



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 11 June 2025

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

by C Harding BA (Hons) PGCert PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/W/24/3357260

91 London Road, Sandy, Bedfordshire, SG19 1DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Muller Property Group against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/23/03546/OUT.
 - The development proposed is outline planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings / structures on the site, and erection of an 80-bedroom care home (Use Class C2), with a sub-station, access, car parking, servicing and other associated works, with consideration of layout, scale, appearance and access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing buildings / structures on the site, and erection of an 80-bedroom care home (Use Class C2), with a sub-station, access, car parking, servicing and other associated works, with consideration of layout, scale, appearance and access at 91 London Road, Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 1DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/23/03546/OUT, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. An application for full costs has been made by Muller Property Group against Central Bedfordshire Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application was made in outline form with matters of landscaping reserved for future consideration. I have therefore had regard to the provided plans, although where reference is made to landscaping details, I have considered those specific elements to be illustrative only.
4. Shortly before the hearing, the Council published its “Five year housing land supply statement and methodology” and its “Housing Trajectory for Central Bedfordshire (Completions as at 31/03/25)”. Although late evidence, this information, as the most up-to-date housing supply position is material to my decision and was not available earlier in the appeal process. The main parties were afforded opportunity to comment upon it both prior to, and at, the hearing. I have, therefore, taken it into account in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- whether the location of the proposal would lead to an over-reliance on the private car, and;
- the effect of the proposal upon the significance of the setting of 96 London Road, a Grade II listed building.

Reasons

Reliance on the private car

6. The appeal site is an existing residential property set within a sizeable garden located immediately to the west of the A1 dual carriageway. A further residential property lies immediately to the north, and a vehicle storage facility can be found to the south and west. Sandy is a town predominantly located on the eastern side of the A1, however the appeal site lies within the Settlement Envelope as established in the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (2015) ('CBLP'). Residential areas directly abut the dual carriageway on its eastern side.
7. For the purposes of this appeal, Sandy's relationship with the A1 is largely confined to a stretch between Sandy Roundabout (A1/A603) in the south, and a junction with Georgetown Road to the north, which provides access and egress to the northbound carriageway. A further junction providing access and egress to the southbound carriageway is located slightly further to the north.
8. Development on the western side of the A1 between Sandy Roundabout and Georgetown Road is sporadic and comprises a mix of commercial and residential properties, in a linear form strung along the road. A footway runs directly adjacent to the dual carriageway from a point to the south of an oriental supermarket, northwards past the appeal site, and follows the exit road from the A1 onto Georgetown Road, before passing through a small area of employment uses. Thereafter, access to Sandy can be achieved by passing underneath the A1. A stretch of footway of similar length can be found on the eastern side of the A1.
9. Walking between Sandy Roundabout and Georgetown on the western side of the road is not possible without straying into the carriageway or navigating vegetation. I also saw that central reservation barriers are in place for the overwhelming majority of this stretch of the A1, although barriers between the footways and the carriageway are largely absent. At the time of my visit, the speed limit for this stretch of road was 50 miles per hour, and I saw that the road is busy, carrying significant volumes of traffic as a major arterial route.
10. It was agreed by the main parties that given the nature of the proposed use, that travel demand generated by the proposal would be mainly driven by employees, rather than residents. I heard that the premises would operate a shift system on a 24-hour basis.
11. As the main driver of travel demand would likely be employee trips, simply assessing the proposal on the terms of its accessibility from the centre of Sandy is of limited value, given that the nature and length of an individual's journey would be determined by the employee's place of residence, rather than the proximity of local shops and services. Nevertheless, the parties agree that the 2 kilometre walking

distance for commuters identified within the Transport Statement is a reasonable pedestrian catchment for the appeal site, and it is notable that this would include a significant proportion of the settlement.

12. The journey from even the closest point of the wider area of Sandy to the appeal site is not particularly direct, given the severance that results from the A1. However, the appeal site is nevertheless accessible from Sandy on foot, with a footway existing to enable such journeys via Georgetown Road and passing under the A1. Given the lack of pedestrian infrastructure on the eastern side of the A1 south of the appeal site, it is unlikely that the proposal would be accessed via the Sandy Roundabout crossing of the A1. The closest homes within Sandy on the eastern side of the A1, as well as the closest bus stops are situated within a few hundred metres of the appeal site. The main parties agree that the Georgetown Road route is not inherently unsafe, and I saw that depending on the route taken once the A1 has been crossed, that pedestrian routes within Sandy itself are often, albeit not exclusively, lit by streetlights.
13. The walk from the appeal site to Sandy by the Georgetown Road route is not scenic. The proximity of the footway to the busy A1 is unavoidable, as is the volume and speed of traffic, however the footway is of a reasonable width, lightly trafficked by pedestrians and this stretch of the journey is relatively short at around 150 metres.
14. Once the Georgetown Road slip road is reached, the ambience immediately changes to a much quieter character. This section of the route passes large industrial and commercial premises, and although I saw there was activity associated with these units, and in particular the vehicle storage use, the road is wide, the character of the area is open, and vehicles leaving the A1 provide a sense of surveillance. While not visually attractive, I consider it unlikely that this part of the route would give rise to significant levels of fear of crime.
15. Passing under the bridge over the A1, the character of the route is more suburban, and this part of the route forms part of the Sandy Green Wheel, a recreational sustainable travel route. I saw several dog walkers, joggers, ramblers and cyclists all making use of this part of the route, along with the rural lane opposite. The footway under the bridge then connects into a network of footpaths and cycleways which crisscross Sandy itself. This part of the route felt akin to many such routes in and around urban areas, did not feel unsafe and is evidently well-used. While I accept the Council's position that some routes, including one towards London Road, are not wholly lit, or pass behind rear gardens and lack surveillance, the range and variety of routes that exist mean that alternative routes are available and such areas are not, therefore, an insurmountable barrier to sustainable modes of travel.
16. There are several bus stops within walking distance of the appeal site via the Georgetown Road route which provide access to settlements further afield, including Bedford. Again, this would provide access to the appeal proposal by means other than private car.
17. The nature of the proposal, which would operate a three-shift system, means that it is likely that some employees will be arriving or departing from the appeal site during night-time hours, including potentially into the early hours of the morning. At such times, I acknowledge that travel on foot may be a less attractive option, and it

is possible that at such times that public transport would also not be operating. As a result, car usage may be higher during these periods. However, this would not be wholly indicative of the appeal proposal being inappropriately located, as this would be the case at many sites, even in more central urban locations.

18. Taking these factors together, I consider that the most convenient and direct walking route between the proposal and wider built-up area of Sandy would represent a safe, feasible and reasonably attractive means of accessing the appeal proposal either directly from within the town, or following arrival into the area by public transport. While there are stretches of the route that are less attractive than others due to environmental factors, these are limited in number and are relatively short in length. Such alternatives exist so that the visitors to, or employees of the proposal would not be wholly reliant upon the private car.
19. Furthermore, the evidence before me does not indicate that a level of traffic would be generated such that it would lead to highway safety issues or affect the operation of the network, or the A1 in particular, or that insufficient parking would be provided. Moreover, neither the Highway Authority nor National Highways has objected to the proposal.
20. I heard that there have been instances in the past of pedestrians crossing the A1 directly, rather than using the Georgetown Road route, or the footbridge to the south of the settlement.
21. There is no doubt, that in terms of journey time and distance, a direct crossing of the dual carriageway would be a quicker and shorter alternative to either of the formal road crossings. Clearly, given the volume and speed of traffic, along with the distance to be covered, directly crossing the A1 is a road safety risk.
22. Given the comparative distances, future crossings of this nature cannot be ruled out, nor would they be easily preventable. However, I also heard that elements of the central reservation have been infilled with additional barriers to discourage them, and I have been presented with no substantive evidence beyond verbal anecdotes which would demonstrate that such attempted crossings are frequent or are resulting in accidents.
23. While the appeal proposal would add to development on the eastern side of the A1, and in doing so, provide an additional driver for pedestrian traffic to and from the that side of the road, I consider that the alternative crossing route is not of such additional length or uninviting character, that it would inevitably lead pedestrians to consider a direct crossing of the A1 as an attractive alternative bearing in mind the inherent risks involved. It is also notable that neither the Highway Authority nor National Highways have raised any concerns, and I find that the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful in this respect.
24. Overall, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not lead to an over-reliance on the private car. It would accord with CBLP Policies T1, T2 and HQ1 which together, and among other factors, state that proposals should demonstrate how they will seek to reduce the need to travel and secure modal shift towards sustainable forms of transport, that proposals will be supported where amongst other things, walking and cycling permeability are promoted, where they are well connected to surrounding areas, provide safe, attractive and convenient routes that encourage travel by sustainable modes and meet the needs of all street users.

