

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/25/3360578**

**12 Hythe End Road, Wraysbury, Staines-Upon-Thames TW19 5AR**

- 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 Simon Williamson against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
  - The application Ref is 24/02322.
  - The development proposed is replacement house and garage, following demolition of existing house, garages and sheds.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement house and garage, following demolition of existing house, garages and sheds at 12 Hythe End Road, Wraysbury,
2. Staines-Upon-Thames TW19 5AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02322, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

### Preliminary Matter

3. A Unilateral Undertaking (UU) under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was submitted as part of the appeal process. Both parties have provided supporting evidence regarding the UU, and I have taken their comments into consideration.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues relevant to this appeal are:
  - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and relevant development plan policies
  - the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt
  - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area
  - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 and 14 Hythe End Road with regard to outlook, light and privacy
  - whether suitable measures would be included to adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change
  - whether the proposal would make appropriate provision for biodiversity net gain; and

- 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**

### *Whether Inappropriate Development*

5. The appeal property is a detached single storey dwelling set behind a driveway and a garage alongside outbuildings and the rear garden fronts the River Thames. The proposal seeks permission to demolish the dwelling, garage and associated outbuildings and replace them with a two-storey dwelling and a single storey garage.

6. Policy QP5 of the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (LP) states that the Council will apply national Green Belt policy to applications falling within the Green Belt, like the appeal site.

7. Paragraph 154d) of the Framework identifies that the replacement of a building, provided that the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces would be not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

8. The proposed two storey dwelling, though in the same use, would be roughly twice the height of the existing single-storey bungalow and therefore materially larger. The replacement garage would also be wider than the building it would replace. Therefore, the proposal would be materially larger and thus would not comply with the exception set out in paragraph 154d) of the Framework and would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

### *Openness*

9. The appeal property is a single storey structure with a pitched roof. The building and associated outbuildings are modest in height and are located between dwellings within a row of ribbon development. On the opposite side of the River Thames to the rear of the dwelling is the Runnymede Pleasure Ground which is a public park, and the dwelling is visible from there, as well as along the footpath that continues along the river.

10. The proposal involves replacing the existing single-storey dwelling with a taller two-storey building featuring a flat roof. While the footprint would be similar, the introduction of first-floor built form would increase the visual impact of development in the Green Belt, particularly from Hythe End Road and the Runnymede Pleasure Ground. The total footprint of outbuildings would be reduced, and the proposed garage would be single-storey. The consolidation of the outbuilding footprint to a single garage and its position on the driveway enclosed by fencing means it would have a minimal effect on the openness of the Green Belt, both spatially and visually.

11. Consequently, whilst the proposal would not necessarily harm the spatial aspect of the openness of the Green Belt, the visual impact of this increase in bulk and massing and resultant loss of openness would be moderate.

### *Character and Appearance*

12. The appeal dwelling is a detached bungalow that has a pitched roof. The house is located on Hythe End Road and the dwellings along here are typically detached buildings that are single storey or two storeys tall. These are usually set back behind

gardens and driveways, with garages, and have rear gardens facing towards the River Thames and there are generally modestly sized gaps between them. The design, scale and appearance of these dwellings vary considerably. The Horton and Wraysbury Neighbourhood Plan (NP) sets out that the appeal site is within the Wraysbury Hythe End Character Area which is described as comprising riverside plots of individual design on unadopted roads. The residential area is characterised by these uniquely designed houses that are generally set back from the River Thames but have a water frontage character which is consistent with the areas character outlined in the NP.

13. The proposed dwelling would be a two-storey building with a flat roof and would be covered by white render. Although raised above ground level, the dwelling would not appear unusually tall given the varied scale of nearby buildings. Additionally, the width and depth of the property would be similar to the existing dwelling and to those either side of it maintaining the modest gaps between buildings. Consequently, the scale of the proposed dwelling would not appear out of character with those around it and would retain the undeveloped buffer zone with the River Thames, as required by Policy QP4 of the LP and as such the scheme would protect views to and from the river.

14. Although bulkier and more cuboid than the existing dwelling, the design reflects nearby properties such as 14 Hythe End Road. Features like large Crittall-style windows with timber shutters, two storey gables, and a rear balcony bound by railings would add visual interest and maintain the River Thames water frontage character. Variation in flank windows is typical in the area, and modest gaps between properties help screen them from view. Overall, the scale, design and siting of the dwelling would integrate well with the spacing, heights, bulk, massing and footprints of existing buildings as advised in the Borough Wide Design Guide. The proposal complements the area's distinctive architectural character while enhancing the special character and setting of the River Thames.

15. The proposed garage would be modest in scale and would use materials similar to those proposed in the dwelling. Given that garages are not uncommon within the street scene and because it would be viewed alongside the dwelling, the garage would be appropriate within this context.

16. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would comply with Policies QP1, QP3 and QP4 of the LP and Policies HOU1 and HOU2 of the NP. These expect development, amongst other matters, to respect the footprint, separation, scale, bulk and height of buildings in the surrounding area and neighbouring properties as well as achieve a high quality of design that improves the character and quality of the area. They also expect proposals to conserve and enhance the special character and setting of the River Thames.

### *Living Conditions*

17. The appeal site sits between no 10, a dormer bungalow, and no 14, a two-storey house, both with flank windows. The proposed dwelling would generally maintain the existing separation distance between no 12 and the dwellings either side of it. The outlook from these windows is of either the flank wall of no 12 or overlooks the roof of the dwelling. Given the modest height of no 12 and the separation distance between these windows and the appeal property the outlook is generally not substantially enclosed. Given that the windows are on the flank elevations of those dwellings the light that could reach them is already partially limited by the existing dwelling. There are

also windows within the flank walls of the appeal property which face towards both dwellings either side. This means that overlooking does already occur between the buildings. Additionally, given the limited height of the boundary treatment between the gardens as well as the drop in ground level between the houses and the gardens it is not unusual for some overlooking to occur of the rear gardens. Additionally, as the houses are located on the River Thames the gardens are overlooked and have limited privacy, especially in views from the pleasure ground.

18. The proposed dwelling would replace the existing single storey structure with a two-storey building and as such, the dwelling would appear more prominent than the current building. However, the dwelling would not be substantially taller than those nearby and whilst the new taller structure would face rooms in the neighbouring dwellings, the modest separation distance and proposed flat roof would ensure it would not be unduly overbearing.

19. Additionally, the appellant identifies that the development would generally accord with the 45-degree angle taken from neighbouring windows within no 10 as advised in the Borough Wide Design Guide. Given the separation distance between the proposed house and the two neighbouring dwellings the affected rooms would not be substantially overshadowed with the windows generally located towards either the front or rear of the dwellings. The window and glazed door within the kitchen at no 10 are centrally located but given that this room is served by a relatively large area of glazing the outlook from this room would not be substantially enclosed and light likely would still reach it, and the room would not become significantly overshadowed. Overall, the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect in this regard.

20. The scheme would increase the number of windows on the flank walls facing the dwellings either side of no 12. However, overlooking already occurs between the properties, especially between windows on the flank walls of the dwellings. Whilst there would be windows on the first floor, given the limited size and siting of those windows, as well as those that would be obscure glazed, the overlooking as well as perceived overlooking from the flank windows would not be significantly different to the existing situation. As such, the design and siting of the windows would not have an unacceptable effect on the privacy of nearby occupiers.

21. The Introduction of the balcony on the first floor of the rear elevation would allow for overlooking to occur from a higher perspective, given the siting of the proposed dwelling, generally in line with those either side. However, the areas closest to the neighbouring houses, where privacy would be expected between neighbouring properties, would generally remain screened from this balcony given the scale, siting and design of the three dwellings. As a result, the development would not have an unacceptable effect on the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers.

22. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. Consequently, the development would comply with Policy QP3 of the LP. This expects development, amongst other matters, to have no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining properties.

### *Climate Change*

23. Policy SP2 of the LP requires all developments to demonstrate how they have been designed to incorporate measures to adapt to and mitigate climate change. It refers to, amongst other matters, the Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Document, or successor documents, for further guidance. This has now been superseded by the Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SSPD) which is a material consideration.

