

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

**APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED UNDER POWERS DELEGATED TO
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER**

PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)

REF : 18/00956/FUL

APPLICANT : Mr & Mrs Rose and Alexis Kennedy

AGENT : Architeco Ltd

DEVELOPMENT : Erection of dwellinghouse

LOCATION: Land North West Of Chapel Cottage
Melrose
Scottish Borders

TYPE : FUL Application

REASON FOR DELAY:

DRAWING NUMBERS:

Plan Ref	Plan Type	Plan Status
02A	Location Plan	Refused
03	Site Plan	Refused
04	Floor Plans	Refused
05	Floor Plans	Refused
06	Roof Plan	Refused
07	Elevations	Refused
08	Sections	Refused

NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 0

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:

No representations.

Roads Planning Section: advises that the principle of a dwelling on this site has already been accepted by Roads Planning Service via application 15/00036/PPP. With regards the current proposal, Roads would have no objections, provided conditions are attached to any approval issued to require parking and turning for two vehicles; have the existing gates set back a minimum of 6m from the public road verge; have visibility splays achieved and maintained at the junction of the access road with the B6359; have the hedgerow realigned to achieve the requisite visibility splays; and have the bin store area relocated out of the visibility splays.

Environmental Health Section: no land contamination comments. Seeks the imposition of a planning condition to require that no water supply other than the public mains should be used.

Landscape Section: objects on the basis that a tree survey has not been provided in support of the application, and advises that without a tree survey first being conducted and reported, this application cannot be supported. It is specifically advised that there is a need to establish the extent of the RPAs of adjacent trees and on the Site Plan as Proposed (Dwg No 1427-02-03) the proposed location of the site access and much of the parking area appears to be located within the RPA of the adjacent sycamore tree. Without the requested Tree Survey information, the Landscape Section cannot support

this application. As well as the tree survey information, Landscape would want to see detail of how the development proposals can be accommodated WITHOUT impacting on adjacent mature trees. This might include a no-dig method of driveway construction, if it cannot be wholly removed from the tree's RPA. The position of the site access and the parking area may need to be located further along the SE boundary. It is not clear from the Site Plan as Proposed how the communal bin store would be accessed. Landscape would not want to see it located closer than 1m from the face of the adjacent hedge. It is suggested that to assimilate the proposed development into the immediate landscape a hedge, in association with the post and wire fence, along the three open boundaries may be more appropriate than a post and wire fence on its own. It is noted that there is in fact no stone wall where the Proposal Drawings advise that there is one. Despite objecting on the basis of a lack of information, Landscape does identify conditions to require protective fencing for trees and hedges, and to require that there should be no development closer than 1m from the existing beech hedge.

Archaeology Section: there are no known archaeological implications of this proposal.

Education and Lifelong Learning: advises that no contributions would be sought towards local schools, for this application at this time.

The Community Council and Scottish Water have both been consulted at the time of the public consultation, but have not responded.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Adopted Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (2016)

PMD1: Sustainability
PMD2: Quality Standards
HD2: Housing in the Countryside
HD3: Protection of Residential Amenity
EP8: Archaeology
EP10: Gardens and Designed Landscapes
EP13: Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
IS2: Developer Contributions
IS7: Parking Provision and Standards
IS9: Waste Water Treatment and Sustainable Urban Drainage

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

- New Housing in the Borders Countryside
- Placemaking and Design
- Trees and Development
- Landscape and Development
- Householder Development
- Development Contributions
- Waste Management

Recommendation by - Stuart Herkes (Planning Officer) on 17th September 2018

BACKGROUND

This application proposes full detailed planning consent for a new house on a site for which planning permission in principle for a new house was refused on 23 July this year. The latter - Planning Application 18/00644/PPP - was refused for the following reason:

"The proposed development is contrary in principle to Adopted Local Plan Policy HD2 and the advice of Supplementary Planning Guidance - New Housing in the Borders Countryside (December 2008) in that it lies out with the Development Boundary, and: (i) the site is not well-related to any existing rural building group (let alone to any building group capable of augmentation in accordance with the requirements of Policy HD2, Section A, 'Building Groups'); and (ii) the Applicant has not demonstrated that there is any

operational need for a new dwellinghouse to be located at the site as a direct operational requirement of any agricultural, horticultural, forestry or other enterprise which is itself appropriate to the countryside".

The Report of Handling on Planning Application 18/00644/PPP sets out the assessment which informed the above noted decision. This assessment is maintained in full and the Report of Handling on Planning Application 18/00644/PPP, should be read as a supporting document in conjunction with the present Report of Handling (18/00956/FUL).

The current application (18/00956/FUL) was registered on 19 July; that is, just before the aforementioned PPP application was determined on 23 July. The current Applicant became aware of the refusal of Planning Application 18/00644/PPP during the course of the current application, and has provided additional details in support of the current application. These additional details consist specifically of a Design Statement and a further document, entitled "Briefing Document". Both documents refer to a "Proposed low energy dwelling & hobby farm incorporating Permaculture design linked to One Step Borders Programme".

PLANNING PRINCIPLE

The assessment within the Report of Handling on Planning Application 18/00644/PPP with respect to the principle of this site being developed to accommodate a new-build house, is maintained in full, and should be referred to directly. In summary though, the latter PPP application was refused because the current version of the Housing in the Countryside Policy no longer allows support for the principle of a new-build house in situations where the pre-existence of a house can be demonstrated with historical documents. The site is essentially a paddock without any building surviving above ground level, let alone to wall head height. I would add that I am aware that the New Housing in the Borders Countryside SPG of 2008, still retains a version of a previous (now superseded) housing in the countryside policy ('D2') in which historical evidence of the pre-existence of a house was admitted as a possible basis of support. However, not only does current planning policy take precedence over the guidance of SPGs, but the reference clearly occurs relative to a superseded version of the policy. As such, I am content that the assessment of the principle of this proposal is and remains as it was detailed within the Report of Handling on Planning Application 18/00644/PPP.

Accordingly, with respect to the principle of this site being developed as is now proposed under the current application (18/00956/FUL), the matters before the Planning Authority are therefore whether the Applicant's additional supporting information provides any new material considerations that would be so significant in themselves as to outweigh the need to determine the current application in strict accordance with the Council's New Housing in the Countryside Policy.

The Applicant's Design Statement is predominantly advice with respect to the intended low energy credentials and low impact nature of the design and layout; and its concern that the development should facilitate a sustainable lifestyle for the Applicants, while providing an exemplar of sustainable living. However, notwithstanding the merits or otherwise of the specific design details, or the underlying intentions, there is no provision within the Council's New Housing in the Countryside Policy to allow that a particular design or layout of dwellinghouse might in itself have sufficient merit as to be able to allow the proposal to be made the subject of an exceptional approval. This is regardless of whether or not the design fulfils or addresses any particular energy considerations, or even if it would be a sensitive accommodation within the landscaping of the site, and/or serve as an example of a better more sustainable lifestyle. Regardless then of any design merits of this proposal, such considerations do not reasonably outweigh the need for this proposal to be determined in strict accordance with the Council's New Housing in the Countryside Policy. It might be added that where planning policy strongly resists housing development on a particular site, it is not then reasonably or logically maintained ulterior to this position, that the siting of a house there (however sensitive or sustainable its design) should nonetheless be considered more beneficial to the site and surrounding area than the same land simply not to be developed at all.

Notwithstanding its history as the site of a lodge house, the land has the appearance of a field or paddock, with no discernible trace of development, and there is no sense at all that development might bring any environmental benefit to this specific site or surrounding area by addressing any long-term eyesore or other negative impact currently prevailing there. I would be clear that had any such circumstance been applicable, it would not reasonably have allowed this Authority to take any different view on the principle of this proposal. However, I consider that it is important to note, at least where the Applicant places so much emphasis on the environmental credentials of their scheme, that the 'greenfield' nature of this particular site

is very strong indeed regardless of its history. Accordingly, it does not reasonably allow the Applicants to maintain that they are bringing any actual environmental benefit to the site or the surrounding area through this proposal. As such, if there are environmental benefits to be derived from this development, then these are not to be derived by the site or surrounding landscape that would accommodate it.

