

Item No.	Classification:	Meeting date:	Meeting Name:
7.1	Open	11 December 2012	Planning Sub-Committee B
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 12/AP/0375 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 34-36 VERNEY ROAD, LONDON, SE16 3DH Proposal: Change of use from offices (Class B1) / general industrial (Class B2) / storage or distribution (Class B8) to operations centre for a coach company with parking and storage (Sui Generis) / (Class B1) for up to 20 vehicles and coaches of varying sizes and increase of width of existing crossover.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Livesey		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 3 May 2012		Application Expiry Date 10 January 2013	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant planning permission subject to a Grampian condition.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 The application is before Members as it is a major application and thirteen letters of objection have been received.

Site location and description

- 3 The site comprises a tall single storey industrial type building with approximately 850sqm of internal floor space. The site has a total site area of approximately 1500sqm and is located within the Urban Density Zone, the Old Kent Road preferred industrial location, Extended Archaeological Priority Zone and Air Quality Management Area.
- 4 Since submission of the application in March 2012 the use has commenced and as to date neither the Planning Enforcement Team or the Highways Team have received any complaints.

Details of proposal

- 5 The application relates to a change of use from offices (Class B1) / general industrial (Class B2) / storage or distribution (Class B8) to an operations centre for a coach company with parking and storage (Sui Generis) and an associated office (Use Class B1). The existing building would not be altered and has capacity to park up to 20 coaches of varying sizes inside. The coaches were previously stored / parked in a yard at Vauxhall in the London Borough of Lambeth.
- 6 It is also proposed to increase the width of an existing crossover from 6m to 7.5m.
- 7 The 20 vehicles would comprise 5 fifty three seat coaches, 8 thirty three seat coaches

and 7 sixteen seat coaches. The coaches would be tightly parked within the building and will be checked / serviced within the building and accessed by mobile lifts / platforms. A total of 6 off street car parking spaces for use by staff would be provided in the front yard.

- 8 The coaches would be washed down in the yard in front of the building and minor servicing and repairs would be carried out when the coaches are parked inside the building. Deep cleaning would be carried out at a commercial coach wash at Victoria coach station and major servicing would take place on a rotational basis at the premises of independent vehicle repair garages.
- 9 A total of 27 staff would be employed. In addition to 20 drivers, a total of 7 jobs would be created on site comprising 5 office staff and 2 mechanics.

Planning history

- 10 TP2354-34/PS: Planning permission was granted on 20 October 1987 for a change of use of 34-40 Verney Road from light industrial (Use Class B2) to printers (Use Class B2).
- 11 Despite the above approval the applicant states that the site has been used as an archive by the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce since 1987. The actual historic use of the site is therefore likely to be storage (Use Class B8).

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 12 32 Verney Road
10-AP-1611: An application for a change of use from a paper recycling centre (sui generis) to Use Class B2 (general industrial) purposes was granted on 1 September 2011. This has been implemented and the site is currently in use as a car repair and maintenance workshop specialising in 'London black cabs' (Use Class B2).
- 13 38-40 Verney Road:
11-AP-2724: Planning permission was granted on 19 January 2012 for a retrospective change of use from a waste paper recycling (Sui Generis) to a waste recycling and recovery facility (Use Class B2). The site is currently still used as such.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 14 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a) the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies.
 - b) the impact on amenity of neighbouring properties.
 - c) the impact on highway and pedestrian safety issues.

Planning policy

Core Strategy 2011

- 15 Strategic policy 1 (Sustainable development)
Strategic policy 2 (Sustainable transport)
Strategic policy 10 (Jobs and Business)

Strategic policy 13 (High environmental standards)

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 16 Policy 1.2 (Strategic and preferred industrial locations)
Policy 3.1 (Environmental effects)
Policy 3.2 (Protection of amenity)
Policy 3.3 (Sustainability Assessments)
Policy 3.6 (Air quality)
Policy 3.11 (Efficient use of land)
Policy 5.2 (Transport impacts)
Policy 5.3 (Walking and cycling)
Policy 5.6 (Car parking)
- 17 For 12 months from 27 March 2012 weight can continue to be given to relevant local planning policies adopted in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and those in the London Plan, in making decisions on planning applications even if there is a limited degree of conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The weight given to the saved policies of the Southwark Plan should be according to their degree of consistency with policies in the NPPF.

London Plan 2011

- 18 Policy 2.17 Strategic industrial locations
Policy 4.4 Managing industrial land and premises
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
Policy 7.14 Improving air quality
Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 19 Sections:
 - 1. Building a strong, competitive economy
 - 4. Promoting sustainable transport
 - 10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 - 11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Principle of development

- 20 Saved Policy 1.2 'Strategic and preferred industrial locations' of the Southwark Plan 2007 and Strategic Policy 10 'Jobs and businesses' of the Core Strategy 2011 advises that in these areas planning permission will only be granted for development falling within 'B' use class, and 'Sui Generis' use class industries which are inappropriate in residential areas.
- 21 The use of the site as an operations centre in association with the storage and light maintenance, cleaning and distribution of vehicles would be a Sui Generis use. While on the balance of probabilities the last lawful use of the site is likely to be a B8 use class, the proposed mix of uses (B1 Use Class/Sui Generis) would not conflict with saved Policy 1.2 and Policy 10 and as such the scheme is acceptable in land use terms. The proposal would also bring a site which has been vacant since July 2011 back into use, thereby complying with section 1 'Building a strong competitive economy' of the NPPF in securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity.

Environmental impact assessment

- 22 An Environmental Statement is not required with this application as the development does not fall within Schedule 1 or 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999.
- 23 The site does not exceed 0.5ha (being 0.15ha), and therefore is not classified as a Schedule 2 'urban development project'. It is considered that the development is unlikely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location based upon a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development.
- 24 The site has an established use as offices/general industrial/storage use, and is located outside a sensitive area as per Regulation 2(1) and the development is unlikely to generate any significant environmental effects. Therefore an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area

- 25 Saved Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity and Strategic Policy 13 High Environmental Standards state that the Council will not allow development where it leads to a loss of amenity for neighbours. The amenity issues arising are considered to be any noise and disturbance in connection with activities arising from vehicles movements and washing of vehicles in the front yard. These issues form the basis of the majority of the letters of objection.
- 26 The proposed use would, in addition to 20 drivers, generate a total of 7 jobs on site comprising 5 office staff and 2 mechanics. The office staff would work between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday and the mechanics between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday. In this case it is likely that vehicular movements would be predominantly during weekdays between 7am and 6pm. There is no objection to these hours as a Preferred Industrial Location (PIL) is intended as an area where a business could operate seven days a week without any operating hours restrictions if it wished to do so. It is likely that any noise and disturbance in connection with activities arising from vehicles movements outside of the above hours would be less due to reduced activity on site.
- 27 The coaches would be washed down in the yard in front of the building. The distance between the side elevation and rear garden of No. 12 Ryder Drive and the front boundary of the site is approximately 16m and as there are no windows to this elevation, combined with the potentially limited activity and likely daytime hours of washing down vehicles, it is considered that this aspect of the proposal would not be detrimental to the amenity of residential properties to the north along Ryder Drive.
- 28 As the site forms part of an industrial estate the use would not be detrimental to other similar uses located immediately to the east, west and south.

Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

- 29 The site falls within a Preferred Industrial Location where permission is usually only granted for development within the 'B' use class and 'Sui Generis' use class, which are inappropriate in residential areas. Other similar uses are located immediately to the east, west and south and it is not considered that these uses would have a detrimental impact on the proposed use.

Traffic issues

- 30 Strategic Policy 2 Sustainable Transport of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies 5.2 Transport Impacts and 5.3 Walking of the Southwark Plan aim to ensure that developments do not have harmful traffic impacts and make provision for sustainable forms of movement. Section 4 'Promoting sustainable transport' of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- 31 The transports impacts that could potentially arise from this development are increased vehicle trips around the site, congestion along Verney Road if coaches park on the street and hazards to road users and pedestrians from widening the existing crossover. Transport issues have been raised in the letters of objection.
- 32 Details of the proposed parking arrangements for 20 coaches inside the existing building is shown on drawing number Pro BP.
- 33 The applicant recently relocated from a depot in Vauxhall where they had 17 vehicles and employed 10 full time and 4 part time drivers. Their office staff comprised 4 members of staff.
- 34 The 10 full time drivers travelled to work using the following modes of transport: 2 by motorcycle, 4 by public transport, 3 by car and 1 by cycle. The 4 part time drivers traveled to work using the following modes of transport: 2 by public transport, 1 by public transport/car and 1 by car. Office staff travelled to work using the following modes of transport: 2 by car share, 1 by car and 1 by public transport. The applicant submitted a plan showing 7 off-street car parking spaces in the front yard.
- 35 The widening of the gate / crossover is to allow easy access and egress to and from the front yard and will lead to reduction of up to 2 on street car parking spaces to the west of the new crossover.
- 36 The applicant states that although the existing building has capacity for more than 20 coaches and thereby the future expansion of the company they have no current plans to expand.
- 37 The applicant states that the coaches are used for pre-booked private hire and that school groups make up a large proportion of the client base.
- 38 The applicant submitted data showing the levels of coach movements for their fleet of 16 vehicles at their previous premises at Vauxhall. Coach movements were at its highest on weekday mornings from 7am onwards and all the coaches returned to the site by 6pm on week days. There were few vehicular movements at weekends. It is estimated that the frequency of coach movements to and from the new site would be similar to the previous pattern as described above and no objection is raised by the Council's transport planning team.
- 39 The applicant states that coach drivers would travel to and from the site by either public transport or private cars. It is not known how many staff would use public transport although it is unlikely to be high given the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of the site of 1 (low). The applicant previously needed 7 car parking spaces (at the Vauxhall site). The applicant states that if more than 7 cars are used by staff to travel to work the additional demand can be accommodated either in the front yard or within the garage, as the spaces become available as coaches are removed and cars are parked in unallocated spaces. Despite this arrangements officer consider that, as the site is not located within a controlled parking zone, there is adequate on street parking capacity to accommodate additional on street parking associated with some staff using private vehicles to travel to and from the site.

- 40 The applicant has proposed to increase the existing vehicular crossover from 6m to 7.5m. If the crossover were left at a width of 6m it is likely that transport impacts would arise from coaches manoeuvring in order to leave and enter the site. The wider crossover would facilitate and be adequate to allow the larger 53 seat coaches to enter and leave the site in forward gear without causing traffic congestion along this section of Verney Road.
- 41 Although the wider crossover would result in the loss of up to 2 on street parking spaces it is unlikely to result in undue on street parking pressure along Verney Road. The transport officer did not raise this as an issue.
- 42 A tracking plan which shows the widened site entrance shows that a space of 4.5m to the west needs to be kept clear to allow adequate space for coaches to manoeuvre . This provision will be secured by a legal restriction, double yellow lines, to keep this area clear of parking. The application has agreed to enter into a Section 278 agreement in this regard. This is covered by a Grampian condition.
- 43 Although none of the other sites operating large vehicles in the immediate vicinity have double yellow lines, a number further to the east have white lining and “keep clear” markings.
- 44 Verney Road has traffic restrictions through the residential area approaching Ilderton Road, which includes width restriction pinchpoints and road humps, as well as signage stating “unsuitable for HGVs”. As a result, the coaches all travel to and from the west, to access Rotherhithe New Road. As no coaches will be turning towards the east, these movements are not shown on the tracking plan.
- 45 As the sightlines and visibility splays are as existing there is no objection in respect of highway and pedestrian safety matters. Given the wider pavement on the northern side of Verney Road it is likely that the pedestrian movement on the southern pavement would be less. Given the mixed industrial and residential nature of the area pedestrian movement along Verney Road is much less than roads outside, to the north of the industrial estate.
- 46 The Southwark Plan requires B2 uses to provide 1 cycle parking space per 500m², a minimum of two spaces in this case. There is no specific standard for sui generis uses. However, there is sufficient space on the site for a limited number of stands should this be required.
- 47 In light of the proposed vehicle parking layout within the existing building it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to a condition ensuring that no more than 6 cars are parked in the front yard to enable the applicant to move coaches into the yard when they are manoeuvring other vehicles / coaches within the building. The front yard is 25m deep and 19m wide and it is considered that if the above condition is adhered to this space would be suitable to ensure that there would be no overspill of coaches onto Verney Road.
- 48 It is concluded that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of section 4 'Promoting sustainable transport' of the NPPF as the residual cumulative impacts of development would not be severe.

Design issues

- 49 There are no design issues to consider as no external alterations to the existing building are proposed.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area

- 50 There are no listed buildings within the vicinity of the site and the site is not located within a conservation area.

Impact on trees

- 51 None identified.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 52 None identified.

Sustainable development implications

- 53 As no external alterations are proposed and the proposal is for change of use only, there is no scope to insist that energy efficiency be improved.

The Sustainability Assessment concludes that:

The Transport Assessment summarises that the development fits well within the predominant existing local land uses, with lower trip generation than a light industrial usage of a comparable size.

The environmental effect of noise created by the use of coaches is in context with its 'strategic and preferred industrial location' and the pollution created by the movement of vehicles will not substantiate to a level that is a concern to air quality.

The site will provide 20 jobs and increase employment opportunities in the area.

The proposed development will provide a more efficient use of the site combined with an environmental impact that is less than an equivalent industrial use of its size.

As the completed Sustainability Assessment Checklist (Appendix 1) and the summary points above provide evidence that the proposed use and scale of this development is sustainable it is recommended that in terms of sustainability this development should be granted planning permission.

Other matters

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

- 54 S143 of the Localism Act 2011 states that any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive in the payment of CIL as a material 'local financial consideration' in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail.
- 55 The previous use of the site ended on 31 July 2011 and as the site has been in use as an operations centre for a coach company with parking and storage (Sui Generis) / (Class B1) since approximately April 2012 the following CIL payment is due as this is an unauthorised use:
- 56 Floorspace of building is 850sqm x £35 per sqm = £29,750.00.

Flood risk:

- 57 The site falls within Flood Zone 3a but is defended to a 1 in 1000 year standard by the Thames Tidal Defences. The proposed development is for a change of use from more vulnerable to less vulnerable.
- 58 Due to the nature of the development it is considered that a flood risk assessment (FRA) is not necessary in this instance.

Environmental issues:

- 59 Environmental issues have been assessed in terms of Strategic Policy 11 Open spaces and wildlife of the Core Strategy, saved Policy 3.28 Biodiversity of the Southwark Plan 2007 and section 11 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 60 The impact on air quality is the main environmental matter that is considered to be a material consideration. This issue has been raised in the letters of objection.
- 61 This site is within an Air Quality Management Area where planning permission is usually granted for development where it would not lead to a reduction in air quality. Although no air quality assessment report has been submitted it is considered that given the industrial nature of the environment and the nature of adjacent sites as a waste recycling and recovery facility and a vehicle repair garage respectively the impact on air quality would be negligible. The Council's Environmental Protection Team did not object to the proposal.

62 Consultation:

Objectors raised concerns about the consultation process, particularly that a property in Ryder Drive received a consultation letter on 25 April 2012. The local planning authority sent consultation letters to neighbouring properties, including some along Ryder Drive, on 27 March 2012 and the 21 day consultation period ended on 19 April 2012. It is not known why delivery of the consultation letter was delayed in this instance.

- 63 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.
- 64 Members should note that this application has been advertised by means of site notice and in the press and consultation by individual letter has been undertaken over an area surrounding the site. As such, officers are satisfied that the type of extent of consultation meets the Council's consultation policy as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 65 The use of the site as an operations centre for a coach company with parking and storage (Sui Generis) and an associated office (Use Class B1) is policy compliant and it is considered that the proposal would not be detrimental to the amenity of adjacent properties. The transports impacts would not lead to an unacceptable level of vehicle trips around the site and as the coach parking and associated vehicular manoeuvring movements would be within the site would not lead to congestion along Verney Road.

Community impact statement

- 66 In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual

orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.

a) The impact on local people is set out above.

b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified as above.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above.

Consultations

67 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

69 Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

70 Summary of consultation responses

Thirteen letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns:

Environmental:

The ventilation of the exhaust fumes if all 20 coaches start at the same time will have an adverse effect on the air quality.

An environmental assessment would be required.

This development is not in keeping with the local environment and will be hugely disruptive to the dense residential area of Ryder Drive.

Amenity:

Noise and pollution would be detrimental to residential properties to the north of the site.

Potential noise due to unsocial operating times.

Transport issues:

Traffic congestion along Verney Road.

Increased number of vehicles using Verney Road.

Increased parking stress along Verney Road.

The development would impede the flow of traffic on and make the use of Verney road increasingly hazardous.

The company to which this application refers is already conducting works at the site and is using the entire length of Verney road for the use of its vehicles - 3 buses were parked down the other end of Verney road and nowhere near the proposed site. This shows that the impacts of this planning approval would not be limited to the immediate vicinity and disruption would be widespread.

Other matters:

Inadequate consultation.

Human rights implications

- 71 This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.
- 72 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a coach company business at this location. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2354-34 Application file: 12/AP/0375 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5457 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Andre Verster, Team Leader (Planning)	
Version	Final	
Dated	17 August 2012	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director, Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	29 November 2012	

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 15/03/2012

Press notice date: 7/06/2012

Case officer site visit date: 17/04/2012

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 27/03/2012

Internal services consulted:

Transport
Environmental Protection

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

14 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

13 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

12 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

38-40 VERNEY ROAD LONDON SE16 3DH

34-36 VERNEY ROAD LONDON SE16 3DH

15 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

11 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

7 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

32 VERNEY ROAD LONDON SE16 3DH

ALLARD HOUSE 18 VERNEY ROAD LONDON SE16 3DH

10 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

9 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

8 RYDER DRIVE LONDON SE16 3BB

Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Community Safety Labour Councillor for Livesey Ward (Councillor Livingstone)

Re-consultation:

N/a

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Transport:

No objection subject to a condition that the front yard be kept clear to ensure that there is space for coaches to manoeuvre into and out of the building.

Environmental Protection:

No objections. However since the operation is within a air quality management area this department would like as an informative for management to ensure that coaches are not left parked outside with their engines running.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency:

No objection.

Neighbours and local groups

Thirteen letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns:

Proposed use / business:

The introduction of this business is entirely out of keeping with the existing industrial activities that occupy Verney Road, particularly as operations would not be restricted to usual hours of business.

Inadequate Consultation:

A resident at a property in Ryder Drive received the consultation letter nearly 2 weeks after the 12 April 2012 (on 25 April) and states that this was the only notification received to make them aware of the proposed developemnt. Concerns were raised that this has not allowed residents to raise objections within the stipulated time period (21 days).

Environmental Impact Assessment:

The details of the planning application also state that under the heading of "environmental Impact assessment status" that this is "Not required by Regs & nothing submitted". The objector believes that this is incorrect as an environmental assessment would be required due to the close proximity of the site to a dense residential and the inevitable increase in:

- Air pollution
- Noise pollution
- Congestion

- Risk of injury to other road users (pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicle users)

Environmental:

The ventilation of the exhaust fumes if all 20 coaches start at the same time will have an adverse effect on the air quality.

Amenity:

A dense residential area is located extremely close to the site meaning that the resultant noise and air pollution would have significant negative externalities on a large number of people:

The exhausts generating air pollution could be as close as 5 metres from the open windows of the closest residents, should coaches be manoeuvring or stationary with their engines on at the north side of the road.

Buses/coaches operate outside standard hours and when reversing have a loud & audible warning sound, especially when in close proximity, resulting in disruption to residents with young children (of which there are many in Ryder drive), and other residents' sleeping/relaxation patterns.

It is not clear what the operating hours would be. Generally coach operators operate from all hours of the day to satisfy the demands of customers. If coaches are required to be working in the early hours it would lead to major vehicle movements at unsociable hours due to space issues on the site.

Transport issues:

The proposal would result in a negative impact on health and safety in the area as the large vehicles with significant blind spots could potentially injure all types of road user and pedestrians and Verney Road is a key access road and through-road.

Verney Road is the key access road to Ryder Drive and the surrounding residential area. The congestion caused by large vehicles both parked and manoeuvring on the highway, in addition to the extra vehicles belonging to employees based at the site being parked there, would significantly hamper the free flow and movement of traffic to the detriment of road safety.

Verney Road is not a wide road and with current parking numbers two cars can just pass each other. If coaches are parked on the road only one vehicle will be able to pass at a time. The proposed development would lead to increased parking stress and congestion along Verney Road.

The proposed development would have approximately 25 employees on site. This will mean that more parking would be required for their vehicles. It is a fair walk from the nearest public transport links and it is unlikely that half of the employees would use public transport. As the front yard would be used to manoeuvre coaches into and out of the building staff could not use the yard to park their vehicles.

Twenty coaches will require a lot of parking space and it is likely that coaches would be moved on to Verney Road during the day. This will have a horrendous effect on accessibility on Verney Road.

In the past there have been significant problems resulting from heavy goods vehicles parking along Verney Road, blocking the main route in and out of the Bohamy Estate located to the north of the site. There are concerns that a coach company could create similar problems given the size of the vehicles in question.

The widening of the existing crossover would lead to the loss of one on street car parking space. This would increase on street car parking stress along Verney Road.

Other:

The proposal will reduce the residential property prices in the vicinity for the reasons cited above.