical garden related activities, such as playing, sitting out, the drying of clothes, cycle and waste storage. Moreover, there would be additional, albeit narrow spaces which could be further used for the purposes of storage. For these reasons, the garden size and layout would be acceptable.
13. Therefore, the proposal would not be harmful in terms of its effect on the living conditions of any occupiers, in terms of the garden size and layout. In that regard, it would comply with Policy LP 50 of the LP, which requires that developments provide an appropriate amount of usable private amenity space for all dwellings.

Other Matter

14. I have had regard of the third-party representations. However, even if what has already been constructed on site deviates from the plans for any previous planning applications, my recommendation is based on the plans for the current appeal proposal. The representations also highlight that the sunroom which was referred to in the original development description has not been constructed on site. Even so, my recommendation is not predicated on the presence of the sunroom, and that it has not been constructed is not decisive to my conclusions on the appeal overall, which I have found to be acceptable.

Conditions

15. The standard conditions in relation to the time limit and the approved plans are necessary in the interests of certainty and clarity. A condition requiring that the external materials match the external materials used elsewhere in the dwelling is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
16. The Council have requested a condition to restrict the installation of additional windows at first floor level of the side and rear elevation unless obscurely glazed. However, there are no dwellings to the rear of the property or to the side towards Glenfield House. Whilst there is a dwelling to the other side, the first-floor side elevation facing this property is existing and mostly faces its side elevation. Furthermore, the bedroom nearest the neighbouring property would have two rear facing windows. It is therefore unlikely that any side facing windows would be required. In these circumstances, this condition is unnecessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. The proposal would comply with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which would alter this conclusion. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR