



Ministry of Housing,  
Communities &  
Local Government

Ashley Collins  
Montagu-Evans  
70 St Mary Axe  
London  
EC3A 8BE

Our ref: APP/T0355/W/24/3346409  
Your ref: 22/03374/OUT

6 June 2025

Dear Ashley Collins

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78  
APPEAL MADE BY GREYSTOKE LAND LTD  
LAND TO THE NORTH AND SOUTH OF GAYS LANE, HOLYPORT  
APPLICATION REF: 22/03374/OUT**

*This decision was made by the Minister of State for Housing and Planning, Matthew Pennycook MP, on behalf of the Secretary of State*

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State to say that consideration has been given to the report of Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI, who held a public local inquiry on 12-16, 19-23 and 26-27 November 2024 into your client's appeal against the decision of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to refuse your client's application for planning permission for outline planning application with matters reserved apart from principal point of access for the demolition of the existing agricultural buildings to create a new state of the art Film and TV Studio including sound stages, ancillary offices, virtual reality studio, storage and warehouses, workshops, specialist studio facilities and outdoor backlot; the creation of a new Nature Park incorporating hard and soft landscaping, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems and new cycle and pedestrian facilities, the provision of a new cricket pitch and associated pavilion, with new cycle and pedestrian route, together with supporting infrastructure to include long stay car parking, cycle parking, boundary treatments, waste storage, sub-stations, and new access roundabout and vehicle route, in accordance with application Ref. 22/03374/OUT, dated 14 December 2022.
2. On 18 October 2024, this appeal was recovered for the Secretary of State's determination, in pursuance of section 79 of, and paragraph 3 of Schedule 6 to, the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) 1990.

**Inspector's recommendation and summary of the decision**

3. The Inspector recommended that the appeal should be dismissed.

4. For the reasons given below, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions, except where stated, and agrees with his recommendation. She has decided to dismiss the appeal and refuse planning permission. The Inspector's Report (IR) is attached. All references to paragraph numbers, unless otherwise stated, are to that report.

### **Matters arising since the close of the inquiry**

5. Revised Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) relating to the Green Belt was published on 27 February 2025. On 13 March 2025, the Secretary of State wrote to the main parties to afford them an opportunity to comment on the changes to the PPG. This letter also gave parties the opportunity to comment on a further update to the Framework on 7 February 2025<sup>1</sup>.
6. A list of representations received in response to this letter is at Annex A. These representations were circulated to the main parties on 2 April 2025. The issues raised have been taken into account by the Secretary of State when reaching conclusions on Green Belt matters. No other new issues were raised in this correspondence to warrant further investigation or necessitate additional referrals back to parties.
7. A list of other representations which have been received since the inquiry is at Annex A. The Secretary of State is satisfied that the issues raised do not affect her decision, and no other new issues were raised in this correspondence to warrant further investigation or necessitate additional referrals back to parties. Copies of the letters listed in Annex A may be obtained on request to the email address at the foot of the first page of this letter.

### **Policy and statutory considerations**

8. In reaching her decision, the Secretary of State has had regard to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004 which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
9. In accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Secretary of State has paid special regard to the desirability of preserving those listed buildings potentially affected by the proposals, or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they may possess.
10. In this case the development plan consists of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan 2013-2033 (adopted February 2022) and the Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (adopted January 2023). The Secretary of State considers that relevant development plan policies include those set out at IR4.3.
11. Other material considerations which the Secretary of State has taken into account include the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) published on 12 December 2024 and updated on 7 February 2025, and associated planning guidance (the Guidance) as updated on 27 February 2025, as well as the documents listed at IR4.4-4.5.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Updates - National Planning Policy Framework](#): 'This version of the National Planning Policy Framework was amended on 7 February 2025 to correct cross-references from footnotes 7 and 8, and amend the end of the first sentence of paragraph 155 to make its intent clear. For the avoidance of doubt the amendment to paragraph 155 is not intended to constitute a change to the policy set out in the Framework as published on 12 December 2024.'

## **Main issues**

### *Landscape Character*

12. For the reasons set out at IR12.6-12.13, the Secretary of State agrees at IR12.11 that the buildings would dramatically alter the landscape including as it is seen and experienced from the public rights of way (PROW) network and other locations around the edges of the site. She also agrees that although there would be a planting scheme in place that would aim to mitigate the impact of the proposed buildings, the effect would be limited and would not offset the significant adverse change on the landscape resulting from the development (IR12.12). For these reasons, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector at IR12.12 that the impact from the PROW network on other parts of the site or around it would be very significantly adverse on the character of the landscape. She agrees that in addition to the buildings there would be car parking, and access roads together with external lighting, all of which would add to the urbanising effect of the buildings on the landscape (IR12.13).
13. For the reasons set out at IR12.14-12.17, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions at IR12.14 that the backlot area would add to the adverse harm to the character of the landscape. She further agrees that Gays Lane is an attractive tree lined track with open views of the countryside on either side and that the harm to the character of Gays Lane that would result from the proposal is substantial (IR12.15). The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions at IR12.16 that at 21m in height, the buildings would be more than 1.5 times higher than the context height of mainly agricultural buildings in the local area, and whilst planting will help in mitigating some of the impact of these tall buildings they would nevertheless appear rather dominant and incongruous in the landscape. She agrees that the proposal would introduce a significant amount of activity to an area where there is currently a predominantly agricultural use, and that noise and activity generated by the large film studio complex would dramatically alter the character of the area adding to the harm caused by the introduction of the physical development (IR12.17).
14. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the proposal would be contrary to Policy QP3 of the Local Plan, in particular criteria (b) and (e) (IR12.18) and Policy QP3(a), in particular clauses 5 and 9a regarding the location and design of tall buildings, as well as being in conflict with the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Building Heights and Tall Buildings (IR12.19).
15. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector at IR12.17 and IR12.107-12.108 that there would be very substantial harm to landscape character and this carries substantial weight.

### *Heritage*

16. For the reasons set out at IR12.20-12.24, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area (IR12.23). The Secretary of State agrees that the impact of the proposed development, just outside the boundary of the Conservation Area would be harmful to the setting of the Conservation Area by a significant degree (IR12.24), and that the harm would be high (IR12.27). For the reasons set out at IR12.25-12.26, the Secretary of State agrees that the exact degree of visual connection between the proposed buildings and the Grade II listed John Gays House is unclear, and agrees at IR12.27 that the harm would be very low.

17. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with IR12.27 that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of both the Holyport Conservation Area and John Gays House through impact on setting, and that the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy HE1 of the Local Plan. In accordance with paragraph 212 of the Framework, the Secretary of State assigns great weight to the harm to designated heritage assets.
18. The Secretary of State takes account of the Inspector's conclusions at IR12.111 that the heritage balancing exercise under paragraph 215 of the Framework is not favourable to the proposal. She has also considered the Inspector's conclusion at IR12.68 that the identified heritage harms do not provide, on their own, a strong reason for refusing or restricting the development. She has carefully considered the harm to the designated heritage assets identified and the public benefits in this case. She agrees with the Inspector at IR12.68 that in terms of footnote 7 of the Framework, the heritage harms do not provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting the development. Overall, she does not consider that in the particular circumstances of this case, the harm to the designated heritage assets justifies a finding that the heritage balance is unfavourable. She therefore considers that the heritage balancing exercise under paragraph 215 of the Framework is favourable to the proposal.

#### *Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land*

19. The Secretary of State has noted the dispute between the appellant and the Council regarding the agricultural land value of the appeal site, as set out in IR12.33-12.35, and the Council's view that 12ha of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land would be irreversibly lost, out of a total area of 43ha. Given the indications from the DEFRA predictive BMV land plan (IR12.33), the Secretary of State considers that the Council's view is a plausible basis on which to proceed. For the reasons given at IR12.36, she agrees that the proposal would partly conflict with the requirements of Policy QP5 (criterion 2). This states that development should not result in the irreversible loss of BMV agricultural land, and the Secretary of State considers that it is not fully in accordance with the Framework as it goes beyond the expectations set out at paragraph 187. Overall, she considers that the loss of BMV land should carry moderate weight.

#### *Sustainable location*

20. For the reasons set out at IR12.41-12.48, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that taking into account the limited facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport, the appeal site is not in a sustainable location for the use proposed and there would be a general reliance on travel by car (IR12.43).
21. The Secretary of State notes the appellant's argument that the appeal site has benefits in terms of accessibility (IR12.44). She has dealt with this matter at paragraph 29 below. The appellant also argues that the site can be made sustainable (IR12.45). The Secretary of State has taken into account that the appellant proposes a number of measures including the provision of a shuttle bus and car sharing (IR12.45). She agrees with the Inspector's comments that there is little detail submitted as to how the shuttle bus services would operate (IR12.45), that there was no evidence or detail before the Inspector at the inquiry to consider whether a car share scheme would genuinely help to make the site sustainable (IR12.46), and further agrees at IR12.43 that the proposed 1000 parking spaces indicate that a high level of transport by car would be expected. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that a number of the transport solutions to make the site sustainable appear to be vaguer than expected at this stage, particularly since paragraph 109 of the Framework seeks early consideration of transport issues in

working up development proposals (IR12.47). Overall, she agrees that the site is not in a sustainable location and like the Inspector she is not satisfied that the proposals set out to date would make it, or would be likely to make it, sustainable in accordance with the Framework's expectations to promote sustainable transport. She agrees that the proposal would conflict with Policy IF2 of the Local Plan (IR12.48).

22. At IR12.107, the Inspector concludes that the proposal would not promote sustainable transport and attaches significant weight to the harm resulting from this. The Secretary of State finds that the unsustainable location and lack of sustainable transport provision should collectively attract significant weight and therefore assigns the lack of sustainability significant weight.

### *Need*

23. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis of need, demand and supply at IR12.49-12.62 and IR12.109, and agrees with the Inspector's analysis and conclusions. In reaching her conclusions she has taken into account that there is government support for the growth of the creative industries in the UK (IR12.50). She acknowledges that the parties disagree fundamentally on the need for the film studio, the need to be in this location, and the value of economic benefits it could bring (IR12.49), and agrees that establishing need and demand for new film studios is not akin to undertaking a statistical exercise (IR12.51). She has further taken into account that assessments of demand have been affected by the effects of the covid pandemic and the writers' and actors' strikes of 2023 in the USA, and agrees that these factors have made assessments of demand difficult (IR12.51). The Secretary of State has also taken into account the evidence on supply which was put before the inquiry (IR12.57-12.58), and recognises that the parties disagree on the status and suitability of a number of studio sites (IR12.58-12.59). She agrees with the Inspector at IR12.60 that it is not appropriate to take a balance sheet approach to looking at sites. She further agrees that some locations outside of the West London Cluster (WLC) and south east of the UK may not realistically be alternatives for the kind of film and HETV production studios which the Holyport site is attempting to attract, while some film and HETV production may be attracted to regional sites which may assist with residual capacity in the south east.
24. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the evidence on need, demand and supply is quite a confusing pattern, and that the covid pandemic and then the 2023 writers' strikes have had an impact such that caution needs to be applied when relying on some of the data including that within the industry-respected Deloitte, Knight Frank and BFI work, which were part of the evidence considered. Like the Inspector, she considers that the evidence indicates that there is likely to be sufficient capacity within existing studio space and commitments for the immediate future, even focussed within the WLC and a widened geography around London (IR12.62).
25. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector at IR12.61 that the Alternative Site Assessment (ASA), originally undertaken in 2022 and updated in October 2024, seems to have been a far too narrow area for a robust search of reasonably alternative sites, and as a result she, like the Inspector, cannot be certain that had an assessment of alternative sites been applied to the area to which the appellant's expert witnesses on need state is where the film and HETV industry wants to be, it would not have come up with viable alternative sites to Holyport and ones which may not have been in the Green Belt. She agrees that very little weight should be placed on the ASAs and she assigns very little weight to the lack of alternative sites.

26. Overall, like the Inspector, the Secretary of State is not persuaded that a clear and convincing need case has been demonstrated (IR12.62, IR12.109). She therefore does not assign weight to this matter.

