



Appeal Decision Notice

Decision by Andrew A Sikes, a Reporter appointed by the Scottish Ministers

- Planning appeal reference: PPA-130-2086
- Site address: Rhu Lodge, Ferry Road, Rhu, Helensburgh, G84 8NF
- Appeal by Mr Graham Wylie against the decision by Argyll and Bute Council
- Application for planning permission reference 21/02709/PP, dated 21 December 2021, to carry out the development without compliance with conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, imposed on the grant of planning permission 20/01150/PP, dated 18 November 2020.
- The development proposed: erection of a dwelling house.
- Date of site visit by Reporter: 31 July 2023

Date of appeal decision: 5 September 2023

Decision

I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the erection of a dwelling house at Rhu Lodge, Ferry Road, Rhu, Helensburgh, G84 8NF, in accordance with the application reference 21/02709/PP made on 21 December 2021, without compliance to conditions numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, previously imposed on application reference 20/01150/PP made on 2 July 2020, but subject to other conditions imposed by that permission, so far as these are still subsisting and capable of taking effect, and subject to the new conditions listed at the end of this notice, namely condition numbers 3, 4 and 5.

Reasoning

1. I am required to determine this appeal in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in this case consists of the Fourth National Planning Framework (NPF4) and the Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2015 (LDP).
2. The determining issue in this appeal is whether conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 attached to planning permission 21/02709/PP meet the six tests of Circular 4/1998: The use of conditions in planning permissions, which have been imposed 'in the interests of road safety'. I consider two of the six tests relevant, firstly, whether the road improvements are necessary in order to mitigate the effects of the proposed development on the local road network and, secondly, whether the conditions are reasonable in all other respects.
3. The appeal site lies within the Rhu Conservation Area. Accordingly, Section 64(1) of the Listed Buildings And Conservation Areas (Scotland) Act 1997 requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. I consider these matters below.

Background

4. Planning permission for the erection of a dwelling house on the appeal site was first granted on 18 November 2020, subject to nine conditions (20/01150/PP). An application under Section 42 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended, subsequently sought to vary conditions 3, 4, 5 and 6 and remove conditions 7 and 8

attached to that consent (21/02709/PP). All of the conditions relate to road improvements and access arrangements required to mitigate the effects of the proposed development on the local road network. On 6 April 2023, however, the council granted planning permission for the dwelling house subject to the same conditions, albeit with some minor changes.

5. In summary, the six conditions seek:

- the provision of a 3.5 metre road (to adoptable standards) between the appeal site and A814 Gareloch Road (condition 3);
- the provision of sightline visibility splays of 2.4 x 25 x 1.05 metres at the site's driveway access with Ferry Road (condition 4);
- the construction of a private access that accords with council guidance (conditions 5, 6 and 7); and,
- parking and turning provision within the curtilage of the proposed dwelling house (condition 8).

6. There is no dispute between the parties regarding the remaining three conditions, namely; condition 1 (approved drawings), condition 2 (connection to public water supply) and condition 9 (materials). With regard to condition 1, however, the council has indicated that due to an administrative error an incorrect set of drawings were stamped 'approved' and issued to the applicant. I address this matter at the end of this notice, where I also provide a revised list of approved drawings.

7. Given the matters in dispute, I undertook an accompanied inspection of Ferry Road. In addition to the appellant, I was joined by residents of Ferry Road and representatives of the community council. At my request, the dimensions of the proposed road improvements and traffic management measures had been marked on the ground. These matters are addressed under the relevant condition headings below (as referred to on decision notice 21/02709/PP). Before doing so, I briefly describe the appeal site and its surroundings, including Ferry Road.

The appeal site and its surroundings

8. The appeal site lies within the grounds of Rhu Lodge, Ferry Road, Rhu, near Helensburgh. Access to the appeal site is via Ferry Road, which provides pedestrian and vehicular access to a number of properties. Approximately 60 metres from its junction with the A814, the road divides to give access to a 30-bed hotel and five houses. Ferry Road continues for a further 240 metres until it reaches an informal turning area, beyond which lie a Ministry of Defence radar mast and Rhu Point. This part of Ferry Road provides access to a further five houses, which use four different accesses. The access to the dwelling for which planning permission has been granted would use one these accesses.

9. High stone walls, mature trees and hedges bound Ferry Road to the north, whilst to the south, beyond a grass verge, lies Rhu Bay and its shingle and sand beach. Together, these features combine to create an attractive residential area worthy of its conservation area status.

10. Ferry Road is a well-maintained single-track traffic-calmed road with a number of passing places and speed bumps. Beyond the access to the hotel, signs indicate that Ferry Road is a private no-through road for use by residents and subject to a 10 mph speed limit. A road marking reinforces the speed limit.

The principle of development

11. Before addressing the matters in dispute, I agree with the parties that the erection of a dwelling house on the appeal site is acceptable in principle. The site is located within the settlement boundary of Rhu in which the policies of the LDP support in principle small-scale development (5 dwellings or less). The scale of the proposed dwelling, its design and choice of materials are also considered acceptable and in conformity with relevant LDP policies and supplementary guidance.

Condition 3

12. Condition 3 requires the provision of a 3.5 metre wide road, constructed to adoptable standards, between the appeal site and A814 Gareloch Road, including the provision of passing places at a maximum of 100 metre spacing. The condition is the same as that attached to the original (2020) planning permission.

13. The appeal site and its surroundings enjoy a high level of amenity. Indeed, as a conservation area, the LDP, supported by supplementary guidance, establishes a presumption against development that does not preserve or enhance its character, appearance or setting. In my consideration of this appeal, I have had regard to Designing Streets, which states, good street design should derive from an intelligent response to location, rather than a rigid application of standards. I have also had regard to the council's adopted supplementary guidance on transport matters, which similarly states, street design for new development must consider place before movement.

14. Although the council has considered the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the conservation area, its assessment, as set out in its handling reports, focuses on the design of the dwelling house and effects on neighbouring properties; there is no assessment of the effects that the required road improvements would have on the character or appearance of the conservation area or its setting. Nor is there an assessment of the wider use of Ferry Road to support the package of road improvements sought; these are matters the council is content to leave to further assessment when discharging conditions. The absence of such assessments as part of the overall consideration of the application lends weight to the claim that insufficient thought has been given to the wider effects of the proposed road improvements on the character and appearance of the conservation area, its setting and wider residential amenity.

15. With regard to development that intends to utilise an existing private access or a private road, I note the terms of Policy SG LDP TRAN 4 and its reference to 'commensurate improvements' that are 'appropriate in scale and nature' and 'informed by an assessment of usage'. The policy adds, private accesses should be constructed to incorporate minimum standards to function safely and effectively in relation to adequate visibility splays, access gradients, geometry, passing places, boundary definition and turning capacities, among other things.

16. In this case, despite the context described above, the road improvements sought by the council are a 'standard' response to the predicted effects of the proposed development, based on guidance set out in the National Roads Development Guide (2017) and the council's Roads Guidance for Developers (small housing developments) (2008). There is no acknowledgement in the roads officer's consultation responses, nor the report of handling, to the scope that exists within the guidance to reduce or seek improvements commensurate to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development.

17. With regard to the issues of concern to the council, I am satisfied that a minimum 3.5 metre carriageway capable of providing access for emergency service vehicles can be

provided from the appeal site to the A814; Designing Streets and National Roads Development Guide advise that an access route can be reduced to 2.75 metres over a short distance and at pinch points, respectively. Ferry Road adjacent to Rosslea West and Tigh-na-mara is presently 2.75 metres wide and is capable of being widened to 3.5 metres by incorporating a grass verge/gully into the running surface of the road.

18. With regard to passing places, the National Roads Development Guide states, on existing narrow rural roads, passing places should be constructed to enable user defined traffic to pass, the design of which should consider functionality against a balanced view of place-making aspirations and a presumption against urbanising the countryside. Within this context, I am satisfied that with the addition of a passing place opposite the appeal site entrance, there would be adequate opportunity for vehicles to pass safely. Importantly, the existing and proposed passing places would achieve the required 100 metres forward stopping sight distance (as shown on drawing no's 22034_006 rev B). As demonstrated to me on site, the proposed passing place satisfies the minimum overall width of 5.5 metres and extends to the required 10 metres, plus 5 metre splays at each end.

19. While the council highlights the informality of the 'passing places' immediately to the west of Rosslea West and east of Tigh-na-mara, I note that their dimensions exceed the 'typical passing place detail' shown on drawing number SD 08/003 rev A. Furthermore, the appellant's photographs demonstrate that two vehicles can pass comfortably and safely at each point.

20. With regard to the Ferry Road/A814 junction, the council states that it is a junction with a public road and not a passing place. Nonetheless, the appellant claims it functions effectively as a passing place and has done so for a considerable amount of time without any record of accidents; I observed the junction being used without difficulty at my site inspection. While the appellant's drawing number 19/20/R11 shows that there is sufficient space for two vehicles to pass, the council's standard detail requires a road width of 5.5 metres, not 4.5 metres as shown on the drawing.

21. Notwithstanding the council's comments, there is a relatively wide expanse of road in front of The Lodge which in effect creates additional space to that shown on the drawing for vehicles to pass safely. Alternatively, vehicles are able to join the A814 either side of a small grass verge which divides the junction. As the junction lies on the outside bend of the A814, there is good forward visibility for vehicles entering the A814 whether heading north or south. Also, as shown on appellant's drawing number 19/20/R1 A (existing passing places), there is intervisibility between the junction and the divide in the road that serves the hotel (also regarded by the council as an informal passing place), which are approximately 60 metres apart. Taking account of these matters, and my findings with regard to the improvements to Ferry Road in general, I consider that a relatively small departure from the standard width of a passing place, albeit an informal passing place, is acceptable given the emphasis of national and local policy to consider place before movement, particularly so in light of the sites location within the Rhu Conservation Area.

22. While Ferry Road has no formal turning head, there is space at the end of the road immediately beyond the radar mast where vehicles can turn, as demonstrated by the appellant's supporting photographs and as I witnessed for myself. In any event, as noted by the appellant, its application to the council sought to vary and remove conditions attached to the original (2020) permission, which did not include any requirement for a turning head. This matter is therefore beyond the scope of this appeal.

23. Finally, the appellant questions the reasonableness of condition 3 given the costs involved in upgrading the road to an adoptable standard to serve one additional dwelling; the relocation of existing utility apparatus would add further cost. Although I have not been

presented with detailed evidence on this matter, it is reasonable to assume that the costs involved in bringing the road up to an adoptable standard would be significant, given the distance between the appeal site and the A814 junction and the range of measures indicated on drawing 19/20/R8 A. In this regard, Circular 4/1998 cautions against the imposition of conditions which are unduly restrictive and would effectively nullify the benefits of a permission.

24. In summary, for the reasons that I set out above, I consider the requirements of condition 3, as proposed by the council, are unnecessary and unreasonable. Whereas, given the location, nature and scale of the proposed development, those proposed by the appellant incorporate the minimum works necessary to allow Ferry Road to function safely and effectively. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the proposed improvements can be secured by the revised condition suggested by the appellant.

Condition 4

25. The matter in dispute relates to the vision splay measurements at the appeal site's driveway access with Ferry Road. The measurements set out in the condition are based on advice contained in Designing Streets and Roads Guidance for Developers, the latter states; the normal requirement is for an 'x' distance of 2.4 metres; a 'y' distance determined by the speed of traffic on a public road (for example. 25 metres on a public road with a speed limit of 20 mph); a vertical distance of 1.05 metres. The appellant considers that there is scope to reduce the 'x' and 'y' values given the character of Ferry Road, the nature of its use and its location within a conservation area.

26. Taking these matters in turn, Designing Streets (page 34) states that a minimum 'x' value of 2 metres may be considered [appropriate] in some very lightly-trafficked and slow speed situations. To this end, a number of the appellant's drawings show a set-back of 2 metres. Others, however, show a set-back of 2.4 metres. Given the uncertainty, I asked the appellant to confirm his position on this matter. In response, with reference to guidance set out in Designing Streets and the site's location in a conservation area, the appellant strongly considers that an 'x' value of 2 metres is appropriate in this instance. The appellant adds, an 'x' value of 2 metres would also result in less disturbance to existing stone walls and reduce harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The council's position is that the 'x' value should remain 2.4 metres.

27. While it is possible to achieve the sightline visibility splays at the driveway access to Ferry Road sought by the council, the appellant correctly states that the measurements quoted in the condition relate to junctions on a public road where the speed limit is 20 mph. Ferry Road is a private road, and the appeal site access is not a junction; it is an existing gated private driveway. Furthermore, Ferry Road is traffic-calmed (speed bumps) and signposted as a 10 mph zone.

28. With regard to the 'y' value, firstly, I note that the 'y' distance has been reduced to 25 metres from 42 metres to correct an error in the drafting of decision notice 20/01150/PP. Secondly, given that it is not possible for vehicles to overtake on Ferry Road, the parties agree that the 'y' value can be measured to the centreline of the road. Thirdly, as I note above, I am satisfied that a 'y' value 25 metres can be achieved at the driveway access, although this would necessitate a minor realignment of the high stone wall that bounds the appeal site. Fourthly, while Designing Streets indicates that the 'y' distance may be reduced further where there is a speed limit of 10 mph, the appellant's proposed visibility splay of 2 x 25 x 1.05 metres, as shown on drawing number 22034_006 rev B, seeks to balance the council's road safety concerns with effects on the character and appearance of the

conservation area, notably by minimising alterations to the stone boundary wall and avoiding any interference with existing mature trees.

29. In conclusion on this matter, while condition 4 is necessary and reasonable in its intent, I find that it should be varied to take account of a revised visibility splay. I am satisfied that the appellants proposed condition 4 would secure and maintain a visibility splay of 2 x 25 x 1.05 metres, as shown on drawing numbers 22034_006 rev B and 19/20/R10 rev B. Also, I am satisfied that the proposed improvements would address the road safety concerns of the council.

Condition 5

30. Condition 5 sets out the requirements for the construction of the private access to the appeal site with reference to the council's standards. While the council believes that the condition should remain unchanged and attached to the planning permission, the appellant believes that it is unnecessary.

31. I have assessed the council's standard detail for the creation of a private driveway, as shown on drawing number SD 08/002 rev A, and comments set out in Appendix A to the report of handling, against the appellant's drawings 22034_006 rev B and 19/2-/R10 rev B. Firstly, I note that the drawing relates to the creation of a private driveway onto a public road; Ferry Road is a private road. Secondly, while not directly relevant to the driveway itself, the report of handling makes reference to the width of Ferry Road as being unacceptable. I address this matter in respect of condition 3 above and conclude that it meets, or is capable of meeting, the requirements of national guidance. Thirdly, the appellant's drawing number 19/20/R10 rev B shows the width of the driveway at the point of entry to be in excess of the 4.5 metres minimum requirement; the drawing is produced at 1:200 scale and is easily measured.

32. I am satisfied that the appellant has demonstrated that the relevant requirements of the council's standard detail have been incorporated into his proposals, as shown on drawing numbers 22034_006 rev B and 19/20/R10 rev B and satisfies national guidance. As such, I agree with the appellant that the proposed measures are commensurate with a lightly-trafficked road and the minimum necessary to address the road safety concerns of the council. I consider the condition as it stands unnecessary.

Condition 6

33. Condition 6 relates to the surfacing and drainage arrangements of the driveway to the proposed dwelling. The appellant argues that the condition is unnecessary as drawing number 19/20/R10 rev B describes the surfacing material to be used and illustrates the intended drainage arrangements, including the provision of a drainage channel and soakaways either side of the driveway. In this regard, I note that the legend to drawing number 19/20/R10 rev B states that the first 5 metres of the driveway will be surfaced with a bitumen macadam. It also shows the location of the drainage channel and the soakaway pits on either side of the driveway. Accordingly, I agree with the appellant that condition 6 is unnecessary.

Condition 7

34. Condition 7 relates to the gradient of the driveway, which should not exceed 5% for the first 5 metres, and be no more than 12.5% over the remainder of its length. The gradient of the driveway is shown in long section on drawing number 19/20/R10 rev B. I note that the gradients specified meet the council's requirements. However, the council argues that the condition should remain as the drawing includes other (unspecified) details which do not

accord with its roads guidance. The condition has been amended from that originally proposed to require details of the driveway gradients to be submitted to the planning authority for its written approval.