The specific design and layout of this proposal are considered in more detail below, but it is suffice here to note at this stage that these do not in general, or in the specific, constitute any basis that would, or should, allow this Authority to make this proposal the subject of an exceptional approval.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional considerations that the Applicants raise in support of their proposal, are that they intend to run a hobby farm and work with 'One Step Borders', which is identified as a social enterprise that works with young people and families in the Scottish Borders to support young people who are experiencing emotional or mental health pressures and those who are caring for someone with such challenges.

The precise link between the house, the hobby farm and the social enterprise are not clearly explained in any precise way at any point but the hobby farm appears to be proposed at least in part, as a facility to support the aforementioned social enterprise. The 'Briefing Document' also suggests that the house is linked to, or required for the upkeep of, the hobby farm; and reiterates the Applicants involvement with 'One Step Borders'. However, the precise roles that the Applicants have in 'One Step Borders' are not detailed, and there is no business case provided.

In common with the Design Statement, the Briefing Document is mostly about explaining and justifying the proposed design, materials and layout in terms of sustainability rather than establishing any economic need or requirement for the Applicants, or any business or other enterprise they run or manage, to be located in this specific countryside location. Some advice is given with respect to what the hobby farm would grow, and in relatively general or generic terms, how it might operate on a year-round basis. This however is not financial information. There are otherwise no details of any business case or any economic justification for either the house, the hobby farm or the social enterprise facility. Instead, the 'Briefing Document' seems concerned to demonstrate the advised sustainability of the lifestyles the proposal would support (rather than the economic viability of any of the proposed ventures).

Ultimately, it is not particularly clear whether or not there is in fact any actual business or enterprise being proposed here at all, but the critical point is that none is evidenced. Where the upkeep of the site is discussed, it is in terms of the plants and animals grown being sufficient to sustain the occupants and/or their guests or visitors. The intention to sell cheese to local product manufacturers is mentioned, but does not occur within any actual business model; and may simply be a stated intention. Ultimately a 'hobby farm' is in any case reasonably understood to be a private endeavour liable to provide little or no economic return to its operators, and the description given within the supporting documents does not describe anything that would merit description as a farm business so much as a lifestyle choice that the Applicants would wish to pursue.

With respect to 'One Step Borders', it is advised that the hobby farm has potential to assist in the treatment, recuperation and education of people involved in the scheme, but there is no actual evidence or demonstration of any formal framework here (i.e. this is not an application being made by the social enterprise on its own behalf). On the contrary, this appears to be the Applicants' own private and charitable concern to support this social enterprise. What is proposed is a new house, not the headquarters or premises for a social enterprise. As such, it would appear that the proposal would simply be the Applicants' own private home, notwithstanding that they themselves would choose to operate a hobby farm, and would seek to offer the hobby farm as a facility and resource, on some basis (presumably at their discretion) to people within the 'One Step Borders' programme. This is entirely laudable, but no account can be taken of the hopes and intentions of applicants as particular private individuals in this situation. Any approval on these terms, would ultimately run the risk of being undermined by the house (or even land, if the house were not built) being sold on to a third party who may have no equivalent intentions to maintain or implement what the Applicants are proposing to operate.

It might be added that as far as the hobby farm and social enterprise are concerned, given that there is in fact no such existing enterprise on site, there is no obvious or particular concern that what is described within the application's supporting details could not in fact be accommodated as readily on a site elsewhere,

and not necessarily within a new-build property. Ultimately the social enterprise must be functioning without this facility at present, and it cannot be overlooked that the application is not being made by 'One Step Borders' itself, so much as by the Applicants as private individuals, regardless of the extent of their involvement within this organisation.

Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, Section F, allows that a new house might be supported where there is a demonstrated operational requirement for it to be located on the particular site identified, for the purpose of supporting the operation of an agricultural, horticultural, forestry or other enterprise which is itself appropriate to the countryside, and which is for the accommodation of a worker predominantly employed in the enterprise, whose presence on site is essential to the operation of that enterprise. However, the Applicants have provided insufficient evidence of any economic requirement for a house to be situated at the site, in relation to their proposal, and for this reason, I consider that the proposal would only reasonably be refused in principle, and for exactly the same reason as Planning Application 18/00644/PPP was refused.

I note that the SPG on New Housing in the Borders Countryside (2008) does include advice that hobby and part time farm proposals might be considered where account can be taken of the physical characteristics of the unit and of the contribution of the farming element to the overall household income. The details provided by the Applicants do not though reasonably demonstrate the contribution of the advised farm unit to their own income in financial terms; and in any terms which indicate the long-term viability of what is being proposed; hobby or otherwise. There is generic information about what foods might be grown (on site?) and consumed, and the potential contributions of such foods towards diet on a yearly basis. However, this is not the detailed financial case that would have been required to evidence that the proposed house and any associated farming or horticultural unit might be operated viably and successfully in the long-term. As such, the advice provided in terms of sustainability does not itself address the concern of planning policy that an economic justification for the proposal be established. As such, and notwithstanding the explicit admission of hobby farms within the advice of the SPG, there is still a requirement that any enterprise should be viable in terms that address the provisions of Policy HD2, Section F, and this is patently not met here.

DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Ultimately the position noted above with respect to the principle of what is proposed, would negate the position that might be reached with respect to what is specifically proposed here with respect to the design and layout of the site; notwithstanding the considerable detail that the supporting documents go into, in terms of establishing the sustainable/low energy credentials of the proposal.

When the development of this site was supported under Planning Consent 15/00036/PPP, it was supported on the basis that any house so proposed should reflect and respect the historical building that occupied the site as was required under the now superseded Policy D2: Housing in the Countryside. Given that this context of support no longer exists, the point is now redundant, but I would observe that what is now proposed, is not reflective or respectful of the design of a traditional lodge house. With the roofs overhanging the gables and dormers, and with heavy eaves detailing, and with windows with a very pronounced horizontal emphasis, and with the proposed use of non-traditional materials on the exterior, the proposed design would also not be particularly sympathetic to traditional rural architectural design either. I am aware that the design seeks some justification in terms of low energy credentials, but the site lies immediately adjacent to the public road (B6359) and access road to Linthill, and indeed within the Linthill Designed Landscape; and in something of a 'gateway' to the latter, being sited immediately adjacent to a main access into the Designed Landscape. On this basis, I would still consider that a design reminiscent of the traditional lodge house would have been the more appropriate and sensitive design approach on this particular site (indeed this was sought by an informative attached to Planning Consent 15/00036/PPP), and that this site is not reasonably an opportunity for a stand-alone, non-traditional new-build house, with no particular sense of the site's history or with any particular respect for the site's highly visible location within the Designed Landscape and its environs.

Contrary to the advice of the design statement, the proposed layout is very unsympathetic to the site, in that there would be a bin store presented front and centre at the corner between the public road and the access road; while the parking area would also be at the front of the site, and in no situation that might have allowed it to be more appropriately screened or made acceptably ancillary to the operation of the house. Together the bin store and parking area would make for a very hard and ancillary appearance, which would be quite suburban and certainly non-traditional. Some type of 'cottage garden' would have been a more appropriate setting for any house sited here, rather than for its frontage to be dominated by such mundane and ancillary

domestic features. This would detract unacceptably from the character of the surrounding area, including the aforementioned Designed Landscape. I would add that the lack of an obvious front door and the proposal to accommodate a deck to the front would also contribute to a very ancillary, even 'rear elevation' appearance to the front, and what should be readily understood as the principal elevation of the property rather than there being any suggestion that this is the rear of the site.

Had these design and layout matters been the only concerns, it would have been possible to have investigated revisions to the design and layout with the Applicants, but given that the proposal could not be supported in principle, these matters were not reasonably referred back to them for any further work.

OTHER CONCERNS

I note that Roads are content for their particular concerns to be regulated under planning conditions but it is not in fact clear whether or not all of the matters identified lie within the current land owners', the Applicants' and/or Roads' control; specifically the ability to remove the existing main gates and achieve the requisite visibility splays either side of the junction of the access road to Linthill with the B6359, which involves land, a gate and possibly hedging, that lie on land that is now within the site boundary or otherwise identified as being within the intended holding. Again, had this been the only concern, it would have been reasonable to have established with both the Applicant and Roads as to what works could be carried out by the Applicant either on their own land and/or on land within the public road verge, but without any actual description of these works, it is not in fact clear that the site access can in fact be accommodated and maintained to Roads' satisfaction. As proposed though, with the bin store sited as it is, the access arrangements would certainly be unsafe and the application should therefore also be refused on that basis as well as the other reasons for refusal identified within this Report of Handling.

I would note that it would have been possible to impose a suspensive planning condition upon any consent issued effectively requiring the achievement of a safe vehicular access at the site and junction ahead of the commencement of development. This would be reasonable where the land owner is the same either side of the access (as appears to be the case at present). However, even allowing that this is still the case, and that that land owner would be agreeable to the works being carried out, there would still be a concern with respect to future maintenance. It is not at all clear that even if the Applicant were in a position to carry out the works then, whether or not having done so they would have the legal right to maintain the requisite visibility splays in perpetuity thereafter. As such, this point would need to have been resolved with the Applicants ahead of the current application being determined, were it to have been recommended for approval. Again, however, this was not the only point of objection, and its resolution would not have overcome the concern that the proposal does not in its principle comply with planning policy. But without this point being resolved, it is necessarily included amongst the reasons for objection.

Given the set back of the site from all surrounding properties, there are no residential amenity concerns.

Notwithstanding the advised concern to avoid mature trees and hedges, there is, as the Landscape Section points out, in fact no tree survey informing these proposals (trees are only shown indicatively), so it is not in fact clear whether or not the proposals would actually avoid impacting the mature trees at all. Similarly, hedging would also appear liable to be impacted, including by the bin store area. Again, had there been no concern in principle with respect to this proposal, it would have been appropriate to have established with the Applicant exactly what the impacts would be upon surrounding trees and hedges. Without a tree survey to demonstrate the accommodation on the site without the loss of any trees, this concern would also require to be included among the reasons for refusal. The Landscape Section also notes its objection in these terms in so far as it anticipates that there would in fact be impacts upon the Root Protection Areas of specific mature trees and hedges which the Applicants have simply not taken account of, within their proposals.

I note the advice of the supporting statement that: "the planning authorities ... agreed the site boundary [should] be adjusted to allow the footprint to avoid roots of the mature trees". There is no record of any agreement in these terms, but any prospective applicant in any situation, would certainly be given positive encouragement to avoid damaging mature trees wherever possible. However, any such informal and generic advice is not reasonably presented here or in any other context as constituting any specific prior agreement of the Planning Authority to any aspect of this proposal before the application was made. The advice referred to, was likely given in pre-application correspondence or advice, and at some point before Planning Permission in Principle 15/00036/PPP expired.

In the event of approval, there may be an opportunity to require a proper archaeological investigation of the site since any such requirement was unfortunately omitted from the previous PPP consent due to the Archaeology Section not being consulted at that time on that proposal. However, again, given that the principle of the site being developed at all is reasonably resisted, this opportunity is not, I would be clear, a point of positive support for the current proposal. It would merely be appropriate to ensure that appropriate consideration were given to the archaeology of the site this time, were the current proposal to be supported. I note that the Archaeology Section is not objecting and does not on this occasion, identify archaeological implications. On this basis, it would not be reasonable to include impacts upon archaeology amongst the reasons for refusal.

In the event of approval, the parking and turning, drainage and water supply requirements could all be regulated under conditions, including one along the lines proposed by Environmental Health in the case of the water supply. The conditions regulated drainage should be suspensively worded though, to ensure that the detail of these proposals should be demonstrated ahead of the commencement of development.

The drawing showing the proposed layout of the hobby farm is not reasonably or necessarily included amongst the drawings to be cited on the decision notice; similarly the larger scale location plan.

A Waverley contribution has already been collected for this site under a Section 69 agreement. There are no education contributions due. Accordingly, if the application were approved, it could be issued without a legal agreement.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons noted above, I consider that the current application is only reasonably refused, notwithstanding any sustainability credentials of the specific design and notwithstanding the Applicant's concern to support a social enterprise as private individuals from this site.

Ultimately no appropriate case that would allow this proposal to be supported under any economic requirement for a house in this location has been given, and as an isolated housing proposal with no justification, it is only reasonably refused as being contrary to Policy HD2 for exactly the same reason as Planning Application 18/00644/PPP was recently refused.