Listed building

25. 96 London Road is a Grade II listed building ('the LB'), described within the listing as a 17th Century timber-framed building. I saw that the building is currently finished in painted brick and addresses the A1 from across a shallow garden and low front boundary wall. Mature trees and shrubs line the front boundary and provide substantial screening.
26. The significance of the LB and its setting is derived, insofar as it relates to this appeal, from the evidential value of the building as an example of a property of the period, and as evidence of the historic form of Sandy. The parties agree that the setting of the LB is restricted to its immediate vicinity, and I also agree.
27. The Council considers that the proposal would lead to a low level of less than substantial harm to the setting of the LB, whereas the appellant considers that the effect of the proposal would be neutral.
28. The dual carriageway which separates the appeal site from the LB is a significant physical and visual barrier, both in terms of its engineering and the high volumes of traffic that use it. The LB is one of a range of buildings adjoining the A1 on its eastern side, and given the level of vegetation within its garden, it is not a prominent feature of the road frontage. It is located somewhat to the south of the appeal site, and although it is likely that the appeal proposal would appear in views from the LB, it is unlikely that the LB would be appreciated such that both would appear in views together; the tight grain of development around the LB means that it would be most likely to be seen from a short distance in views towards west, when the appeal proposal would be behind the viewer.
29. Moreover, even if the two were to be seen together, the intervening presence of the A1 and the activity associated with it would provide a significant buffer, meaning the presence of a large building on the appeal site, beyond the dual carriageway, would be very much a secondary feature, remote from the LB. Furthermore, a number of larger buildings, of a scale commensurate with their commercial use, can be found on the western side of the road and in such a context the appeal proposal would be unlikely to be harmfully prominent.
30. I conclude that the effect of the proposal would have a neutral effect on the setting of the LB, and that no harm to significance would occur. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy HE3 of the CBLP, which states that development proposals affecting designated heritage assets will be granted provide they, where possible, preserve, sustain or enhance the special character, significant, appearance and/or special architectural or historic interest of the asset and preserve the setting of the asset.

Other Matters

31. Interested parties have raised a number of issues in relation to the scheme relating to privacy, disturbance and highway safety.
32. The proposal would be a significantly larger structure than that which current exists within the appeal site. I saw that a neighbouring bungalow is located close to the north-eastern boundary of the site, and a substantial fence currently separates the properties. The proposal would be situated and orientated such that direct views towards the neighbouring property would be at an angle and from some distance

away. Even accounting for the significant height differential between the buildings, I consider that the proposal would not lead to harm to the living conditions of existing neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to privacy.

33. There would be a degree of activity associated with the operation of the proposal, however, there is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that levels of activity or comings and goings would be such that they would lead to unacceptable noise and thus disturbance to existing neighbouring occupiers.
34. The accuracy of the provided pollution report is queried, however there is no further detail before me in relation to the nature or extent of possible inaccuracies, and I note that the report has been prepared by an appropriately qualified individual. On this basis I have no reason to doubt the conclusions within this report.
35. Overall, none of the issues raised by interested parties lead me to find that the proposal would be materially harmful in these respects.

Conditions

36. I have had regard to the suggested list of planning conditions provided by the main parties and their comments on them made at the Hearing. I have also had regard to two additional conditions agreed between the parties and subsequently provided to me. I have amended some of the conditions in the interests of satisfying the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') and Planning Practice Guidance. Where necessary, I have sought the views of the appellant in relation to pre-commencement conditions.
37. I have imposed conditions (1) and (2) in relation to the timing and format of future reserved matters applications and to control when development must have begun in the interests of certainty. An approved plans condition (3) is required in the interests of certainty and to inform future reserved matters submissions. A condition (4) limiting the number of bedrooms is required to control the level of occupation at the site in the interests of certainty.
38. Conditions (5), (6) and (7) relating to the management of construction and the protection of trees are required in the interest of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, highway safety and biodiversity. The installation of tree protection measures and the formulation of construction management plans are required to be pre-commencement in order to ensure that adequate protection is in place at the outset of construction work.
39. I have attached a condition (8) relating to drainage measures in order prevent increased flood risk. In the interests of public health I have attached a condition (9) in relation to assessing and mitigating contaminated land.
40. Given the proximity of the appeal site to the A1 and in order to ensure that acceptable internal noise levels are achieved, I have attached a condition (10) in relation to establishing noise levels and providing mitigation. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition (11) relating to external materials is necessary.
41. It is necessary to secure a Travel Plan by means of condition (12) in order to promote sustainable travel. In order to enhance biodiversity, I have attached a condition (13) relating to ecological enhancements. A condition (14) relating to

landscape management is also required in the interests of ecology, as well as the character and appearance of the area.

42. To ensure appropriate provision is made in the interests of the living conditions of future occupiers, a condition (15) relating to the location of bin stores and collection points is attached. To ensure highway safety is maintained conditions (16) and (17) relating turning spaces and parking arrangements are also necessary.
43. Furthermore, in the interest addressing climate change it is also necessary to attach conditions (18) and (19) relating to the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and to secure other energy saving measures.
44. I have not attached the condition suggested in relation to the provision of Public Art as it has not been shown that such a condition would be necessary to make the development acceptable, or that art could be provided within a public location, given the nature of the proposed use as a privately operated facility. It would, therefore, fail the relevant tests set out in the Framework.
45. I have also not attached the conditions suggested by Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Authority as they would duplicate the requirements of other legislation, so are not, therefore, necessary to make the development acceptable.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

46. The main parties disagree in relation to the current housing land supply position. The Council considers that it can demonstrate 5.08 years, whereas the appellant has adopted a figure of 4.93 years, as established by previous Inspectors.
47. It is common ground between the parties that the appeal proposal would equate to the release of 42 homes back into the housing market. This figure has been calculated on a 1:1.9 ratio as adopted by the Council in response to the Housing Delivery Test Measurement Rule Book, and I have no reason to disagree with it. However, as the extant planning permission¹ for housing on the site would not be deliverable should the appeal proposal come forward, and having regard to the loss of the current dwelling on the appeal site, the net increase to the overall supply would be reduced to 34 dwellings. Nevertheless, this represents a moderate contribution to the level of overall supply, and being mindful of the Government's stated desire to significantly boost the supply of housing set out at paragraph 61 of the Framework, this is a benefit of the proposal.
48. The Council's most recent evidence indicates that there are currently 576 nursing and care home spaces for older people in the area, with demand rising to 641 over the period to 2030. The appellant's Care Home Needs Assessment identifies that there would be a shortfall of 146 care home bedspaces by 2030.
49. While there is some difference in the extent of the expected shortfall, the parties agree that there is a significant need for additional care home bed spaces in the area, and the 80 care home spaces which the appeal proposal would provide would represent a significant contribution towards addressing any shortfall. This is a further benefit of the proposal.

¹ CB/19/04298/OUT and APP/P0240/W/21/32979343

50. Additionally, the proposal would deliver short term economic benefits during construction, and longer-term benefits following occupation in terms of servicing needs and employment.
51. Therefore, even if I were to find that the Council cannot demonstrate an adequate five-year supply of housing land, there are no adverse effects which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of granting planning permission in this instance.
52. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would accord with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no material considerations that I should take a decision other than in accordance with it.
53. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Harding

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Details of the landscaping, ("the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this decision. The development shall begin not later than two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, if approved on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.
- 3) No more than 80 bedrooms shall be provided on the site pursuant to this planning permission.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: H.22.124 (9) 1 rev C; H.22.124 (9-) 2 rev F; H.22.124 (00) 2 rev A; H.22.124 (00) 3 rev B; H.22.124 (00) 4 rev A; H.22.124 (21) 1 rev B; H.22.124 (21) 2 rev C; H.22.124 (21) 3 rev B; H.22.124 (21) 4 rev B; H.22.124 (21) 5 rev A; H.22.124 (21) 6; H.22.124 (21) 7; H.22.124 (21) 8 rev B; H.22.124 (21) 9 rev A; H.22.124 (90) 1 rev C; H.22.124 (90) 2 rev B; and 404-SP01 Rev G
- 5) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), associated with the development of the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority which will include information on:
 - the parking of vehicles.
 - loading and unloading of plant and materials used in the development.
 - storage of plant and materials used in the development.
 - the erection and maintenance of security hoarding / scaffolding affecting the highway if required.
 - wheel washing facilities.
 - measures on site to control the deposition of dirt / mud on surrounding roads during the development.

