

4/00130/18/FUL	DROPPED KERB AND CROSSOVER.
Site Address	64-66 AKEMAN STREET, TRING, HP23 6AF
Applicant	Mr Barry, 26 Lyonsdown Avenue
Case Officer	Sally Robbins
Referral to Committee	Called in by Councillor Conway due to highway safety and loss of on street parking

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 The site is located in an area where non-residential development is acceptable in principle. The Conservation Officer and Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal. The proposal would result in a 3m long area of road/pavement that could not be used for on-street parking. Measures would be put in place to ensure that the access would be used for entering the site only and to ensure that commercial vehicles cannot use the access point. These details would be secured by condition.

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is located on the west side of Akeman Street. The site occupies a corner position on the junction of Akeman Street and Albert Street. The site comprises a three storey office building that was constructed in the early 1980's. The adjoining premises (nos. 67-68 Akeman St) is in the same ownership as the application site and comprises a building dating from the late 18th century.

4. Proposal

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a dropped kerb to provide access to the rear car park of 64-66 Akeman Street. The dropped kerb would measure 3m in width.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 A previous application to re-open and re-utilise vehicular access was refused in 1990 (ref. 4/00828/90/FUL) on the grounds that the access is too narrow and insubstantial in width to carry the level and type of traffic that would be associated with the commercial uses on the site. At that time the use of the site was light industry (B2), which would be associated with heavy goods vehicles. The current use of the site is mixed use offices (B1) and dance studio (D2) on the ground floor, the access and traffic requirements for which are considered to be less substantial than for light industry.

5.2 An application with a similarly narrow access was approved at Development Management Committee on 26/06/2014 (ref. 4/00237/14/FUL) for land adjacent to and to the rear of 20 High Street in Tring. The dropped kerb for that application was to provide vehicular access to 12 parking spaces, which were a combination of residential and commercial. The width of the access was 2.72m, in comparison to the proposed access of 3.93m.

5.3 In 2007 a full application was submitted for 64-68 Akeman Street for redevelopment to 8 apartments, commercial floorspace and associated parking (4/1895/07/FUL). It was recommended for approval, and in reference to the Albert Street access, the Highway Authority stated, "This is described as one way only (entry into the site), controlled with a suitable gated system to prevent vehicles exiting from this point. This detail will be a requirement of the Highway Authority due to the substandard visibility at this point. Further information will be required to ensure the system selected is acceptable. If the Planning Authority are minded to grant planning permission the Highway Authority would recommend a suitable planning condition to control this point of access." The Highway Authority considered the Albert Street access acceptable, subject to condition. The application was referred to Development Management Committee due to the contrary view of the Town Council. Prior to the Committee meeting the plans were amended to omit the Albert Street access.

5.4 Planning permission for application ref 4/1895/07/FUL was refused at Development Management Committee in March 2008, on the grounds that the proposed loss of office accommodation within this location would result in significant harm to the overall employment land supply within Tring, inadequate off-street parking and increased pressure for on-street parking, exacerbating existing parking problems and detrimental impact on highway safety.

5.5 The application was subsequently allowed on appeal, with the Planning Inspector making reference to parking and highways safety, "I noted during my site visit a good deal of on-street parking, which, due to the narrowness of the surrounding streets, restricted some carriageways to the width of a single lane." The Inspector went on to say, "Any reduction in parking congestion in local streets, particularly if it lessened the degree of pavement parking that I have witnessed, would bring clear benefits to pedestrians, riders and drivers in terms of highway safety."

5.6 This consent won on appeal has not been implemented and the site still operates as mainly office use, but with the semi-basement area used as a dance studio.

4/01417/17/FUL ADDITION OF TWO SASH WINDOWS AT FIRST FLOOR LEVEL ON SOUTH ELEVATION TO MATCH EXISTING.
Granted
14/08/2017

4/00593/17/FUL RETENTION OF ALTERATIONS TO EAST AND WEST ELEVATIONS INCLUDING FORMATION OF OPENING IN EXISTING CAVITY BRICK WALL
Granted
03/05/2017

4/02590/16/NMA NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION 4/00166/16/FUL (ALTERATIONS TO EAST AND SOUTH ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING OFFICE BUILDING)
Granted
21/10/2016

4/00166/16/FUL ALTERATIONS TO EAST AND SOUTH ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING OFFICE BUILDING
Granted
04/04/2016

4/00385/10/FUL CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR ONLY FROM B1 TO D2
Granted
06/07/2010

4/01895/07/FUL	EIGHT APARTMENTS, COMMERCIAL FLOORSPACE AND ASSOCIATED PARKING Refused at DMC Allowed at Appeal 02/04/2008
4/00433/96/FUL	INSERTION OF ROOFLIGHT ON THE SOUTH EAST ELEVATION Granted 28/05/1996
4/01619/95/4	SITING OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT CABINET Granted 09/01/1996
4/00828/90/FUL	APPLICATION TO RE-OPEN AND RE-UTILISE VEHICULAR ACCESS Refused 30/07/1990

6. Policies [list relevant /key policies only]

6.1 National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy

CS4, CS8, CS12, CS13, CS27

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10, 12, 58

6.5 Advice Notes and Appraisals

- Tring Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals (Draft January 2018)

7. Constraints

- GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AREA
- AREA OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE
- Former Land Use
- CONSERVATION AREA

8. Representations

Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B

9. Considerations

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle
- Impact on Street Scene & Conservation Area
- Impact on Highway Safety & Access
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Parking

Policy and Principle

9.2 The application site is located in an urban area of Tring, wherein non-residential development is acceptable, provided it is compatible with its surroundings, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS4.

Impact on Street Scene/Conservation Area

9.3 The proposed dropped kerb would have no impact on the streetscene. There are other examples of dropped kerbs in the immediate vicinity, such as 50 Albert Street (Tring Yoga Studio) and land to the rear of 63 Akeman Street, which is directly opposite the proposed dropped kerb. The Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the proposal, noting that the street furniture in this area is modern and of minimal interest. The proposal includes the replacement of the fence with a gate. It is deemed reasonable and necessary to impose a condition regarding the details of the proposed gate to ensure that they are in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area.

Impact on Highway Safety & Access

9.4 Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have an increased impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways. Several local residents and the Ward Councillor have raised concerns regarding the potential danger of vehicles exiting onto Albert Street, increased traffic and heavy goods vehicles using the access point. The applicant has indicated that they would be willing to make the vehicular access as entry only from Albert Street. This would be verified by the submission of entry/exit restrictions.

9.5 Regarding heavy goods vehicles, it is deemed reasonable and necessary to impose a restrictive condition to prevent commercial vehicles using the access point. The condition will require details of mechanisms to be employed on the Albert Street access point to prevent unauthorised use - this may include pin gate entry systems, height limiters or raised comb spike devices for example.

9.6 Local residents mentioned that the parking of vehicles on the pavement pushes some pavement users out onto the road, such as wheelchair users or pushchairs. It is considered that the proposed dropped kerb would result in a betterment to this situation as it would result in less parking on the street and/or pavement.

9.7 64-66 Akeman Street has an agreement to vehicular and pedestrian access from Akeman Business Park. The agreement is not reciprocal, and therefore the Albert Street access will only be used by 64-66 Akeman Street, to access the 7 parking spaces serving 64-66.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

9.8 Local residents have raised concerns regarding the use of the access by commercial vehicles in an area that is residential in character. As outlined above a restrictive condition will be imposed in order to prevent commercial vehicles using the access. The access will also be limited to site entry. These conditions are deemed to be reasonable in order to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Parking

9.9 No changes are proposed to the existing off-street parking arrangements for 64-66 Akeman Street. 7 car parking spaces would be retained.

9.10 Local residents and the Ward Councillor have mentioned that a number of on-street parking spaces would be lost, which would have a detrimental impact upon local parking provision. The proposed dropped kerb would measure 3m wide. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not result in the loss of any more than one space and that it will not have a significant detrimental impact upon local parking provision.

Archaeology

9.11 The County Archaeologist has raised no objection to the proposal, noting that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets with archaeological interest

Response to Neighbour comments

9.12 Some local residents have expressed concerns regarding the fact that the access is for pedestrians only and that it should remain as such. There is no Public Right of Way over the application site and the application site is privately owned.

10. Conclusions

10.1 The impacts of the proposal have been considered, taking into account concerns raised by the Ward Councillor and local residents. It is acknowledged that dropped kerb would prevent vehicles parking on a 3m strip of road/pavement. The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal, noting that the dropped kerb and access will not have an adverse impact upon the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable, subject to restrictive conditions that limit the access to be used by non-commercial vehicles entering the site only.

11. RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the reasons referred to above and subject to the following conditions:

No	Condition
----	-----------

1	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>
2	<p>Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted full details of the proposed commercial vehicle entry/exit restriction mechanisms for Albert Street shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved mechanisms/systems shall be installed prior to the commencement of development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. They shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS12.</p>
3	<p>There shall be no vehicular egress on to Albert Street. Full details of measures to prevent vehicular egress on to Albert Street shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be provided prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted and they shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS12.</p>
4	<p>The development hereby permitted may not be brought into use until details of the gate have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the work shall then be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> In the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS27.</p>
5	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>DK/18/03</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS12.</p> <p><u>Article 35</u> Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town</p>

and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

INFORMATIVES

1. The Highway Authority requires the alterations to or the construction of the vehicle crossovers to be undertaken such that the works are carried out to their specification and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.), the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. The applicant may need to apply to Highways (Telephone 0300 1234047) to arrange this, or use link:-

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/droppedkerbs/>

2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

3. Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website

<http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Appendix A

Consultation responses

Comments received from Tring Town Council:

The Council recommended no objection to this application

Comments received from Highway Authority:

Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not object to the development, subject to the informative notes.

COMMENTS

This application is for Dropped kerb and crossover , to the rear of the sit on Albert Street.

PARKING AND ACCESS

No parking information was submitted with this application.

A new VXO is proposed on Albert Street, which is an unclassified local access road with a speed limit of 30 mph, so vehicles are not required to enter and exit the site in forward gear.

CONCLUSION

Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have an increased impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways.

Comments received from Herts Archaeology:

In this instance we consider that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets with archaeological interest, and we have no comment to make upon the proposal.

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Address	Comments
47 Albert Street	<p>I object to this application for a cross over and drop kerb at this property.</p> <p>This access has been for pedestrians only and should remain so. As you can see from the photographs supplied this is a very congested area for cars and parking. This development will negatively impact on parking in the street.</p> <p>The access is insufficient to allow cars to safely turn from a blind entrance. It wild produce more traffic in a tightly congested area. This will potentially involve delivery lorries attempting to access the industrial estate either entering or leaving the area. Problems already exist with the collection of refuse from this building and the public highway being blocked by industrial bins.</p> <p>This site has previously had planning permission granted</p>

	<p>following appeal for mixed residential and commercial use. As part of this planning application this area was maintained as pedestrian access only because of the impact on the locality, road noise, tight configuration. It needs to remain as is</p> <p>Further comments received: As one of the two holders of a residents disabled parking space in Albert street this proposed loss of parking will be detrimental to me as I already struggle to compete with visitors to the museum and the akeman who misuse my disabled parking space. The officie applying for this planning permission are repeat offenders of parking in or over my designated parking space which as a hand controls user makes it impossible for me to access the space provided. Parking in the street is already so limited that access is constantly a problem. A proposed loss of 4 spaces would have a huge impact on the street alone even if you don't consider its two disabled residents as well as many more with access needs simply wanting to park their car and go into their house. This loss of 4 spaces could result in me having to move from my home and brings great anxiety and stress.</p> <p>Further comments received: The property borders a residential area and the fence/gate was put in to allow workers to access the rear of building. The owners then sold their parking spaces to Oakman Inns reducing outside space and parking for their staff to Nil. Now they say they want to have dropped kerb in order to prevent parking to make accessing their rubbish bins easier. This will result in the loss of 4 spaces on Albert St. It is very poor of DBC planning and Herts Highways to support this application without visiting the site and just indicative of the authorities not supporting/understanding the everyday situation for residents. The area is swamped with cars from the Museum and local restaurants, indeed with the recent refurbishment of the Akeman pub we had up to 8 builders vans parked daily for 6 weeks. The owners were aware and unable to stop their contractors from doing so despite asking. The really gauling thing is that the staff from 64-66 Akeman St park here every day compounding their bin problem.</p>
61 Akeman Street	<p>I object to this application for a cross over and drop kerb at this property.</p> <p>This access has been for pedestrians only and should remain so. As you can see from the photographs supplied this is a very congested area and the business park already has two access points for veichles on Akeman street and Langdon street. A third access is excessive given the residential location, and justification of bin</p>

	<p>access which can be fulfilled using other entrances.</p> <p>I own the drive way adjacent to the Salvation Army building and will be directly impacted with a increase of traffic as a result of the application, and fear this will block my driveway further. Additionally I have asked for the H-Bar to repainted by both Dacorum and Herts which has been refused twice, despite being access to private land.</p>
43 Albert Street	<p>There seems to have been no consultation to the residents of the conservation area on this application.</p> <p>This is a pedestrian access and I believe has had an application refused before.</p> <p>On the grounds of this area already being very congested and dangerous to pedestrians I object to this application. Increased traffic, heavy goods vehicles and additional parking and noise to local residents is not preferable and should be considered.</p>
41 Albert Street	<p>Albert Street is a Victorian, well maintained residential street that just about manages to keep parking issues to a minimum amongst existing residents and other users. I strongly object to this planning proposal of a dropped kerb to allow non-essential access for a few business users, when there are ample DBC car parks less than 5 minutes walk from this building.</p> <p>Further access to cars entering and leaving Albert Street and the adjoining Akeman Street junction will greatly increase risk of pedestrian and vehicle accidents on this blind spot junction, the paths are narrow and Akeman St has no speed restrictions yet, so cars frequently speed across the junction with Albert St. Children and elderly people live in Akeman St, Albert St and would be at increased risk of road safety accidents with additional traffic based on this proposal.</p> <p>I am disappointed DBC Conservation do not object to the proposal. As residents, our objections must be upheld to prevent this planning proposal.</p> <p>Further comments received: I object strongly to this application. Industrial bins should be collected from WITHIN the industrial estate-into which there is ALREADY ample access. Creating an entrance into the industrial estate from Albert St will result in the loss of up to three parking spaces in Albert St; where parking conditions are already intolerable. The further increase in traffic flow into Albert St would also constitute a clear safety issue, in a road where pedestrians (including mothers and small children) are already, often forced to walk in the road. The small improvement in convenience for the Applicant is outweighed enormously by the detrimental impact on residents and might most charitably be described as "the tail wagging the dog."</p>

38 Albert Street	<p>We live on Albert Street and this is a heavily congested residential area, the people who live here will only suffer further with goods vehicles and delivery vehicles using this proposed access road. The business park already causes issues to the residents by leaving business bins in the road.</p> <p>Due to the tight nature of the road I don't see how there would even be room to make turns. Has a site visit been made? This is a reckless decision for a residential street and will have a heavy impact in terms of noise and disruption to the people who live here.</p> <p>Further comments received: Having read the submission / proposal for the access I am struggling to understand the utter ignorance here, how can residents of Albert Street affect 64/68 Akeman Street, this is pure geography, how we park on Albert has no reflection on Akeman St. Please visit Albert Street to understand that as residents we do not enjoy "free parking" due to the business park we in fact enjoy the absolute opposite, by close of business a lot of cars disappear as they enjoy the free parking of our road.</p> <p>With regards to the Euro bins that are referenced in the proposal, several residents have repeatedly complained as said "site manager" does not wheel them any distance and in fact abandons them in them in Albert Street for days on end, if we don't complain they are left there from week to week, which is disgusting. I have a lot of photographic evidence to prove this matter.</p> <p>Again, have you visited this road and do you have any understanding of what you are considering.</p>
40 Albert Street	<p>Objection made for application of dropped curb and crossover. Parking on Albert Street is already stretched to its maximum. To further reduce residents space to park by introducing a dropped curb will make it impossible for residents to park in their own street. It would also be very dangerous for cars to be entering/exiting in such a small street with virtually no angle of turning.</p>
46 Albert Street	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed change of use as it will impact significantly on the integrity of this road in the Conservation area.</p> <p>The application states that the reason for the change is due to the road being narrow, with cars parked on the pavement allowing for only single lane vehicle access. Changing the access at the rear of 64/66 will only compound these current traffic and pedestrian difficulties as well congestion as opposite the access route are 2 private drives and the former Salvation Army Hall being</p>

