



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 26 July 2022

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by D Szymanski BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/22/3298401

Land between Green View and Glenside, Off Holyport Street, Holyport SL6 2JR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Neil Burgess against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 21/03718, dated 17 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses and associated parking and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description in the banner heading above is from the application form. However, I have considered the development based on that in the Council's decision notice, which refers to the new access. The proposal is for '2no. semi-detached dwellings with associated landscaping, parking and vehicular access'.
3. Following the submission of the appellant's appeal statement, the Council does not wish to pursue reason Nos 4, 5 and 6 for refusal in its decision notice, in respect of protected species, wider biodiversity, and trees and a hedgerow. I have had regard to this in determining this appeal.
4. The decision notice refers to the effect of the proposed development upon the setting of designated heritage assets. I sought clarification and discussed this matter further at the Hearing. The Council clarified the reference was to the Holyport Conservation Area (HCA). The appeal site lies well within the HCA boundary. Therefore, I am of the view the reference to the setting of the HCA is a mistake, so I have not considered the effect upon the setting of the HCA.
5. Both parties are of the view the proposal would not adversely affect the settings of any statutory listed buildings. However, on a precautionary basis I gave the parties the opportunity provide evidence in respect of this issue, and given my statutory duties under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCAA) have considered this as a main issue.

6. During an adjournment a planning obligation was submitted by the appellant in respect of carbon off-setting, upon which the Council was given the opportunity to comment. I will return to this later.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

- whether or not the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;
- the effect of the proposed development upon the openness of the Green Belt;
- the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area including the Holyport Conservation Area;
- the effect of the proposed development upon the setting of heritage assets;
- the effect of the proposed development upon biodiversity; and,
- if the proposal is inappropriate development, whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

8. The appeal site is a largely undeveloped parcel of land comprising grassland, trees and scrub, within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Paragraph 147 states that inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Framework identifies the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt, subject to exceptions listed in paragraphs 149 and 150.
9. Policy QP5 of the Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (February 2022) (the BLP) states the Green Belt will be protected against inappropriate development, and permission will not be granted for inappropriate development (defined by the Framework), unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. It states that certain forms of development are not considered inappropriate, as defined in the Framework. In this regard it is consistent with the Framework.
10. The appellant considers the proposal meets the exception of limited infilling in villages in paragraph 149e) of the Framework. The Framework does not define the terms 'village' and 'limited infilling'. Policy QP5 states in assessing limited infilling outside identified boundaries, proposals will be required to demonstrate the site is considered as falling within the village envelope as assessed on the ground. Consideration will be given to the concentration, scale, massing, extent and density of built form on either side of it and the proximity of the proposal site to the boundary.
11. The Council and appellant agree that given the close proximity of the site to identified settlement boundaries, the size of gap, being between two dwellings,

and being on the street frontage, the site falls within the village envelope. It is also a limited gap in a continuous frontage and two dwellings is restrictive in quantity. While being part of a wider land, my consideration relates to the appeal site, which could be capable of being subdivided from the other land. Therefore, I see no reason to disagree with the main parties in this regard.

12. In *R (Tate) v Northumberland County Council* [2018] EWCA Civ 1519, it is consistent with *Julian Wood v SSCLG and Gravesham Borough Council* [2015] EWCA Civ 195, in finding that whether a development meets the exception of limited infilling, will be a question of fact and planning judgment. The former held the decision maker can have regard to the nature and size of the development, the site location and its relationship to other, development adjoining it. This is similar to paragraph 6.18.9 of the supporting text of QP5, which advises that limited infilling should be appropriate to the scale of the locality and not have an adverse impact on the character of the locality.
13. Supporting text should not be elevated to the status of or followed in the same way as the development plan policy, and some of the aforementioned matters might be considerations that also relate to other non-Green Belt policies. However, the matters set out in the supporting text are generally consistent with caselaw to which I am referred by both main parties. I am satisfied I should have regard to both the caselaw and QP5 supporting text in assessing whether the proposal meets the exception in paragraph 149e).
14. At approximately 6.4m high to the eaves and 10.4m to the ridge, the new building would be significantly higher than the adjoining Glenside/Warden House and Green View. It would also be of a significantly greater width than both buildings. In the context of the existing gaps between the neighbouring buildings and the gaps to dwellings neighbouring them, the appeal proposal would result in considerably smaller comparatively narrow gaps, and the perception of this compounded by the scale and massing of the new building. Therefore, given its height, width, scale, massing, and the narrow spacing, the appeal development would not be 'limited', so not constitute limited infilling.
15. That the proposal is residential, two storeys and follows a similar front building line to neighbouring properties, does not mitigate the incongruity. Holyport Lodge further to the north is a significantly larger building. However, given its distance from the appeal site, the gap between it to Glenside/Warden House, being set much further rear of the street frontage, and the position of buildings and mature trees, it has a very limited visibility if any around much the appeal site and immediate vicinity. Therefore, while it is a part of the locality, it has a limited influence upon how the appeal site is viewed. Moreover, when viewed from the north west in relation to the appeal site, it highlights the current wide spacing between buildings, and the narrowness of the proposed spacing for the appeal proposal. Therefore, its presence does not alter my view.
16. I note the appeal decision letters and plans provided by the appellant¹. In 3238418 the dwelling was of a lesser width than immediately neighbouring buildings, not significantly larger, no higher than one, and the Inspector found the spacing to be consistent with those around adjacent dwellings. That is not the case for this appeal proposal. For 3196341 the building appeared narrower than the nearest dwellings, of a similar footprint to that to the south, and with greater spacing than those to the north, south and east.

¹ APP/T0355/W/19/3238418; APP/P0240/W/18/3196341; APP/K2230/W/20/3255704; APP/P1940/W/17/3183388.

17. In 3255704 the full scale and nature of the new dwellings and their context in respect of surrounding buildings is not clear. However, the new buildings appear of a similar or lesser footprint and with similar or greater spacing between them than development immediately adjacent to and opposite the site. In 3183388 the context of the appeal site is not clear. However, the proposed buildings appear no higher or wider than neighbouring properties. Therefore, none of the examples are directly comparable to the circumstances of this appeal proposal, which I have considered on its own merits in relation to its specific context.
18. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the proposed development would not constitute limited infilling, and therefore not meet the exception set out in paragraph 149e) of the Framework, or Policy QP5 of the BLP.

Openness

19. Paragraph 137 of the Framework identifies the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The verdant largely undeveloped appeal site is bound in part by fences separating it from properties to the east and north, and it has a close board fence on its frontage. Notwithstanding the fencing, it appears as a verdant largely open parcel of land contributing to the openness of the Green Belt.
20. By virtue of the proposed height, width, depth and scale of the new dwellings, and associated access, hardstanding and parking areas, residential use, paraphernalia, and increased comings and goings, the proposed development would result in significant adverse effects upon both the spatial and visual openness of the Green Belt. It would also result in the encroachment of development into the countryside, contrary to the Green Belt purpose at paragraph 138c). Given the proximity of the building to the frontage on a corner plot, the harm to openness would be clearly visible from Holyport Street, Holyport Road and part of The Green.
21. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the proposed development would have a significant adverse effect upon the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt. In this regard it would conflict with the aims of Policy QP5 of the Local Plan and paragraph 137 of the Framework, insofar as these state that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt, and seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.

Character and appearance including the HCA

22. Within the HCA there is a statutory duty under section 72 of the LBCAA to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. Paragraph 199 of the Framework requires that when considering the impact upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and harm to its significance requires clear and convincing justification (paragraph 200).
23. The HCA encompasses the historic settlement and some land and buildings outside it. It is primarily characterised and derives its significance from the mix of mostly historic buildings, exhibiting the use of traditional building materials, with some newer buildings, with distinctive layouts and streetscapes, with important views along streets, between buildings and across open spaces.