- footpath/footway/cycleway or road closures needed during the development period.
- traffic management needed during the development period.
- times, routes and means of access and egress for construction traffic and delivery vehicles (including the import of materials and the removal of waste from the site) during the development of the site.
- details of escorts for abnormal loads.
- temporary removal and replacement of highway infrastructure and street furniture.
- the reinstatement of any signs, verges or other items displaced by construction traffic.
- banksman and escort details, and
- tracking diagrams.

Thereafter, the approved CTMP associated with the development of the site shall be adhered to throughout the construction process.

- 6) No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall set out measures during the construction phase to protect retained habitat features of importance and protected and priority fauna including bats, breeding birds, reptiles, common toad, harvest mouse and hedgehog, including through appropriate fencing and site best practice and the avoidance of pollution from run-off. The approved CEMP shall be strictly adhered to throughout the construction process.
- 7) Construction of the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the Tree Report (by Muller Property Group dated January 2024) hereby approved, which includes an Arboricultural Method Statement and a Tree Protection Plan showing the details of substantial protective fencing for the protection of any retained trees and hedgerows on site. The approved fencing shall be erected prior to any equipment and machinery being brought onto site and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.
- 8) No development above damp-proof course shall commence until a final detailed design of the surface water drainage scheme, to manage surface water runoff from the development for up to and including the 1 in 100-year event (+40%CC), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The approved drainage works shall be completed prior to the completion or occupation of buildings on site whichever is the sooner and thereafter maintained as approved.

The detailed drainage designs to be provided shall include, at a minimum:

- a clearly labelled drainage layout plan showing pipe networks and any attenuation ponds, soakaways and drainage storage tanks. This plan should show any pipe 'node numbers' that have been referred to in network calculations and it should also show invert and cover levels of manholes;
- the proposed impermeable area;

- the proposed method of surface water disposal (using the drainage hierarchy) and evidence to support this;
 - proposed runoff rates, if discharging off-site;
 - proposed runoff volumes, if discharging off-site;
 - total required volume of attenuation;
 - detailed SuDS proposals (type, location, size);
 - where infiltration such as infiltration trenches and soakaways forms part of the drainage system, the results of soakage tests (carried out in accordance with BRE digest 365/CIRIA156);
 - where an outfall discharge control device is to be used such as a vortex control or orifice, this should be shown on the plan with its dimensions and rate of discharge stated;
 - calculations should demonstrate how the system operates during a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) critical duration storm event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change and urban creep. If overland flooding occurs in this event, a plan should also be submitted detailing the location of overland flow paths including the extent and depth of ponding;
 - management / maintenance arrangements (including adopting body); and, formal agreement from third party if discharging into their system.
- 9) A) No development shall take place, with the exception of demolition, until a Phase 2 intrusive site investigation is undertaken to establish whether the site is contaminated, to assess the degree and nature of any contamination present and to determine its potential risk to other receptors. The investigation shall be carried out according to the requirements of the local planning authority, including BS 10175:2011+A2:2017 - Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites Code of Practice (or any standard that may replace it). A report detailing the results of the investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to any further development works on site.
- B) Where any potential sources of contamination and impacts have been identified, a written method statement setting out the proposed means of dealing with any contamination identified on the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any further development takes place. The remediation strategy shall set out a timetable of works and the proposed means of dealing with any contamination on site, including provisions for monitoring any specified actions and validating the outcomes. The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved.
- C) Upon completion of the remediation scheme(s) as approved by part B) of this condition, a Verification Report(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to occupation of the development.
- D) If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, the local planning authority is to be informed immediately and no further development shall be carried out until a report indicating the nature of the contamination and how it is to be dealt with is submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority. Any

required remediation shall be detailed in an amendment to the remediation statement and verification of these works included in the verification report.

