

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO 6
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

19 September 2007

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

07/1698/FUL

690 Yarm Road, Eaglescliffe,

Revised application for residential development comprising 10 no. New build apartments and conversion of existing dwelling into 4 no. Apartments together with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Expiry Date: 4 September 2007

UPDATE REPORT

Additional comments have been received as follows;

1. The Head of Technical Services advises that the proposed access works to Yarm Road can be achieved although this will require works within the highway.
2. The agent for the scheme has advised that they can detail the road frontage boundary to suit including a set back of the boundary to increase the road verge. Furthermore, the agent has advised that they are willing to retain a number of the large conifers to the boundaries of the site in order to retain screening of the development from the adjoining properties.

Material Planning Considerations

3. In view of the required highway works being achievable it is considered that the condition listed within the main report is adequate to achieve such provision.
4. It is considered that the retention of the conifers along the boundaries of the site, although retaining some screening of the development, would compromise the existing scheme by having particularly large trees within very close proximity to buildings whilst it would be inappropriate to condition the retention of such trees due to their scale and their existing impact on adjoining properties. Furthermore, the removal of some trees would result in limited growth on exposed sides of the trees and it is understood that such species of trees would not have new growth in such areas, thereby having a reduced beneficial appearance. As such, it is considered that the suitability of the scheme should not rest upon these trees being in place.
5. The Architect for the scheme has commented verbally that the use of SPG2 guidance on distances in considering the proposal is not appropriate as the proposal is not an extension and there are no elements of the scheme, which involve proposed habitable windows directly overlooking existing habitable windows. It is considered that the comments are valid but do not change the original view that there is not an overlooking issue with the proposal and the proposed scheme is acceptable.

Conclusion

5. It is recommended that the application be determined as detailed within the main report.