### *Benefits of the proposal*

27. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that biodiversity net gain (BNG) should carry moderate weight; achieving BREEAM excellence rating should attract moderate weight; the proposed new cricket facility for the community should attract moderate weight; and the proposed nature park should attract limited weight (IR12.82).

28. For the reasons given at IR12.63-12.65 and IR12.109, the Secretary of State agrees that the direct and indirect jobs could contribute to meeting the jobs target for the Borough set out in the Local Plan to 2033 (IR12.63). Furthermore, the proposal would be a significant investment in the local area, would create a large number of jobs, boost the local and wider economy and provide local training opportunities (IR12.109). She considers that the economic benefits of the proposal should carry moderate weight.

29. For the reasons given at IR12.54-12.55, the Secretary of State agrees that the appeal site would benefit from its proximity to the M4, Heathrow and the train connections into London as well as the clustering advantages of the WLC, providing access to a pool of skilled and experienced labour. The Inspector does not assign weight to this benefit, but the Secretary of State gives this limited weight.

### *Green Belt*

30. National Green Belt policy has changed since the adoption of the development plan documents, including with the introduction of policy on grey belt. However, the Secretary of State considers that in relation to the Green Belt, Policy QP5 (except where stated in paragraph 19 above with regards to criterion 2) of the Local Plan remains broadly consistent with the Framework as it refers to the Framework provisions on types of development that are not inappropriate in the Green Belt.

31. The Secretary of State is aware that it was originally agreed by the parties that the proposal (except the nature park element) would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt (IR12.66). However following the publication of the December 2024 Framework, the appellant's position is now that the proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore very special circumstances do not need to exist (IR12.66). The Secretary of State, having taken into account the Inspector's analysis at IR12.66-12.81, has considered whether the site meets the definition of grey belt, as set out in the glossary to the revised Framework, and has considered whether it meets the relevant criteria set out in paragraph 155 of the Framework. Her conclusion on whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt is set out in paragraph 39 below.

32. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the site is not previously developed land (IR12.69).

33. The Secretary of State has taken into account the two Green Belt assessments set out at IR12.72 and agrees with the Inspector that the more recent Edge of Settlement Analysis (ESA) in 2016 is a more detailed analysis which identifies a number of parcels across the Borough and provides far more in-depth assessments than the Green Belt Purpose Analysis 2013 (GBPA). As such, like the Inspector at IR12.72, she prefers it in her considerations.

34. The Inspector notes that part of the appeal site, to the east of Gays Lane, lies within parcel M36 of the ESA (IR12.73). The Secretary of State notes that Site C of the appeal proposal (containing the backlot area and nature park) to the east of Gays Lane lies within parcel M36, but Site A and Site B of the appeal proposal to the west of Gays Lane lies outside parcel M36. The Inspector further notes that the ESA 2016 assesses M36 as making a very strong contribution to purpose (a), and that it states the parcel contributes to the separation of the built-up area of Maidenhead and the Green Belt settlement of Fifield. The Inspector concludes at IR12.73 that there is a continual band of built-up development out of Maidenhead town centre along Braywick Road to Bray and the more modern part of Holyport around the Springfield Park area, and that M36 acts as a block to sprawl between Bray and Fifield. He goes on to conclude that the area to the west of Gays Lane, including Site A and Site B, makes a very strong contribution to the purpose of preventing urban sprawl, given that development there would fill in a significant gap between Holyport and Fifield (IR12.74). He concludes that the appeal site contributes very strongly to the purpose of checking the urban sprawl of large built-up areas (IR12.74).
35. The Secretary of State has taken the Inspector's conclusions into account in assessing whether the site makes a strong contribution to purpose a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, and whether it is grey belt land. She has further taken into account that neither Holyport nor Fifield nor Bray are listed as 'large built-up areas' in the ESA; she also does not consider them to be 'large built-up areas'. Given the distance to Maidenhead and the configuration of the local area, she does not agree with the Council that the appeal scheme would read as part of the urban sprawl of Maidenhead (IR7.11). She has further taken into account that M36 does not cover Site A or Site B of the appeal site (IR7.11), and that the ESA was produced prior to the current Framework policies and prior to the publication of the Green Belt PPG, and was produced for a different purpose (IR7.11). She therefore does not consider that the conclusions of the ESA can be read directly across to the appeal site. She further does not consider that if developed, the proposal would result in an incongruous pattern of development. Overall, she does not consider that the appeal site makes a strong contribution to purpose a).
36. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that purposes b), preventing neighbouring towns from merging, and d), preserving the setting and special character of historic towns, are not relevant to this appeal, and notes that it is no part of any party's case that the proposal would conflict with these purposes (IR12.70).
37. Given her conclusions at paragraph 18 of this letter, the Secretary of State considers that the application of policies referred to at footnote 7 of the Framework (other the Green Belt) do not provide a strong reason for refusal. Overall, she concludes that the site constitutes grey belt land.
38. In the light of her conclusion at paragraph 35 above, the Secretary of State does not agree at IR12.76 that the proposal would fundamentally undermine purpose a). She agrees with the Inspector at IR12.76 that the proposal would undermine purpose c) of the remaining Green Belt land in this area in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Taking into account her conclusions on the impact on the purposes of the Green Belt, and the Inspector's conclusion at IR12.76 that the development would leave the overwhelming part of the Green Belt remaining in the Local Plan area<sup>2</sup>, she concludes that the development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (when taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the whole of the Local Plan area.

---

<sup>2</sup> the developable area of the appeal site amounts to 0.16% of the total Green Belt in the Borough with 16,189ha remaining (IR6.26)

Therefore, she considers that the proposal would meet the criteria in Framework paragraph 155(a).

39. As set out in paragraphs 20-26 above, the Secretary of State has concluded that the site is not in a sustainable location and that there is no demonstrable unmet need for the proposal. Therefore, the criteria in paragraph 155(b) and (c) of the Framework are not met. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Inspector at IR12.77 and IR12.78 that the proposal should be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt and should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances (VSC).
40. For the reasons set out at IR12.79-12.81 and IR12.105, the Secretary of State agrees that there would be harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, harm to openness and harm to purpose c). She agrees that the harm to the Green Belt attracts substantial weight (IR12.105). Her conclusion on whether VSCs exist is set out at paragraph 51 below.

#### *Other matters*

41. With regards to highway safety, for the reasons set out at IR12.29-12.30 the Secretary of State agrees there is no conflict with paragraph 116 of the Framework (IR12.31).
42. For the reasons set out at IR12.32, the Secretary of State agrees that most of the PROW network in the vicinity of the appeal site would still be able to be used as it is now. She further agrees that the enjoyment of using some of the PROW may alter as a result of the significant adverse impact to the character and appearance of the area. The Secretary of State has included this as part of the substantial weight assigned to the landscape character harm at paragraph 15.
43. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's analysis of flood risk at IR12.37-12.40 and finds no conflict with the Framework or the PPG in respect of the sequential test (IR12.40).
44. The Secretary of State agrees that there is no demonstrable evidence that undue harm would be caused to the living conditions of local residents by reason of noise, air quality or lighting either during construction or operational phases, providing that conditions which include mitigation measures, are imposed and adhered to (IR12.83).

#### **Planning conditions**

45. The Secretary of State had regard to the Inspector's analysis at IR12.94-12.104, the recommended conditions set out at the end of the IR and the reasons for them, and to national policy in paragraph 57 of the Framework and the relevant Guidance. She is satisfied that the conditions recommended by the Inspector comply with the policy test set out at paragraph 57 of the Framework. However, she does not consider that the imposition of these conditions would overcome her reasons for dismissing this appeal and refusing planning permission.

#### **Planning obligations**

46. The Secretary of State has had regard to the Inspector's analysis at IR12.85-12.93, the planning obligation dated 20 December 2024, paragraph 58 of the Framework, the Guidance and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, as amended. For the reasons given at R12.85-12.93, she agrees with the Inspector's conclusion that the obligation complies with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 and the tests at paragraph 58 of the Framework. However, the Secretary of State does not consider that

the obligation overcomes her reasons for dismissing this appeal and refusing planning permission.