35. As I note above, details of the driveway gradients and the lengths over which it would rise are clearly set out on drawing number 19/20/R10 rev B. As such, I agree with the appellant that the condition is unnecessary and should be removed. Nor is it reasonable to require the information to be submitted for further approval when it is other unspecified elements of the proposal which are deemed unsatisfactory. In any event, as I note above, I find the private driveway arrangements with Ferry Road acceptable in all other respects.

Condition 8

36. Condition 8 requires the provision of car parking spaces within the curtilage of a dwelling house to be in accordance with the council's guidance as set out in Policy SG LDP TRAN 6 (vehicle parking provision). The parties agree that the number (three) and dimensions of the parking spaces accord with the guidance. However, as with condition 7, details of parking arrangements are set out on a drawing which, in the view of the council, also includes other unspecified details which do not accord with its roads guidance. As such, it believes that the condition should remain. The condition has been amended from that originally proposed to require details of parking provision to be submitted to the planning authority for its written approval.

37. The parking arrangements are clearly set out on drawing number 19/20/R10 rev B. They accord with the council's roads guidance. As such, and for the same reasons that I set out in paragraph 35 above, I agree that the condition is unnecessary and should be removed.

Other matters

38. In paragraph 6 above, I refer to an incorrect set of drawings that were stamped approved and issued by the council. Given that this appeal is made under Section 42 of the 1997 Act, it is in effect seeking a new planning permission. Given my decision to allow the appeal, a revised schedule of approved drawings is provided in the table that forms part of condition 1, including those relating to the construction of the dwelling house and the landscaping of the site.

39. The Rhu and Shandon Community Council objects to the proposed development. However, as noted by the appellant and confirmed by its representatives at my site inspection, it is the road improvements sought by the council and their effects on the character and appearance of the conservation area that is of concern to the community council. Also, despite some confusion regarding the nature of the application, this view is shared by almost all those that made representations to the council on the application; essentially village residents and visitors to Rhu Point do not wish to see Ferry Road improved to an adoptable standard. I deal with this matter in detail above in relation to condition 3.

Appellant's proposed conditions

40. The appellant suggests that the proposed improvements to Ferry Road, access to the appeal site and parking and turning provision within it can be secured through the imposition of three conditions. I have considered the suggested conditions and agree that they would secure the improvements proposed. Furthermore, with minor amendments they satisfy the tests of Circular 4/1998. With regard to replacement condition 3, for clarity, I have added the title of the drawings referred to. In replacement condition 4, I have

amended the suggested text to make clear that the 'x' value shown on drawing number 22034_006 rev B should be 2 metres, not 2.4 metres. Replacement condition 5 is unchanged. For completeness, condition 1 has been amended to take account of my decision to allow this appeal and incorporate the drawings relating to the improvement and traffic calming measures on Ferry Road. Conditions 2 and 9 remain unchanged, although condition 9 is renumbered condition 6.

41. In the interests of consistency, in setting out the conditions attached to this grant of planning permission, I have used the format adopted by the council, that is, the standard conditions are unnumbered whilst the additional conditions are numbered 1 to 6.

Conclusions

42. In conclusion, I find that conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 attached to planning permission 21/02709/PP fail to meet the tests of necessity and reasonableness, as set out Circular 4/1998. The appellant has demonstrated to my satisfaction that it is neither necessary nor reasonable to require Ferry Road to be improved to an adoptable standard given the location, nature and scale of the development proposed; it is a lightly-trafficked private road within a conservation area. There is no evidence to suggest that the council has undertaken an assessment of use to justify the package of improvement measures to Ferry Road that it seeks. In the absence of such, I consider the improvements proposed by the appellant are proportionate and would ensure that Ferry Road continues to function safely and effectively.

43. Furthermore, the appeal site's location within Rhu Conservation Area requires decision makers to take full account of the area's special interest and ensure that new development preserves or enhances its character or appearance. The council's rigid application of standards in its pursuit of infrastructure to serve the proposed dwelling house suggests that it has failed to consider the qualities of the place before the movement of vehicles; contrary to policies set out in Designing Streets and the LDP. Accordingly, I find that conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 should be varied or removed as described above and as set out in the schedule of conditions attached to this notice below.

Andrew A Sikes

Reporter

Conditions

Standard time limit condition

The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: in accordance with Section 58 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997

Standard soil management condition

Where the development involves ground breaking works, soil management should be undertaken in compliance with the established best practice set out in the DEFRA publication 'Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites 2009', unless an alternative methodology for the sustainable management of soil is submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: in order to ensure that sustainable management of soils and compliance with the requirements of NPF4 Policy 5A.