24. Policy SP2 does not specify targets or standards, however, the SSPD seeks to secure a contribution to the Council's carbon offset fund where developments have demonstrated that net zero cannot be achieved. The SSPD identifies an initial price of carbon offsets per tonne over a 30-year lifetime of the development.

25. Policy SP2 does not specify that net zero must be achieved. Furthermore, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that policies for planning obligations should be set out in plans and examined in public and that it is inappropriate to set out formulaic approaches to obligations in Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD), as these would not be subject to examination and SPDs should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development. The requirement for the planning obligation is set out in the SSPD and not within an LP policy and it has not been subject to independent examination or viability checks. Whilst the SSPD can encourage developers to exceed current policy and seek to provide net zero carbon emissions, it should introduce new compulsory targets.

26. For the reasons given above, the contribution towards the carbon offset fund would not meet the tests set out in the Framework and Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended).

27. Furthermore, the appeal is supported by a Designed Sap Calculation which sets out the range of energy efficiency options that are proposed to be incorporated into the development. These demonstrate that the development would achieve Standard Assessment Procedure rating of 98A, an Environmental Impact rating of 100A and net zero carbon emissions. A condition could be used to secure the delivery of the measures specified. As a result, it is evident that climate change adaptation and mitigation have been duly considered as per Policies SP2 and EP1 of the LP.

#### *Biodiversity Net Gain*

28. Under the statutory framework for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted, unless exempted, subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met.

29. The application form states that the proposal would be self-build, and this is confirmed by the appellant in their submissions. Self-build is one of the exemptions set out in the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024 SI 2024/No.47 (the regulations). However, the regulations also provide that "self-build or custom housebuilding" has the same meaning as in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015. In order for the proposed dwelling to benefit from the exemption, it would be necessary to ensure compliance with that definition.

30. The submitted UU seeks to secure this matter. The Council state that the UU does not covenant written notice of a disqualifying event, if a custom or self-build house was not provided which would in turn trigger the requirement to provide a BNG. It also states that the UU does not include a schedule relating to BNG in the event of a disqualifying event triggering its requirement. However, it is not necessary for this to be specifically referred to within the UU and if the appellant does not adhere to the UU, the Council can enforce against it.

31. I am satisfied that the UU, submitted to secure the plot as self-build, meets the tests under Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and paragraph 58 of the Framework in that it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; is directly related to the development; and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

32. As a result of this, there is a valid exemption for the development to not identify that a BNG could be achieved. In this instance the scheme does not need to be accompanied by the minimum information set out in Article 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

33. Therefore, it has been demonstrated that the development would be exempt. Consequently, the development would accord with Policy NR2 of the LP insofar as it expects developments to, amongst other matters, demonstrate how they maintain, protect and enhance the biodiversity of the application site.

#### *Other Material Considerations*

34. The Planning Practice Guidance recognises the benefits of custom and self-build housing in diversifying the housing market and increasing consumer choice. The Framework also encourages local planning authorities to support community-led and self-build housing on small sites. The submitted UU provides a legal mechanism to secure the development as a custom/self-build dwelling, contributing to the Council's identified need for this type of housing.

35. The Framework supports development on previously developed land and housing that meets the needs of different groups, including self-builders. These factors attract moderate weight in favour of the proposal.

36. The appellant has indicated that the existing dwelling could be extended under Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification). The proposed plans illustrate the differences between the fallback and appeal schemes. As permitted development rights do not appear to have been removed, there is a more than realistic prospect that the fallback development could take place. However, the fallback development would result in a smaller, less bulky dwelling than the appeal proposal and therefore would be less harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The difference in scale between the two schemes would be modest and as both schemes would result in a two-storey dwelling being erected, moderate weight is attached to the possibility that the fallback development could take place.

37. It is not disputed between the parties that the development would provide a net zero dwelling and that substantial weight should be attributed in favour of the development to this benefit. Based on the information before me I find no reason to conclude otherwise.

38. The site lies within Flood Zone 3b, a functional floodplain. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted, identifying mitigation measures to ensure the development would not increase flood risk elsewhere. These measures, including raising the dwelling and incorporating flood voids, could be secured by condition. The Environment Agency (EA) and the Lead Local Flood Authority have raised no objections, subject to conditions.

39. The proposed flood voids are intended to increase floodplain storage capacity and the FRA states that they would likely reduce offsite flood risk.

40. The appellant has identified that the Council previously attached significant weight to the additional flood compensation measures provided by flood voids proposed as part of a different scheme at 10 The Island. However, the Council notes that the EA state that flood voids should not be used to provide additional flood compensation. This does not however, appear to indicate that flood voids cannot be used to provide mitigation on site and the EA's suggested condition seeks to secure the mitigation measures, including the flood voids. The concern would appear to relate to when flood voids are used to provide additional flood compensation. This may relate to issues with the free drainage of the site, their isolation from the flood plain and that they may not provide storage at the correct flood levels. As such, whilst the flood voids may reduce the risk posed to offsite locations, for these reasons, I have come to a different conclusion on this matter than the Council did at 10 The Island and I do not attribute weight to this in favour of the development.

41. Whilst the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area, this would be expected for developments and weighs neither for nor against the proposal. Given the variety in the design of dwellings in the area, the existing dwelling is not necessarily harmful nor in such a dilapidated condition that it harms the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the benefits of demolishing this dwelling weigh neither for nor against the scheme. Similarly, the benefits of replacing the existing dwelling which may not be as energy efficient as the proposed dwelling does not weigh in favour of the development, other than the weight already attributed to the benefit of providing a net zero dwelling.

42. There would be economic benefits during and after construction and the scheme includes biodiversity enhancements, although given the limited information submitted, it is not evident what the extent of those enhancements could be. Given the limited scale of the development, limited weight is attributed to these matters in favour of the development.

### **Green Belt and Planning Balance**

43. The proposal would be inappropriate development which the Framework identifies is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and which should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It would also cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt, albeit this would be moderate and localised. The Framework sets out that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt and thus substantial weight is attributed to the identified harm in this instance.

44. When considered cumulatively, the other considerations I have identified are of very significant weight in favour of the proposal. As such, the benefits of the development are weighty and the harm to the Green Belt would be clearly outweighed by the other considerations identified and therefore the very special circumstances required to justify the development do exist as required by paragraph 153 of the Framework.

45. Consequently, the proposed development would accord with the development plan insofar as Policy QP5 of the LP states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development (as defined in the Framework), unless very special circumstances are demonstrated which they have been in this instance. It would also accord with paragraph 153 of the Framework for similar reasons.

## Conditions

46. Further to the statutory commencement condition, a condition requiring the development is carried out in accordance with the permitted plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.

47. The Council's ecologist identified that based on the information submitted that the appeal site is in close proximity to potentially significant habitat for commuting and foraging bats which are a protected species. Consequently, it was suggested that a condition ensuring no external lighting is installed unless first approved [11] would be necessary. Further conditions to secure a construction environment management plan [3] and another to secure the biodiversity enhancements [7] as set out on the submitted plans are necessary in the interests of protecting protected species and to provide biodiversity enhancements as required by Policy NR2 of the LP and I concur. Furthermore, the Environment Agency has identified it is necessary to secure a landscape and ecological management plan [4] in the interests of protecting wildlife and supporting habitat and based on the evidence before me I concur and have included the suggested condition for these reasons. It is necessary for conditions 3 and 4 to be pre-commencement as the plans to be approved shall affect how work takes place at an early stage.

48. Condition 5 is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

49. A condition to ensure habitable rooms in the development are served by appropriate acoustic insulation and ventilation is necessary to protect the living conditions of future occupiers, given the development's location in relation to air traffic [6].

50. Whilst not suggested by the Council the EA and the Lead Local Flood Authority have identified conditions that should be attached in the interests of ensuring the development does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Based on the information before me, I find no reason to conclude differently and thus I have included the recommended conditions for that reason [8 & 9]. I have revised these in the interests of clarity and certainty.

51. Conditions 10 and 11 are necessary in the interests of highway safety and the living conditions of the occupiers of the dwelling. The suggested condition 10 referred to cycle parking as shown on the submitted plans, but cycle parking facilities are not shown. As such, I have revised this condition to require the details of these to be submitted and approved. However, details of the refuse facilities are shown on the plans.

52. Condition 12 is necessary in the interests of securing sustainability measures in the interests of adapting to and minimising the impact on climate change.