- 10) No development shall take place above damp-proof course level until a scheme for protecting the occupiers of the proposal from noise has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be based on the recommendations identified in the ACA Acoustics report dated Oct 2023. The building shall not be occupied until such a scheme has been implemented in accordance with the approved details and it shall be retained in accordance with those details thereafter.
- 11) No development shall take place above damp-proof course level until a full schedule of the materials to be used in the external walls, roofs and fenestration of the care home building hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.
- 12) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a full Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council, to include details of:
 - predicted travel to and from the site and targets to reduce car use;
 - details of existing and proposed transport links, to include links to both pedestrian, cycle and public transport networks;
 - proposals and measures to minimise private car use and facilitate walking, cycling and use of public transport;
 - details of provision of cycle parking in accordance with Council guidelines;
 - details of marketing and publicity for sustainable modes of transport to include site specific welcome packs.
 - timetable for implementation.

Welcome packs shall include;

- walking, cycling, public transport and rights of way information. Site specific travel and transport information;
- travel vouchers;
- details of relevant pedestrian, cycle and public transport routes to, from and within the site; and
- copies of relevant bus and rail timetables;
- details of the appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator.

Thereafter the travel plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timetable, and be monitored and reviewed annually, for a period of 5 years.

- 13) Any future Reserved Matters submission for Landscaping shall be accompanied by a detailed Ecological Enhancement Strategy (EES) for the creation of new wildlife features such as hibernacula, the inclusion of integrated bird/bat and bee boxes in buildings/structures, hedgehog holes in fences and tree, hedgerow, shrub and wildflower planting/establishment. The content shall be informed by the August 2021 Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and shall include the:
 - purpose and objectives for the proposed works;

- detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) necessary to achieve stated objectives (including, where relevant, type and source of materials to be used);
- extent and location of proposed works shown on appropriate scale maps and plans;
- timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of construction;
- persons responsible for implementing the works;
- details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance.

The EES shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable, and installed measures shall be retained thereafter.

- 14) Any future Reserved Matters submission for Landscaping shall be accompanied by a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance scheme for all areas of the development. The landscape management plan shall thereafter be carried out as approved, and the landscaping shall be managed and/or maintained in accordance with the approved maintenance scheme.
- 15) Any future Reserved Matters submission for Landscaping shall be accompanied by a scheme, detailing the enclosure of the bin storage / collection areas associated with the development, to be designed in accordance with Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (2023). The bin storage / collection areas shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and retained thereafter.
- 16) The turning space for vehicles illustrated on the approved Plan No 404-SP01 Rev G (within the Highways Technical Note dated January 2024) shall be constructed and made available for use before the development is first occupied and retained thereafter for the purpose of vehicle turning.
- 17) No part of the building shall be occupied until the car parking spaces to serve the development have been provided and made available for use. The car parking spaces shall be retained for parking purposes thereafter.
- 18) Prior to occupation of the building hereby permitted, a Verification Survey shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, which confirms that the measures to address climate change and sustainability, as set out in the Energy Statement by Muller Property Group dated November 2023, have been implemented in full.
- 19) Prior to first occupation of the building hereby permitted, a scheme for the charging of electric and ultra-low emission vehicles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of active charging posts or passive provision such as cabling and electricity supply for each space provided and timescales / triggers for implementation of the scheme.

The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details including the agreed timescales / triggers, and the charging facilities retained and made available for use thereafter.

END OF SCHEDULE

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr I Ponter	Barrister, Kings Chambers, instructed by Walsingham Planning
Ms L Beech BA MTPL MRTPI	Associate Director, Walsingham Planning
Mr P Wooliscroft MSc HNC	Partner, Eddisons
Mr S Bourne	Technical Director, Muller Property Group

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr D Gauntlett BSc (Hons) MSc	Principal Planning Officer
-------------------------------	----------------------------

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Cllr S Bell	Ward Councillor for Sandy, Beeston and Blunham, Central Bedfordshire Council
Mr N Aldice	Sandy Town Council
Mr Sandhu	Landowner
Mr D Levett	Representing Mr Sandhu