Additional conditions

- The development shall be implemented in accordance with the details specified in the drawings and reports that form part of applications 20/01150/PP, dated 2 July 2020, and 21/02709/PP, dated 21 December 2021, and listed in the table below, unless the prior written approval of the planning authority is obtained to amend the approved details under Section 64 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

	Drawing number reference and revision	Dated	Title
1.	19/ 20/ R01 rev A	21.03.20	Location plan
2.	19/ 20/ R06 rev A	29.05.20	Site photographs 1, 2 and 3
3.	19/ 20/ R07 rev C	22.06.20	Site photographs 4, 5 and 6
4.	19/ 20/ R08	-	Site photographs 7, 8 and 9
5.	19/ 20/ R09	-	Site photographs 10 and 11
6.	19/ 20/ R02 rev C	22.06.20	Site and roof plan as proposed
7.	19/ 20/ R03 rev A	24.05.20	First floor plan as proposed
8.	19/ 20/ R04 rev B	27.05.20	North and west elevations as proposed
9.	19/ 20/ R05 rev B	27.05.20	South and east elevations as proposed
10.	19/ 20/ 10	-	Cross section X-X as proposed
11.	19/ 20/ 11	-	Proposed landscape and planting layout
12.	4246/1	24.08.18	Topographical survey
13.	-	26.06.20	Tree protection report
14.	-	2020	Design and Access Statement
15.	ECS 22034_006 rev B	04.07.22	Ferry Road proposed improvements
16.	19/ 20/ R2 rev A	01.02.22	Proposed passing places
17.	19/ 20/ R4 rev D	25.01.23	Proposed traffic calming measures
18.	19/ 20/ R5 rev D	25.01.23	Combined traffic calming measures
19.	19/ 20/ R7 rev D	-	Ferry Road proposed improvements
20.	19/ 20/ R9 rev D	25.01.23	Ferry Road extent of resurfacing
21.	19/ 20/ R11	-	Plan of junction with A814
22.	19/ 20/ R12 rev A	23.04.23	Plan of junction with Rosslea Hotel

Reason: for the purposes of clarity; to ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the approved plans.

2. Notwithstanding the effect of condition 1; prior to the commencement of development the developer shall submit written evidence to the planning authority that an agreement with Scottish Water is in place for the connection of the proposed development to the public water supply.

Reason: in the interests of public health and to ensure the availability of an adequate water supply to serve the proposed development.

3. Notwithstanding the effect of Condition 1; prior to the first occupation of the dwelling house hereby approved, the following improvement works to the access road are required, the provision of a private access road, between the A814 Gareloch Road and the entrance to the approved dwelling house, incorporating the improvements and traffic calming measures shown on drawing numbers; ECS 22034_006 rev B (Ferry Road – proposed improvements; 19/20/R2 rev A (passing places); 19/20/R4 rev D (traffic calming); 19/20/R5 rev D (traffic calming); 19/20/R7 rev D (Ferry Road improvements); 19/20/R9 rev D (resurfacing); 19/20/R11 (passing place); 19/20/R12 rev A (passing place).

Reason: in the interests of road safety.

4. Notwithstanding the effect of Condition 1; prior to the first occupation of the dwelling house hereby approved, the access to the dwelling house shall be formed in accordance with the details shown on drawings ECS 22034_006 rev B and 19/20/R10 rev B. Notwithstanding the dimensions shown on each drawing, the access shall incorporate visibility splays measuring 2 x 25 x 1.05 metres, and these shall be maintained in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: in the interests of road safety.

5. Notwithstanding the effect of Condition 1; prior to the first occupation of the dwelling house hereby approved, the parking and turning provisions as shown on drawing number 19/20/R10 rev B shall be implemented in full. Thereafter, the approved parking and turning provisions shall be maintained in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: in the interests of road safety and in accordance with the council's 'Roads Guidance for Developers'.

6. Notwithstanding the effect of Condition 1; prior to works commencing on site, samples of the proposed materials to be used for the external walls and roof of the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: in the interests of the visual amenity and the integration of the proposed development with its surroundings.