Spaces between buildings and mature trees create a rural ambiance as well as a connection with the surrounding landscape, and wider setting of the HCA.

24. The part of the HCA within which the appeal site is located is characterised and primarily derives its significance from the largely open verdant space of The Green and thoroughfares, lined by high quality historic and period mostly domestic buildings from between the 16th – 20th century, which are often subordinate to the space. Many are in local red brick, with clay roof tiles and chimney pots, although there are some more limited examples of rendering, painted brick and slate roofs. There is often generous spacing between buildings with mature landscape features or views of them, which forms an important part of the character and appearance of the HCA and area.
25. Despite its surrounding fencing, the appeal site contributes to the character, appearance and significance by virtue of being a generous wide verdant and prominent frontage gap between two sizeable high quality period buildings, through which there are views above the fence levels to the appeal site and trees to its rear. Its contribution to defining The Green and the greening by the degree of Ivy covering, means the frontage fence makes an overall neutral contribution to the HCA. Open gaps are noted as being of importance (paragraph 2.2) in the Holyport Conservation Area Appraisal (2016) (the CAA) and form a notable positive characteristic of this part of the HCA. That the appeal site is not specifically identified in the CAA does not mean it does not contribute positively. Overall, the appeal site makes a moderate positive contribution to the character, appearance and significance of the HCA.
26. The Aboricultural report including tree protection measures demonstrates the proposal would retain the trees of most value, with three to be removed (T5, T6 and T8) assessed as being small trees of limited value. Combined with new planting and landscaping secured by a suitably worded planning condition, the proposals would ensure there is no overall harm in respect of the loss of trees in the medium term. Therefore, the proposal does not conflict with the aims of BLP Policy NR3 in this regard.
27. The development would not detrimentally impact views over The Green. However, the height, width, scale, massing, forward position on a corner plot and limited side spacing means the proposed development would considerably erode the largely open verdant character of the appeal site, and the visibility of landscape features across and over it. Moreover, the building would appear somewhat large, dominant, cramped and out of keeping with the spacing and size of buildings and plots to which the proposed new building would closely relate, within the immediate context of the appeal site. This would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area including the character, appearance and significance of the HCA.
28. Some considerable thought has clearly gone into the design. It is a bold strong prominent academically correct Regency building with classical detailing and features. The clay chimney pots, corbelled detailing, slate roof and Flemish bond brickwork reflecting some of the surrounds. However, notwithstanding some limited examples of buildings to which my attention is drawn to the north, the prevailing character and appearance of this part of Holyport Street is one exhibiting a good degree of unity in materials, appearance and spacing. While traditionally styled, the proposed architectural style and composition creates a grand imposing unapologetic building. In my view this would

accentuate the harm caused by the massing, scale and prominence of the building. The bell-cast and turret style roof forms, and the light-coloured brickwork, are strong design features that would appear strident and harmful in the street scene.

29. The boundary treatment would be more sympathetic to the prevailing character. However, it would not mitigate the harm. The building would be unlikely in the future to become a positive contributor to the HCA. While it might be considered to comply with some criteria of paragraph 51 of the National Design Guide (2019), I do not consider the development has a scale and appearance that respects its specific context. Therefore, I also do not regard it as an outstanding or innovative design, referenced in the Framework.
30. The harm from the development would be visible from the immediately neighbouring properties, and given its highly prominent position on a corner-type plot, significant lengths of Holyport Street, Holyport Road, and The Green increasing when nearby deciduous trees are not in leaf.
31. For the reasons set out above the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, including the character, appearance and significance of the HCA. This harm is less than substantial harm. However, it would conflict with the aims of Section 72(1) of the LBCAA and Policy HE1 of the BLP. This requires development preserves or enhances the character and appearance and respects the significance of heritage assets. It would conflict with Policies QP1 and QP3 of the BLP, which require that development is of a high quality design that contributes to a positive place identity, respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area paying particular regard to height, scale, massing and materials. It would also conflict with paragraph 130c) of the Framework which has similar objectives.