I would add that although the matters might have been addressed with the Applicants had the proposals otherwise been capable of support, the current proposal is also reasonably refused on the basis of the fact that its particular design and layout would be highly detrimental to the rural amenity and environment of this site and in particular the Designed Landscape in whose 'gateway' it is. Ultimately such an ancillary and suburban character of development, with no particular concern to reflect rural or traditional architecture, would in itself detract unacceptably from the quality of the Designed Landscape and surrounding countryside. For these reasons, the current application should be refused. As noted above, the access arrangements and impacts upon surrounding trees and hedges have also not been addressed appropriately within the specific form and layout of the proposal and as such, these matters are also necessarily included amongst the reasons for refusal - even although a revised layout; evidence of a right to maintain the visibility splays in perpetuity; and the submission and approval of a professionally conducted and reported tree survey, may have alleviated these particular concerns.

REASON FOR DECISION :

The planning application should be refused for the following reasons:

1) The proposed development is contrary in principle to Adopted Local Plan Policy HD2 and the advice of Supplementary Planning Guidance - New Housing in the Borders Countryside (December 2008) in that it lies out with the Development Boundary, and: (i) the site is not well-related to any existing rural building group (let alone to any building group capable of augmentation in accordance with the requirements of Policy HD2, Section A, 'Building Groups'); and (ii) the Applicant has not demonstrated that there is any operational need for a new dwellinghouse to be located at the site as a direct operational requirement of any agricultural, horticultural, forestry or other enterprise which is itself appropriate to the countryside;

2) The proposed development is contrary in principle to Adopted Local Plan Policies HD2, PMD2, EP10 and the advice of Supplementary Planning Guidance - New Housing in the Borders Countryside (December 2008) and Supplementary Planning Guidance - Place-Making and Design (January 2010), in that it is not in keeping with the sense of place of the countryside character and setting of the site and the surrounding area, principally through the introduction of an unsympathetic and suburban form of development into an isolated rural location, which would be harmful to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area; including the Linthill Designed Landscape;

3) The proposed development is contrary to Adopted Local Plan Policies HD2, PMD2, EP10 and EP13, in that it has not been demonstrated satisfactorily that the development would not have any unacceptable impacts upon the local landscape, principally that it would not cause the loss of, or serious damage to, existing mature trees and hedging which contribute to the landscape value of the Linthill Designed Landscape; and

4) The proposal does not comply with Adopted Local Development Plan Policy PMD2 in that the access arrangements are unsuitable to serve the development and inadequate provision has been made for the accommodation of appropriate visibility splays, such that there would be adverse impacts upon road safety as a result.

Recommendation: Refused

- 1 The proposed development is contrary in principle to Adopted Local Plan Policy HD2 and the advice of Supplementary Planning Guidance - New Housing in the Borders Countryside (December 2008) in that it lies out with the Development Boundary, and: (i) the site is not well-related to any existing rural building group (let alone to any building group capable of augmentation in accordance with the requirements of Policy HD2, Section A, 'Building Groups'); and (ii) the Applicant has not demonstrated that there is any operational need for a new dwellinghouse to be located at the site as a direct operational requirement of any agricultural, horticultural, forestry or other enterprise which is itself appropriate to the countryside.
- 2 The proposed development is contrary in principle to Adopted Local Plan Policies HD2, PMD2, EP10 and the advice of Supplementary Planning Guidance - New Housing in the Borders Countryside (December 2008) and Supplementary Planning Guidance - Place-Making and Design (January 2010), in that it is not in keeping with the sense of place of the countryside character and setting of the site and the surrounding area, principally through the introduction of an unsympathetic and suburban form of development into an isolated rural location, which would be harmful to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area; including the Linthill Designed Landscape.
- 3 The proposed development is contrary to Adopted Local Plan Policies HD2, PMD2, EP10 and EP13, in that it has not been demonstrated satisfactorily that the development would not have any unacceptable impacts upon the local landscape, principally that it would not cause the loss of, or serious damage to, existing mature trees and hedging which contribute to the landscape value of the Linthill Designed Landscape.
- 4 The proposal does not comply with Adopted Local Development Plan Policy PMD2 in that the access arrangements are unsuitable to serve the development and inadequate provision has been made for the accommodation of appropriate visibility splays, such that there would be adverse impacts upon road safety as a result.

"Photographs taken in connection with the determination of the application and any other associated documentation form part of the Report of Handling".