

DELEGATED

AGENDA NO.

REPORT TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 2nd August 2006

**REPORT OF CORPORATE
DIRECTOR, DEVELOPMENT AND
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES**

06/1561/OUT

654-656 YARM ROAD EAGLESCLIFFE STOCKTON-ON-TEES

**OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF NURSING HOME AND
ASSOCIATED MEANS OF ACCESS (DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PAIR OF SEMI-
DETACHED DWELLINGS)**

EXPIRES 17 AUGUST 2006

SUMMARY

The outline application proposes the demolition of a pair of semi-detached Victorian dwellings and the erection of a 75 bed nursing home. The site is to be found between 658 Yarm Road to the south and properties on Highfield Drive to the north.

A Supporting Planning Statement, Transport Statement, Condition Survey of 654 and 656 Yarm Road, a Bat and Barn Owl Survey and Pre-development Arboricultural Report accompanied the application documents.

The indicative plans show an 'H' shaped 2.5 storey building following the same orientation as the existing buildings. External amenity open space is provided to the east and west of the site. Car parking is arranged along the northern boundary of the site in three blocks, with a turning area to the rear of the site.

Thirteen letters of representation have been received, objecting to the proposal. Comments from consultees are still outstanding, notably Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy.

In principle the development accords with the general locational requirements of adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan policies GP1 and HO8. Indicative elevations and the detail of the site layout show that the building can be accommodated on site, whilst providing for adequate amenity for the occupiers of Whingroves, properties on Highfield Drive and the new nursing home. Those details also show that a building can be designed to incorporate local features, and to respect the local context.

Furthermore, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on landscape features or protected trees and measures and safeguards can be put in place to ensure that protected species are not adversely affected by the development.

Responses from some consultees is outstanding, notably the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy and Network Rail.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended that subject to no objections being received from the outstanding consultations that outline planning permission for application number 06/1561/OUT be approved with conditions in respect of approved documents, time limits, details of design, external appearance and landscaping, (soft and hard), tree and vegetation protection, levels, external illumination, secure cycle storage, provision of internal footpath link to Yarm Road, means of enclosure, drainage, working period, insulation from railway noise, land contamination, Bat and Barn Owl mitigation and any other matters arising.

THE APPLICATION SITE

1. The site is currently occupied by a pair of semi-detached Victorian villas (records indicate construction between 1895 – 1897) in various states of repair. The villas are brick built, slate roof and decorative cornice detailing, stone lintels and cills. Both properties have a shared rear offshoot with other minor extensions and outbuildings. Each villa has a separate vehicular access to the road A135 Yarm Road.
2. To the north of the site are the rear gardens and properties known as 37 to 45 Highfield Drive. The common boundaries comprise vegetation, fencing and walls, although the majority of the properties rely on a mix of deciduous and evergreen vegetation as screening from the site. These dwellings are set at a lower level than the existing buildings on the application site.
3. To the south of the site is Whingroves Nursing Home. The common boundary comprises a mix of fencing and vegetation. One protected tree is to be found along this boundary – a Sycamore, in the front garden of 656 Yarm Road. Whingroves is set at a lower level than the current buildings on the application site.
4. To the east, the site is bounded by thick vegetation, beyond which is the road A135 Yarm Road. To the west, the site is bounded by fencing and vegetation, beyond is the railway line in cutting.
5. It should be noted that the applicant's agent and subsequently their consultants and advisors have mistaken the orientation of the site and surroundings. The existing buildings are on an east-west orientation, not north south. The orientations referred to in the Material Planning Considerations are correct.

THE PROPOSAL

6. The outline application proposes the demolition of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and the erection of a 75 bed nursing home – a reduction of 5 bed spaces from the original submission.
7. The application is in outline, with siting and means of access for consideration here. Nevertheless, and for illustrative purposes only, the applicant has submitted an elevation, floor plans and sections. Those details indicate a two and a half storey 'H' shaped building running in an east-west direction. The two larger blocks set to the front and rear of the building connected by a lower mid section.

8. Access would be taken via a new access to be created onto Yarm Road. Parking spaces would be provided to the front, side and rear of the site, generally adjacent to the northern boundary of the site.
9. Amenity open space is to be provided in a communal seating area to the front of the site and a patio and garden space to the rear.
10. The applicant envisages the following split of accommodation:
 - Ground Floor: 20/22 residents – general old age – private, entrance, kitchen, general lounge/dining space, associated bathrooms and storage.
 - First Floor: 28/30 residents – General nursing care, general lounge/dining space, associated bathrooms and storage, laundry.
 - Second Floor: 24/25 residents – Elderly Mentally Infirm, dementia, specialist care, elderly, mild, moderate, convalescent, general lounge/dining space, associated bathrooms and storage, laundry, staff facilities.
11. In terms of staffing, the applicant states that the care home will require
 - 1 Manager
 - 2 Administrative Staff
 - 40 Care Staff
 - 20 Ancillary Staff (Chef, cleaners, gardeners, handy man etc)
 - 1 Activity Co-ordinator
 - 3 Office Staff.
12. The applicant explains that the proportion of full and part time staff cannot be accurately predicted at this stage, however, it is likely to be 2/3 full time to 1/3 part time. This would provide 24-hour care based around a three-shift pattern: 0800 to 16:00, 16:00 to 22:00 and 22:00 to 0800 hours. The applicant envisages that the majority of care and ancillary staff would be local from the neighbouring community.

Supplementary Information

13. The application is supported by a Supporting Planning Statement, Transport Statement, Condition Survey of 654 and 656 Yarm Road, a Bat and Barn Owl Survey and Pre-development Arboricultural Report.

CONSULTATIONS AND VIEWS RECEIVED

14. The planning application has been publicised by means of individual letters, site and press notice.
15. Thirteen letters of representation have been received from occupiers of 37, 43, and 45 Highfield Drive, 648 and 660 Yarm Road, 4 Ashville Avenue (x2), South Lodge (x2 – one from Eaglescliffe Preservation Action Group), 4 Formby Walk, 23 Albert Road and two from email addresses.

The grounds of objections can be summarised as:

- Other brownfield sites within Stockton which would be more suitable for this
- Loss of heritage through demolition of the houses in a signature row of properties on Yarm Road, which can be repaired
- The houses should be repaired – a better scheme in terms of PPG3 -or in the very least the facade retained
- Nursing Home next door already and there are seven similar homes within a 2-mile radius of the application site.
- Lack of security at the home could lead to elderly and inform residents “escaping” and visiting neighbouring properties uninvited.
- Over-development of the site
- The development will overshadow properties in high summer, never mind in the winter months
- Loss of privacy for the occupant at 37 Highfield Drive and occupants at 45 Highfield Drive
- Impact on privacy and amenity for the residents on Highfield Drive
- Overlooking of properties on Highfield Drive
- Loss of privacy (from 43 Highfield Drive) resulting from the additional height and new windows, which will be above existing established trees (along the northern boundary of the site)
- Construction will have a detrimental impact on occupants of neighbouring properties in terms of noise and mess.
- Impact of the side elevation on the properties on Highfield Drive.
- The building will dominate the southerly view from Highfield Drive.
- Noise arising from cars arriving at the site all times of day and night
- Additional pollution as the car park is close to the gardens on Highfield Drive
- Any lighting on the site will lead to disturbance to residents on Highfield Drive
- Economic devaluation of property
- Site difficult to access by public transport because of the reduced bus service, particularly on Sundays
- Substantial impact on traffic detrimental to road safety, particularly as this is a route well used by school children – reference is made to the Council’s commitment to ‘Safe Routes to School’
- Increase in traffic from visitors to the home
- Insufficient parking spaces to cater for visitors and staff, which will lead to overflow onto Highfield Drive and Yarm Road
- Demolition requires permission under Building Regulations. This is not on the planning file
- Has the matter of subsidence been resolved, caused it seems by tree roots.
- Strain on local infrastructure
- Is there a demand and need for the facility? The care home next door has been for sale for some months.
- Severe strain on drainage which is beset with problems
- Lack of internal amenity space
- Amenity space sited close to Yarm Road, which is noisy, busy and full of pollutants, unsuitable for occupants of the home, which may wish to use it.
- The new building is incongruous and totally out of character and will therefore ruin the street scene
- Roof windows are out of place

- The siting is close to the railway, has this been checked?
- New access is on a dangerous point on Yarm Road
- Need for service vehicle parking and turning within the site.
- The new building may lead to water draining from the site to properties on Highfield Drive.

Parish Council

16. No response received

Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy

17. The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy makes the following comments:
- There are 24 number parking bays proposed in relation to this development. However, clarification is needed in order to identify whether this is acceptable, dependant on numbers of staff on duty at any one time.
 - There appears to be no provision for disabled parking, which in this case should be 5% of the total car parking spaces. This is unacceptable.
 - The turning area provided within the grounds does not meet the criteria outlined within the Design Guide. This would make turning facilities for service vehicles inadequate.
 - This locality has good cycleway links and given that a number of the staff employed there may be of a casual nature secure / covered cycle storage should be provided.
 - An internal footpath link is required within the development in order to connect it to A135 Yarm Road footpath.
 - The access road should meet the Yarm Road centre line at 90 degrees and the central hatching burned off in the vicinity of the proposed access. The visibility is acceptable
 - I have no knowledge of any flooding in this area and the applicant is

Landscape Officer

18. Raises no objection to the proposed development but comments that the proposed nursing home is a sizeable scale development and whilst the mass of the building appears large, it is not entirely out of character with other buildings in the locality.
19. One tree within the grounds of 656 Yarm Road is protected by Tree Preservation legislation. This is a sycamore on the southern boundary within the front garden. The tree is able to make a significant contribution. It is considered that the building can be successfully accommodated in the site as indicated without a detrimental impact upon the tree. Furthermore, the removal of the driveway (from 656) will improve the future growing conditions for the tree.
20. In addition, a mature Alder in the rear garden of 37 Highfield Drive is a significant specimen and should be retained and protected. It is close to the proposed road and parking at the rear of the site. This is not an insurmountable problem. If permission is granted an additional tree survey

should be submitted to assess the impact of the development upon the tree. Appropriate construction methods should be used.

21. Along the site frontage, it appears that the existing planting is to be retained. This planting is valuable in providing screening of the building. In order to provide additional softening, tree planting should be carried out within the communal seating area associated with the site frontage.
22. The site benefits from mature mixed hedges to part of the side and rear boundaries. The dominant plant is evergreen and due to the height of the hedges (approx 4.5 metres) there are only very limited views into the rear of the site from both ground and first floor windows of neighbouring properties
23. There are however some views from 658 Yarm Road and 37 to 45 Highfield Drive and new planting along the boundaries in these locations would be acceptable to minimise the visual impact of the development. The use of predominantly evergreen species would be required.
24. Conditions should be imposed in respect of tree protection during construction in accordance with BS5837: 2005 Tree Protection during Construction, and a detailed scheme for landscape indicating materials and construction methods, boundary treatment details and a planting plan.

Environmental Health Unit

25. Raises no objection in principle subject to the imposition of conditions in respect of land contamination, protection of residents from noise from the adjacent railway line, and in respect of the impact of construction noise, vibration and dust emissions advises a condition limiting working hours.

Tees Archaeology

26. The current building forms a semi-detached pair of late Victorian properties. They are in keeping with the historic character of the greater Eaglescliffe area and the loss of the buildings would represent erosion of this character.
27. The Council should consider the impact of the loss of this building on the historic environment of the area when forming its planning decision. Should consent be granted then the council should satisfy themselves that the new build will be appropriate to the character of the area. My own preference would be to see the building retained and extended/converted.

CE Electric UK

28. Has no objections to the proposal and has forwarded mains records for the area

Environment Agency

29. Standing flood risk advice applies. (*Comment: The site is not within a Flood Risk Zone*)

English Nature

30. Has no objection to the proposal in relation to species protected by law subject to a condition which requires that no development shall take place unless in accordance with the mitigation detailed within the protected species report, (A Bat and Barn Owl Survey of 654-656 Yarm Road, Eaglescliffe E3 Ecology Ltd; R03 Final; 18-05-06), including but not restricted to adherence to timing and spatial restrictions; provision of mitigation in advance; adherence to precautionary working methods; provision of alternative bat roost sites.

Julie Allport – Housing

31. No response received

Northumbrian Water

32. Makes comments in relation to water supply and foul and surface drainage.

Fire Service

33. No response received

Northern Gas Networks

34. No response received.

Police Crime Reduction and Architectural Liaison Officer

35. Has responded directly to the applicant offering advice and information on 'Secured by Design'.

Joint Public Transport Group

- 35A. No response received.

Fire Service

- 35B. No response received.

Councillor Maureen Rigg

36. The comments which I make are based on the information before me at present and my opinion may change in the light of any further evidence in the future.

I am always sorry to see the loss of old houses along Yarm Road, but I accept that if the buildings are proved to be structurally unsound their loss is inevitable. In that case the design of the replacement will be of crucial importance but is not part of this application.

It seems that the major question in this case is one of safe vehicular access, and I must leave that to SBC engineers to determine.

The site would be sustainable as a nursing home, being within walking/wheelchair pushing distance of a medical centre, pharmacy and Co-op general store as well as being on a road with good weekday bus services.

The evening and Sunday services are considerably less frequent and at those times visitors and staff would probably use cars unless they could walk.

Councillor J Fletcher

37. On the basis of the information currently before me I have the following comments. I may add to or change those comments in the light of any further information or arguments I may receive.

There is a slight inaccuracy in the Transport Statement. Under "Public Transport" & " Conclusion" it is stated that there are buses every 20 minutes along Yarm Road, between Yarm, Stockton and Middlesbrough. There are no through buses to & from Middlesbrough passing the application site. During daytime, Monday to Saturdays, there are buses every 10 minutes between Stockton & Yarm; evenings, Sunday & Bank Holidays they operate hourly.

In my view the main issues on this outline application are:

The impact of the vehicle movements generated by a nursing home of this size on traffic & highway safety on A135 Yarm Road

The effect of the presence of parking spaces along the northern boundary of the site on the amenity of the residents of numbers 37 to 43 Highfield Drive. Given the need for 24 hour cover in a nursing home, there would be vehicle movements in & out of parking spaces at any time of the day and night.

PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

38. Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act requires that an application for planning permission shall be determined in accordance with Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In this case, the relevant Development Plans are the Tees Valley Structure Plan (TVSP) and the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan (STLP)

39. Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan Policy GP1 requires all proposals for development to be assessed not only against Structure Plan policy, but also against a number of criteria which include concerns about the external appearance of the development, effect on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, access and parking arrangements, need for a high standard of landscaping and its relationship with the surrounding area.

40. STLP Policy HO8 states that proposals for residential institutions will normally be permitted provided that the property is located within a mainly residential area, within easy reach of public transport, shopping and other community facilities, the design of the development complements its surroundings and can provide an attractive outlook with secure and sheltered sitting areas; the development will have no adverse effect upon neighbouring properties and adequate access and space for parking and servicing can be accommodated without causing undue disturbance.

41. Planning Policy Guidance Note 4 'Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms' advises that commercial uses in residential areas should not normally be refused unless there are specific and significant objections, such as relevant development plan policy, unacceptable noise, smell, safety, and health impacts or excessive traffic generation.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

42. Whilst mindful that the application requires consideration of the principle, siting and means of access of a 75 bed nursing home on this site, the main considerations relate to planning policy implications, impact on the amenity of the residents of adjacent and proposed dwellings, and occupiers of adjacent properties, impact on the street scene and visual amenity, nature conservation and access and highway safety considerations.

Land Use Planning Policy Issues

43. The application site is previously developed land located within the urban area of Eaglescliffe and within the limits of development. The site is within 400 metres of shops and facilities, including a health centre on Sunningdale Drive, the journey to which is level. Yarm Road provides access to bus services. It is considered in principle that the use of the site for a nursing home in wider terms accords with policy HO8, and is acceptable but individual environmental impacts of the proposed development and their policy implications are considered below.

Loss of 656 and 654 Yarm Road

44. The site is currently occupied by a pair of semi-detached properties set in large gardens, and these dwellings are of some historical character. However, the properties are not listed nor are they within a Conservation Area. The applicant has supplied an Inspection Report of the condition of the two properties. The report concludes that "there are major structural faults within both properties" and that "extensive structural and fabric repairs will be required". The report goes on to recommend a series of works, ongoing maintenance and upgrading. Further investigation is also recommended and estimates a baseline figure of £200,000 to £250,000 for repairs. However, a final figure would be dependent on further investigation.
45. The report does not advise that the buildings are irreparable, and that demolition of the buildings is the only course of action. It is considered that their loss would, obviously, detract from the stock of this type of building in Eaglescliffe, and a repeat of this loss would detract from local character and charm. The comments of objectors and Tees Archaeology are noted. Nevertheless, as stated above the buildings are neither individually nor as part of a wider area afforded statutory or local protection. It is advised that the findings of the report should be borne in mind, although limited weight is accorded in the final balance of considerations.