Setting of heritage assets

32. The George Inn, its Brewhouse and The Rails are Grade II listed buildings on the opposite side of The Green to the appeal site. The Brewhouse was constructed in the 18th century, and the others in the 16th century but with later 17th – 20th century additions. They derive their special interest from the architectural and historic values of their construction, forms, materials, and their evolution. They are constructed with traditional vernacular techniques and materials, and the ancient pattern of settlement development is preserved by them, appreciable from many locations around and across the Green.
33. The Green is likely to have a similar ancient history and is understood to have been present alongside the properties with the same defining edge, surrounded by buildings including these three listed buildings. The wider setting of the listed buildings includes The Green and is largely defined by the land, buildings and boundaries immediately beyond. The setting contributes to the significance of the buildings as it is part of the historic environment with which the buildings were and are viewed, associated, and traversed to access, as well as enabling an experience of them individually and as a group.
34. The appeal site is on the opposite side of The Green, rear of Holyport Street and Holyport Road some distance from the buildings, with filtered views as a result of trees. While there is some intervisibility, the appeal site falls within the broad views outwards so it is not intrinsic to their special interest, and is in common with various other buildings and structures around The Green.

Therefore, while the proposed development would be within the setting of these listed buildings, I am of the view the effect of it would be neutral.

35. Green View and Glenside/Warden House are both Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs), as are the War Memorial and the K6 phone box on the island close to the front of the appeal site. The significance of Glenside/Warden House derives from its distinctive late Victorian/Edwardian style with a good degree of survival. Notwithstanding its subdivision and replaced windows it is still a considerable private dwelling, reflecting a status in its location and scale.
36. The significance of Green View is as of an early 19th century brick building of a simple aesthetic reflecting a vernacular tradition and local materials, painted white with a symmetrical front façade of three bays with broad windows flanking a central door. It is more in keeping with the smaller scale of buildings on Holyport Street but also has a relationship with The Green. The War Memorial and the K6 telephone kiosk are small structures. The significance of the K6 kiosk is primarily in the design of its cast iron structure and its detailing. The significance of the war memorial is as of a modest but attractive landmark building on the Green containing a memorial plaque, sculpture of Christ, with a commemorative significance.
37. The setting of all four NDHAs is defined by The Green and surrounding buildings and plots, including the appeal site. I do not disagree with the view that it is The Green that contributes most significantly to their settings. However, the appeal site is also of significance to these structures by virtue of the spaciousness it creates allowing a prominence and strong visibility of each of the NDHAs, as well as being part of the historic rural surrounds in which they were constructed, are used and appreciated. Therefore, the appeal site makes a moderate contribution to the significance of the settings of the NDHAs.
38. Some of the buildings surrounding the Green are sizeable and of landmark quality. The proposal would not erode the legibility of the Green or the relationship to it of properties surrounding it or the broader pattern of development. However, by virtue of the proximity, scale, height and the visual interest from the deliberately strong design, it would inhibit views of some elevations and appear somewhat dominant, drawing attention away from Green View and Glenside/Warden House. It would also feel dominant and detract from the current spacious rural ambience at the phone kiosk and the war memorial. For this reason, I regard it as new contribution that is not sensitive and would negatively affect the setting and significance of the NDHAs.
39. Therefore, for the reasons set out above the proposed development would harmfully affect the setting and significance of four NDHAs. This harm would be limited. However, it would conflict with the aims of Policy HE1 of the BLP, which requires that development preserves or enhances the character and appearance and respects the significance of heritage assets.

Biodiversity

40. The appeal site contains some limited suitable habitat for Great Crested Newts (GCN). A large pond lies opposite side the appeal site and two others are identified in the wider area (approx. 280 – 315m away). This nearest pond has a 'poor' Habitat Suitability Index score. Roads are barriers to commuting, the surrounding fencing is also a barrier, and the site contains limited suitable habitat. Subject to the imposition of suitable planning conditions, such as in

respect of construction management, the proposal would not be likely to result in harm to protected species.