53. Condition 13 is necessary in the interests of protecting protected species.

54. Conditions 14 and 15 are necessary in the interests of the living conditions of nearby occupiers during construction.

55. Electric vehicle charging points are matters covered by Building Regulations and as such a condition requiring their installation would not pass the test of necessity. As such, I have not included the suggested condition.

## Conclusion

56. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*G Sibley*

INSPECTOR

### Schedule of 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: 12HR/9/04; 12HR/9/05; 12HR/9/06A; 12HR/9/07; 12HR/9/08; 12HR/9/10; 12HR/9/11; and 12HR/9/12.
- 3) No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP: Biodiversity shall include the following:

- Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”.
- Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction, including measures for the protection of nearby priority habitats (River Thames), designated sites, hedgehogs, and nesting birds.
- The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP: Biodiversity shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

- 4) No development shall take place until a landscape and ecological management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas (except privately owned domestic gardens), has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The landscape and ecological management plan shall be carried out as approved and any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

The approved scheme shall include the following elements:

- Details of maintenance regimes.
- Details of any new habitat created on-site.
- Details of treatment of site boundaries and/or buffers around water bodies.

- Details of management responsibilities.

5) No development shall take place above slab level until details of the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

6) No development shall take place above slab level until details of the measures to be taken to acoustically insulate all habitable rooms of the development hereby permitted against aircraft noise, together with details of the methods of providing ventilation of habitable rooms shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved measures.

7) No development shall take place above slab level until details of the biodiversity enhancements, to include but not limited to bird and bat boxes, a hedgehog house, gaps in the fences (13 centimetres x 13 centimetres) for hedgehog movement, deadwood piles, and wildlife-friendly planting (as illustrated on the landscape plan drawing no 12HR/9/04, prepared by Tegwynne Goldthorpe Architect Ltd, dated September 2024), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The biodiversity enhancements shall thereafter be installed and maintained as approved.

8) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by KRS enviro, dated September 2024 and the following mitigation measures it details:

- The proposed dwelling shall utilise flood voids with a finished floor level of 17.20 metres Above Ordinance Datum to include the decking.
- The flood voids shall be completely open on all sides.
- The proposed dwelling shall match the footprint area of the existing dwelling.
- Any new boundary fencing, walls or gates shall be of an open construction.
- The decking shall be open on all sides as shall the staircases. The balustrade to the decking shall also be open.
- All electrical wiring, switches, sockets, outlets, electrical and gas meters shall be located a minimum of 450 millimetres above the finished floor level of the dwelling.

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

9) The drainage system shall be installed in accordance with the drainage layout in the Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by KRS enviro, dated September 2024. The development shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted strictly in accordance with the details so approved and maintained as such thereafter.

10) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of covered and secured cycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These facilities shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved plans and kept available for the parking of cycles in association with the development at all times.

11) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the refuse bin storage area and recycling facilities shall be provided in accordance with drawing no 12HR/9/04. These facilities shall be kept available for use in association with the development at all times.

12) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted the sustainability measures related to dwelling emission rate, fabric energy efficiency and primary energy rate as set out in the Designed SAP Calculation Rev A, prepared by Melin, dated 17 October 2024, shall be installed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved measures.

13) No external lighting shall be installed until a report detailing the external lighting scheme, and how this will not adversely impact upon wildlife, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report (if external lighting is to be installed) shall include the following figures and appendices:

- A layout plan with beam orientation
- A schedule of equipment
- Measures to avoid glare
- An isolux contour map showing light spillage to 1 lux both vertically and horizontally, areas identified as being of importance for commuting and foraging bats, and locations of bird and bat boxes.

The approved lighting plan shall thereafter be implemented as agreed.

14) No groundwork, demolition or construction work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours:

- Monday to Friday: 08:00 – 18:00
- Saturday: 08:00 – 13:00

No works shall take place on Sundays or on Bank or other Public Holidays

15) There shall be no collections from or deliveries to the site during the demolition and construction stages outside the following hours:

- Monday to Friday 08:00 – 18:00
- Saturday 08:00 – 13:00

No working on Sundays or Bank or other Public Holidays.

End of Schedule