Residential Amenity and Adjoining Uses

46. Whingroves Nursing Home lies to the south of the site, and follows the general orientation east west. This property has been altered and extended in the past. The front garden of that property, to Yarm Road has for the majority been surfaced to form a hard standing for parking.

47. The northern elevation of Whingroves contains habitable room windows at ground and first floor, and the narrow area of land between the property and the boundary is set aside for pedestrian access and an informal seating area.
48. The indicative site layout shows that adequate distances can be maintained between such a building and Whingroves. However, as some of the distances involved are less than the 21 metres generally required to ensure privacy careful consideration will need to be given to the uses behind the elevation. The separation distances will ensure that the outlook from both buildings whilst bland and uninspiring would be empirically adequate.
49. Given that the proposed building would stand to the north, it is not considered that the new building would overshadow Whingroves.
50. Properties on Highfield Drive stand to the north of the application site. In particular those at 37 to 45 Highfield are those most likely to be affected by the new building.
51. The proposed 2.5 storey building would measure 48.5 metres in length and stand to the rear and south and south west of 37 to 39 and 41 Highfield Drive. The separation distances are 22 metres to 41 Highfield Drive, a minimum 23.5 metres to 39 Highfield Drive, briefly at 20 metres rising to 26 metres and increasing to 37 Highfield Drive. Those distances are considered acceptable in order to maintain privacy between habitable room windows. At a distance of 35 metres, it is not considered that the privacy of the occupants of 45 Highfield would be unacceptably compromised.
52. The new building would be clearly visible from the rear of those properties on Highfield Drive. It should be acknowledged that the view, from those properties, beyond boundary vegetation would be changed and in contrast to current views, dominated by built development. However, given the distances set out above and the relative levels (see paragraphs 57 and 58 below) it is not considered that the building would be overbearing, to such an extent as to refuse planning permission on that ground.
53. The new building would be set to the south of the existing dwellings, and there would undoubtedly be some degree of overshadowing. However given separation distances involved, it is not considered that it would be to such an extent as to warrant refusal of planning permission on those grounds.
54. The proposed driveway and parking for the nursing home would be along the common boundary of the site and the rear of gardens of properties on Highfield Drive. This would inevitably lead to noise and disturbance arising from the comings and goings of staff, visitors, services and deliveries. Given the fairly low-key nature of the proposed use on the site and the likely staffing arrangements, it appears that the home could operate without undue disturbance to adjacent residents.
55. In light of the above comments, it is considered that the new nursing home could be located on the site and provide an acceptable level of amenity for occupants of the home without unacceptable adverse impact in terms of loss of privacy, unacceptable outlook, and overbearance from neighbouring buildings. Some degree of overshadowing would occur from Whingroves, but

not to such an extent as to warrant refusal of planning permission on those grounds.

56. Amenity open space would be provided to the front and rear of the site. The comments of the objectors in terms of pollution and disturbance to users of the frontage area, the seating area is 9 metres from the highway boundary, which is heavily vegetated. There is no doubt that some vehicle fumes would migrate towards seating area and that road and pedestrian noise would be audible, however, it is not considered that this would render the area unusable. The patio and gardens to the rear, whilst similarly affected by rail traffic would seem to offer a generally quieter and potentially less polluted alternative.

Relative Ground Levels in relation to Whingroves and Highfield Drive

57. The application site rises from the east and north, and is set higher not only than it's neighbours to the north, but the building at Whingroves to the south. The applicant's agent has provided sections through the site to show that the building can be set at a lower level, and this coupled with lowered eaves height would help to some extent to lessen the impact of the new building on visual and residential amenity.
58. The applicant's agent claims that the result of changes in the eaves height and variations in levels on the site means that there will be no difference in the overall ridge height of the existing and proposed buildings. However, as the drawings are indicative, those levels are also, and would need to be agreed prior to any development taking place on site. This can be adequately controlled by condition.

Visual Impact and Street scene

59. The proposed building would stand approximately 29 to 38 metres from the boundary of the site to Yarm Road, and separated there from by an existing substantial hedge. The indicative elevation shows how a new façade can incorporate elements of the vernacular, including square bays, hipped roofline, and small windows in the roof plane.
60. The submitted sections indicate that the building could sit comfortably, with Whingroves and the separation distance to those properties is such that the building would not dominate the smaller buildings on Highfield Drive.
61. The design of the building beyond the façade has not been submitted. Whilst the rear of the building would not be readily visible surrounding public viewpoints, it is important for neighbouring residents in particular to ensure a sympathetic design, and this would be the subject of any reserved matters submission. Subject to careful control of levels over the site, detail of design, external appearance and landscaping in any subsequent application for reserved matters, it is considered that the frontage and the remaining bulk of a building of this scale would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene or local visual amenity.

Nature Conservation

62. The Bat and Barn Owl Survey found no evidence of roosting bats and the surrounding habitat and buildings are considered to be of low significant for

bats. The applicant's report advises that a mitigation strategy and method statement would be appropriate. In respect of barn owls, no evidence of roosts or nesting has been found. English Nature has no objection subject to a condition as set out in paragraph 30. The proposed development is therefore acceptable in nature conservation terms.

Landscape

63. The proposed development would maintain vegetation on the site and the Landscape Officer's concerns in respect of the two noteworthy trees on the site can be addressed by condition. Nevertheless, I am concerned with the impact of the development on the existing vegetation to the northern boundary (Highfield Drive) of the site. Although it would appear that the majority of vegetation which screens the site from those dwellings is within private gardens, it is considered that any permission granted should be subject to a landscaping scheme which addresses the requirement of the Landscape Officer and in particular the treatment of the northern boundary to Highfield Drive. Although details of landscaping are not for consideration here, a preliminary assessment would indicate that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on landscape.

Access and Highway Safety

64. Access to the application site is via a new entrance to Yarm Road. The illustrative plans show 24 parking spaces to be provided in three locations within the site. A turning area is proposed to the rear of the site. The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy has found the submission lacking and requests that the applicant address the matters set out in paragraph 17 above. The applicant has been asked to address those matters and it is the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy's informal opinion that the site could accommodate those requirements. Nevertheless, the spatial impact of those requirements and the policy implications will need to be assessed once the details have been received.

Residual Matters

65. Demolition of buildings – Notice is required to be given to the Local Authority under Section 80 of the Building Act 1984. The Local Authority has a six-week period to issue the said notice. A copy of this application/notice is not required for the current planning file, and is not a material planning consideration.
66. Subsidence (trees) – This is a matter for Building Regulations and careful design of the building, not at issue here.
67. Drainage – The applicants' agent has addressed the matter of localised flooding and suggests that the car park will allow for the collection of rainwater and management of flood. The detail of drainage can be addressed by condition.
68. Railway – Network Rail has been consulted and those comments are awaited.

- 69. External Illumination – Lighting of the building and grounds can be positioned and shielded to ensure that light spillage does not unduly disturb the occupiers of neighbouring properties and this can be controlled by condition.
- 70. Economic devaluation of property is not a material planning consideration.
- 71. Security – Internal security arrangements, to prevent ‘escapees’ are matters for the applicant.
- 72. Construction noise and disturbance – a condition can be imposed on any permission granted which would limit the working hours on the site.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

- 73. In light of the above assessment, it is considered that a nursing home is likely to accord with adopted planning policy and guidance. It is considered that the subject to a favourable response from outstanding consultees, and on balance of considerations, that outline planning permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined above.

Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services

Contact Officer: Jane Hall– Telephone 01642 528556

Financial Implications

None

Environmental Implications

As Report

Community Safety Implications

N/A

Human Rights Implications

The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

Background Papers

Adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan (1997)
 Planning Policy Guidance Note 4 ‘Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms’

Ward and Ward Councillors

Ward	Eaglescliffe
Ward Councillor	Councillor M. F. Cherrett
Ward Councillor	Councillor J. A. Fletcher
Ward Councillor	Councillor Mrs M. Rigg