41. The appellant's Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) evidence applies the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 3.0 to calculate whether or not there would be an overall BNG and the magnitude of it. The appeal site primarily comprises modified semi-improved grassland, with some tall ruderals, scrub, ivy covered fencing and scattered trees. These are of a poor and moderate condition and of a low and medium strategic significance.
42. The proposals include the retention and creation/planting of grassland, trees, and approximately 117m of new hedgerows. Subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions including those to secure habitat provision, retention, and a long-term management plan, the proposed development would result in a 100% BNG. This calculation does not include the bat and nest boxes, other refuges and hibernacula, which would add further value which I am assured can be secured by conditions. Therefore, the proposal would result in a significant overall biodiversity gain at the appeal site.
43. Subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions referred to above and in respect of matters including site clearance, ecological supervision, lighting, ecological management, and long-term retention, the proposal would result in significant medium to longer term BNG. The development complies with Policy NR2 of the BLP, which, expects development to demonstrate that it will protect and enhance biodiversity, including protected and priority species and demonstrate a BNG by quantifiable methods. It would also be compliant with paragraphs 174d) and 180a) of the Framework, which require development avoids harm to and minimises impacts on biodiversity, and provides for BNG.

Other considerations

44. Paragraph 147 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 is clear that substantial weight should be given to any identified harm to the Green Belt.
45. The proposal would result in a modest economic benefit during design and construction, and once complete a small on-going spend in the local economy and support to local services and facilities. The BLP is understood to allocate sufficient land to meet projected housing needs, and there is no dispute the Council has a Housing Delivery Test (HDT) measurement result of 111% (May 2022) and can demonstrate a 5.92 year Housing Land Supply (HLS). However, meeting these requirements should not be considered a ceiling to housing delivery. I am informed Holyport has relatively few new dwellings building within it. Overall, the provision of two family size homes, would be a small contribution to supply and a modest overall benefit.
46. The absence of harm to protected species is a neutral matter. While the appeal site is of a modest size and of limited value at the present time, having regard to the quantity and value of additional habitat to be created and other proposed enhancement measures, on-balance, this should be attributed moderate weight in favour of the scheme.
47. The loss of some sizeable trees and some other vegetation would be mitigated in the medium term by landscape planting. Based upon the proposed site

layout and spaces, this is a neutral matter in the balance. I cannot conclude the proposed development would result in a net benefit in respect of renewable energy production. Compliance with development plan and other policies to secure dwellings with overall net zero carbon emissions, and with energy efficiency measures, would mitigate the environmental impacts of the development, but based upon the evidence before me would not be an overall benefit. This is also a neutral matter.

48. Subject to the imposition of a suitably worded planning conditions, the compliance with policies in respect of archaeology is a neutral matter. Were I to agree the development would be compliant with policies for the living conditions of neighbouring and future occupiers and flood risk these would be a neutral matter. If I were to find the proposed development would not result in harmful effects in respect of highway safety or the wider highway network, and be compliant with highway authority requirements and standards in respect of access specifications and parking provision, these would be neutral matters.
49. It is put to me that the development would result in improvements to visibility for those traversing between Holyport Street and Holyport Road using the section of highway in front of the site. The technical evidence in the Transport Statement does not highlight this section as presenting a safety issue, or that the development will result in a wider public highway safety benefit. Pedestrians mindful of safety might well use the far side of the carriageway or the grass island. However, even if I were to accept it is a benefit as put to me, based upon what I saw and the evidence before me, at best this would be a moderate benefit attracting moderate weight.