	<p>used daily as a busy yoga business.</p> <p>The proposed long term development of the site into housing and business will only increase traffic volume and the access is narrow, inappropriate and has restricted vision and is therefore totally unsuited for the proposed use.</p>
2A Albert Street	<p>This is an incredibly selfish application. It will make the existing parking difficulties residents face in the evening even worse by removing at least one space. It seems the application is based on the fact the one person has to push a bin once a week. Surely it is not fair that dozens of residents are impacted every day to make one person's life easier once a week? Also is this a legitimate use of council money if they have to pay for the dropped curb??</p>
14 Albert Street	<p>I object to this application. The detriment caused to the residents of Albert Street with the installation of the dropped curb will be far greater than any detriment caused to the applicant if this application is rejected.</p> <p>A large proportion of residents in Albert Street are families with young children. It is already notoriously difficult for residents to find a parking space outside their homes and to negotiate children and luggage in and out safely. This has already been exacerbated by workers at the Akeman Business Centre using Albert Street as an overflow car park. This causes a fundamental detriment to the residents. The installation of a dropped curb will further reduce the available parking for residents on the road and would result in an intolerable situation.</p> <p>Furthermore, increase traffic on Albert Street will give rise to a foreseeable risk to health and safety. Albert Street is so narrow that residents are required to park on the right-hand pavement, blocking it entirely. Pedestrians are therefore required to use the road itself as a pavement. Diverting traffic up Albert Street to gain access to the business centre will therefore create an unsafe traffic route with a mix of pedestrians and vehicles. Finally, it is to be pointed out that increasing the traffic flow through a very narrow road will also increase the likelihood of vehicle collisions with parked cars.</p>
48 Albert Street	<p>We strongly object against this proposal.</p> <p>Parking is already a big problem for residents. Removing a further car parking space will only add to the frustration.</p> <p>This is a very excessive proposal just to satisfy the needs of one person, who once a week has to wheel a bin a very small distance!!</p>
4 Albert Street	<p>The application suggests the proposed dropped kerb is in Akeman St, but it's actually in Albert St, a narrow</p>

	<p>residential road in the CONSERVATION AREA. Parking is at breaking point and the loss of further spaces unviable. The business park already has two other wide vehicle accesses, in Akeman St and Langdon St where bin lorries can actually drive in and pick up the bins. Albert St cannot accommodate a vehicle access. This dropped kerb is not about the bins, it's about creating access for his housing development. And Albert Street cannot safely accommodate increased traffic.</p> <p>His interests are solely financial, so I hope the council will not put his business interests above residents.</p> <p>Perhaps a planning rep should visit the site? You might also agree the applicant's site offers potential for allocating parking spaces for the residents of Albert St. With the switch to electric charging points this could save the Council an enormous headache. And we could use the existing accesses!</p>
2B Albert Street	<p>I object to the above planning permission as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Increased parking in Albert St which is already overcrowded. . Increased congestion in Albert St, which is not suitable for any volume of traffic. <p>The above 2 items will have an adverse affect on the wellbeing of the residents of Albert St on the basis of them not being able to park near their residences. This raises questions of health and safety due to elderly people and young families with children having to walk in the road as the pavements are used for parking and will increasingly disallow access for disabled and elderly people to enter or leave their residences. The probable increase in vehicle usage will have an adverse affect on the road surface which will potentially cause the volume of potholes in the road which will increase H&S concerns and increased costs for the Council.</p>
45 Albert Street	<p>We strongly object to this application. The site already has 2 established entrances and the creation of a 3rd is unnecessary for such a compact site. Albert Street is a Victorian Street in the conservation area, as stated many times, parking is at capacity, the loss of the kerb would have a further negative impact on the residents ability to park. Damage to cars is a regular occurrence and the movement of commercial bins would add a further risk in such a tight space. We also have concerns for the health and safety of predestrians as there is restricted views from this area. A site visit would confirm the residents concerns.</p>