### **Planning balance and overall conclusion**

47. For the reasons given above, and in the light of her conclusion at paragraph 51 below, the Secretary of State considers that the appeal scheme is in conflict with Policies QP3, QP3(a), QP5 in respect of Green Belt, HE1, IF2, and is in partial conflict with QP5 (criterion 2) of the development plan, and is in conflict with the development plan overall. She has gone on to consider whether there are material considerations which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in line with the development plan.
48. Weighing in favour of the proposal are the economic benefits, BNG, the BREEAM excellent rating, and the new cricket facility which each carry moderate weight; the proposed nature park which carries limited weight; locational benefits which carry limited weight; and lack of alternative sites which carries very little weight.
49. Weighing against the proposal is the harm to landscape character and the harm to Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, harm to openness and harm to purpose c), which each carry substantial weight; the lack of sustainability which carries significant weight; heritage harm to the settings of the Conservation Area and John Gay's House which carries great weight; and the loss of BMV land which carries moderate weight.
50. For the reasons set out at paragraph 18 above, the Secretary of State has found that the heritage balancing exercise under paragraph 215 of the Framework is favourable to the proposal.
51. The Secretary of State considers that in this case, the potential harm to the Green Belt through inappropriateness, harm to openness and harm to purpose c), and any other harm resulting from the proposal, as identified in paragraph 49 above, is not clearly outweighed by other considerations and therefore there are no VSCs which would justify this development in the Green Belt.
52. Overall, in applying s.38(6) of the PCPA 2004, the Secretary of State considers that the conflict with the development plan and the material considerations in this case indicate that permission should be refused.

### **Formal decision**

53. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's recommendation. She hereby dismisses your client's appeal and refuses planning permission for outline planning application with matters reserved apart from principal point of access for the demolition of the existing agricultural buildings to create a new state of the art Film and TV Studio including sound stages, ancillary offices, virtual reality studio, storage and warehouses, workshops, specialist studio facilities and outdoor backlot; the creation of a new Nature Park incorporating hard and soft landscaping, green infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems and new cycle and pedestrian facilities, the provision of a new cricket pitch and associated pavilion, with new cycle and pedestrian route, together with supporting infrastructure to include long stay car parking, cycle parking, boundary treatments, waste storage, sub-stations, and new access roundabout and vehicle route, in accordance with application Ref. 22/03374/OUT, dated 14 December 2022.

### **Right to challenge the decision**

54. A separate note is attached setting out the circumstances in which the validity of the Secretary of State's decision may be challenged. This must be done by making an application to the High Court within 6 weeks from the day after the date of this letter for leave to bring a statutory review under section 288 of the TCPA 1990.
55. An applicant for any consent, agreement or approval required by a condition of this permission for agreement of reserved matters has a statutory right of appeal to the Secretary of State if consent, agreement or approval is refused or granted conditionally or if the Local Planning Authority fail to give notice of their decision within the prescribed period.
56. A copy of this letter has been sent to Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council, Bray Parish Council and Holyport and Fifield Community Action Group, and notification has been sent to others who asked to be informed of the decision.

Yours faithfully

*Laura Webster*

Decision officer

*This decision was made by the Minister of State for Housing and Planning, Matthew Pennycook MP, on behalf of the Secretary of State, and signed on his behalf*

## **Annex A Schedule of representations**

### **SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS**

#### **General representations**

<b>Party</b>	<b>Date</b>
Joshua Reynolds MP	17 December 2024
A Davies	7 January 2025
S Kershaw	25 April 2025

#### **Representations received in response to the Secretary of State's letter of 13 March 2025**

<b>Party</b>	<b>Date</b>
Bell Cornwell	26 March 2025
Montagu Evans on behalf of Appellant	27 March 2025
Holyport and Fifield Community Action Group	27 March 2025
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council	27 March 2025

#### **Representations received in response to the Secretary of State's recirculation letter of 2 April 2025**

<b>Party</b>	<b>Date</b>
Holyport and Fifield Community Action Group	10 April 2025