Other Matters

50. I have concluded the proposed development would have a neutral effect upon the setting and significance of nearby statutory listed buildings. However, given it is within the setting of such buildings, application publicity should be compliant with Regulation 5A of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Regulations 1990. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons I have not sought further publicity by the Council.
51. The dwellings would reduce carbon emissions by 68.95% compared to a standard dwelling by using energy efficiency measures and renewable energy sources. The Planning Obligation seeks to secure a contribution in accordance with the Council's Position Statement on Sustainability and Energy Efficient Design (March 2021) (the PS) for £4,407 to off-set emissions from the development and its occupiers to secure net zero carbon emissions. I was advised the PS is not formally adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document presently. The appellant suggested the PS may make requirements beyond those in Policy SP2 of the BLP, so may not meet the requirement in paragraph 57 of the Framework of being necessary to make the development acceptable.
52. Policy SP2 requires development is designed to adapt to and mitigate climate change and refers applicants to various pre-existing and future SPDs for further guidance. The text does not specify all dwellings must be carbon neutral. The sustainability measures and contribution, seek to mitigate and off-set the impacts of the development and there is no evidence before me demonstrating there would be a net carbon benefit. As I am dismissing this appeal for other substantive reasons I have not considered the paragraph 57 tests in detail. However, meeting the requirements of the PS would be a neutral matter.

53. At the hearing I sought views from the Council and appellant in respect of the effects upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at Glenside and Green View. They agreed the development would not result in harmful living conditions to the occupiers of those properties with reference to daylight, outlook and privacy. I would have needed to see further evidence to assure me the development was acceptable with reference to outlook. However, as I am dismissing this appeal for other substantive reasons, I have not considered it further. Were I to find the development acceptable in these regards, it would be a neutral matter.

Heritage Balance

54. The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the character, appearance and significance of the HCA. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development. However, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation, and less than substantial harm should not be equated with a less than substantial planning objection.
55. The proposal would result in a modest economic benefit during design and construction, and once complete a small on-going spend in the local economy and support to local services and facilities. The provision of two family size homes, would be a small contribution to supply and modest overall benefit. The resulting biodiversity increase and Biodiversity Net Gain attracts moderate weight in favour of the scheme. Any benefits that might result in respect of highway safety are attributed moderate weight.
56. Overall, the public benefits constitute a moderate public benefit. Consequently, when giving great importance and weight to the special regard I must have to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the HCA, I find that the harm that would arise from the appeal scheme would not be outweighed by its cumulative public benefits. Accordingly, there would be a conflict with paragraph 202 of the Framework as the harm to designated heritage assets would not have a clear and convincing justification. This attracts great weight.

Planning Balance & Conclusion

57. The appeal scheme would be inappropriate development that would, by definition, harm the Green Belt, and would result in harm to the visual and spatial openness of Green Belt. In accordance with the development plan and the principles of the Framework, substantial weight should be given to harm to the Green Belt. The development would also result in harm to the character, appearance and significance of the HCA, the character and appearance of the area, and harm to the setting of four NDHAs.
58. The factors and benefits set out by the appellant, overall, attract moderate weight in favour of the scheme. However, they would not clearly outweigh the harm identified to the Green Belt and the other harm to the character, appearance and significance of the HCA, the character and appearance of the area, and the harm to the significance of NDHAs. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. Therefore, the proposed development conflicts with Policy QP5 of the BLP and paragraphs 137, 138, 147 and 148 of the Framework. These seek to preserve

the openness of Green Belt and protect it from inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances exist.

59. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole, and there are no considerations advanced, including the policies of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mrs Fiona Jones, BTP MRTPI (Planning Consultant, Cameron Jones Planning)

Mrs Jody O'Reilly (Heritage Consultant, HCUK Group)

Mr Ben Wilcox, RIBA (WAM Architecture)

Mr Neil Burgess (Appellant)

FOR THE COUNCIL:

Mr Carlos Chickwamba (Senior Planning Officer, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead)

Ms Sarah Tucker (Central Team Leader, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead)

Miss Alisha Lad (Conservation Officer, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead)

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Councillor Derek Wilson (Bray Parish Council)

Councillor Leo Walters (Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead)

Mrs Christie Scott (Local Resident)

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

HS-1: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead – Position Regarding Housing Delivery Test (HDT) and 5 year Housing Land Supply (July 2022).