



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/W/25/3375030

The Bell & Bottle, Bath Road, Littlewick Green, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 3RX

- 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 S.K Rajput against the decision of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref is 25/01950.
 - The development proposed is replacement detached outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement detached outbuilding at The Bell & Bottle, Bath Road, Littlewick Green, Windsor and Maidenhead SL6 3RX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01950, 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 the proposed outbuilding site layout and the proposed outbuilding plan & elevations.
 - 3) Prior to the building hereby permitted being rendered, details of the external finish and colour shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The building hereby permitted shall not be used other than for storage associated with the use of the wider site as shown on the plans hereby approved.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Policy QP5 of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Local Plan 2022 (LP) refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to ascertain what would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is harmful thereto by definition. New buildings in the Green Belt are inappropriate, subject to some exceptions. Such as Paragraph 154 (d) of the Framework, which allows the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.
5. The appeal site is a large restaurant building with a large car park surrounding. There is an existing small outbuilding used for storage in the rear corner of the site. The building is situated alongside gas storage containers surrounded by fencing and a large storage container which gives a perception of the corner of the site being built up as ancillary storage close to the staff entrance.
6. The new building would be used for storage. It would be larger and I am acutely aware of the figures in the Council's evidence amounting to a 60% increase in volume over the existing situation. However, materiality is different to just an increase and more than a product of a paper exercise.
7. The building would be only approximately 60cm taller, but in retaining a flat roof such an increase would be only marginally perceptible across the whole building. The increase in its floor area would amount to some 11 square metres which, in its own context, would not be significant. The building would remain in a very similar position between the existing storage containers and still be a contextually modest outbuilding within a small enclave of other structures and read alongside the host building and the existing car park. The proposal would neatly fit between the existing development and would be small scale and stature in the context of the wider site. The building would be very similar to the existing arrangement. It would therefore be larger, but not materially so. The proposal would therefore comply with the requirements of Policy QP5 of the LP and would not be inappropriate development in accordance with The Framework.

Other Matter

8. Given my findings above that the proposal would be not inappropriate development, there is no need for me to further consider whether or not the proposal would be acceptable under paragraph 155 of the Framework. Nor am I required to assess the effect of the scheme on the Green Belt's openness.

Conditions

9. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to the submission and agreement of the render's final finish is necessary because no specific details have been provided. It is also necessary to ensure that the building is used for storage to meet the above requirements.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. I have found that the development would not be inappropriate in Green Belt terms and it would thus comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR