FILE COPY

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices
Priory Road
Spalding
Lincolnshire
PE11 2XE

contacts:
admin: 01775 764723
dc officers: 01775 764703
s/board: 01775 761161
facsimile: 01775 762937

Application no: H07-0567-15

Applicant: Mrs R Whitwell
The Bungalow
Mole Drove
Gedney Hill
Spalding
Lincs
PE12 0PA

Agent: A L Architecture
The White Cottage
Shepeau Stow
Spalding
Lincs
PE12 0TU

Description: Replacement dwelling

Location: Heading House
56 Mole Drove
Gedney Hill
Spalding
PE12 0PA
PE12 0PA

Amendment: Revised design (dwg nos. 003A, 004A, 005A & 006A)

Letter Sent: 9th September 2015

Dear Sir/Madam

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF AMENDMENT

I acknowledge receipt of the amended details in respect of the above and confirm that the changes are able to be incorporated in the application which will now **only be considered in its amended form.**

Your rights of appeal remain as explained on the original acknowledgement.

You are reminded that revision to any submission made under the Building Regulations may also be necessary.

Yours faithfully

Paul Jackson
Place Manager

PLANNING AMENDMENT

For Office Use only A1
Application No: HO7-0567-15-
Date Registered: 09 SEP 2015
Case Officer: DAVID GEDNEY

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

(Please complete using block capitals and black ink)

APPLICANT NAME AND ADDRESS	**AGENT NAME AND ADDRESS**
MRS R WHITWELL FILE COPY Telephone:	A.L. ARCHITECTURE. Telephone:
SITE ADDRESS DETAILS HEADING HOUSE, 56 MOLE DROVE, GEDNEY HILL.	
CURRENT APPLICATION NO: This amendment cannot be considered unless the relevant reference is stated.	H07-0567-15
Building Regulation reference relating to same development (if applicable)	

I attach four copies of this form and necessary plans and request that the changes described below can be accepted as an amendment. As the amendment relates to a current application, I agree to an extension of the terminal date (if applicable).

Signed : Date: 09 SEP 2015

FULL DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT OF CURRENT APPLICATION THAT THIS AMENDMENT RELATES TO	REPLACEMENT DWELLING.	
State details of amendments proposed. (Give a full detailed list of the changes, and also mark these clearly on the accompanying plans. Only the changes listed here will be considered)	REVISED DESIGN.	
State drawing numbers of the current submission		
Has this amendment been requested by the Council? (If so, state Officer dealing with the application)	(YES)/NO	
Describe any part of the original development which is excluded by virtue of the amendment, and state any alteration to plot numbers		
Has a similar amendment been submitted under Building Regulations? (If so, state Building Control Surveyor dealing with application)	YES/(NO)	

AMENDMENT RECORD SHEET – LIVE APPLICATION

Admin to Complete

Date Received KP 9-9. Date Registered SAS 9/9.

Case Officer to Complete

Has this amendment been requested? **Yes/No**

If Yes, is it what was asked for? **Yes/No**

Is it an amendment in principle? **Yes/No**

Is it the same character/description for fee purposes? **Yes/No**(Refer to Admin if in doubt)

If No, but amendment requested, the following must be completed if the amendment is to be accepted

Certified That Development Objectives Outweigh The Financial Objectives

Senior Officer's Signature: **Date:**

Re-Consults as a result of this amendment **None** ☒ **All** ☐

Parish Council ☐ **Ward Member** ☐ **Press** ☐ **Site Notice** ☐

Standard Consults ☐

Residents ☐ - ***Name/Address:***

Case Officer's Decision:

REJECTED – New Application Required ☐

Reason

Do you want this reason to be added to the Rejection Notice? **YES/NO**

ACCEPTED – Superseded Details Removed ☒

Note

Do you want this note to be added to the Acceptance Notice? **YES/NO**

Revised Description (if applicable)

Case Officers Signature PMG **Date** 9/9.

Admin To Complete

09 SEP 2016

Acceptance/~~Rejection~~ Letter Issued ☑ Date Sent :

Scanned ☐ Re-Consultations Carried Out (*if necessary*) ☐

Pass File Back to Case Officer (after Scanning) ☐ Pass File to Admin for Consults/Re-Consults (after Scanning) ☐

Application Amendments

Application: H07-0567-15

Location: Heading House
56 Mole Drove
Gedney Hill
Spalding

Post code: PE12 0PA House Number:

Amendment: 1 Date: 09-09-2015

Type: CUR Current Application

Sub-Type:

Description: Revised design (dwg nos. 003A, 004A, 005A & 006A)

Long Description:

Decision: Date:

Fee: 0.00 Vat: 0.00 Total: 0.00

Agent: Desn:

Name: A L Architecture

Address: The White Cottage
Shepeau Stow
Spalding
Lincs

Post Code: PE12 0TU E-Mail: amieladyman@ou

Tel: Fax:

Ref:

Officer: DMG

External Ref:

Please check description OK

Sibley, Sally

From: Gedney, David
Sent: 01 September 2015 13:00
To: _planningadvice
Subject: FW: Planning Application H07-0567-15 - Replacement dwelling, Heading House, 56 Mole Drove, Gedney Hill
Attachments: 003 - A - Proposed Site Plan.pdf; 004 - A - Proposed Plans.pdf; 005 - A - Proposed Elevations 1 of 2.pdf; 006 - A - Proposed Elevations 2 of 2.pdf

Amended plans. I have requested the submission of a form.

DMG

David Gedney | Senior Planning Officer| **South Holland District Council**
dgedney@sholland.gov.uk
DDI: 01775 764468 |
www.sholland.gov.uk

From: Amie Ladyman [mailto:amieladyman@outlook.com]
Sent: 28 August 2015 16:50
To: Gedney, David
Subject: RE: Planning Application H07-0567-15 - Replacement dwelling, Heading House, 56 Mole Drove, Gedney Hill

Dear David,

Planning Application H07-0567-15 - Replacement dwelling, Heading House, 56 Mole Drove, Gedney Hill

Please accept my sincerest apologies for the delay getting the amended drawings for the above application to you, unfortunately the holiday season has prevailed in this case.

Never the less, please find attached the revised drawings, which have been amended in light of your comments (numbered) as followed:

1. All openings should have segmental arches (not soldier courses)
   - The drawings have been amended to show segmental arches above the openings

2. An integral garage is considered inappropriate. A detached garage should be utilised with single side opening doors and archways above
   - After detailed discussions with my Client, an integral garage is considered to be necessary at the property to assist the requirements for the disabled occupant. My Client advised that the reason for this is for the occupant's wife to maintain her independence as there will be times when she will need to make her way from the car to the house on her own. My Client explained that the occupant's wife's disability restricts her from walking very far and on some days she is unable to walk at all. The convenience of having direct access from the garage to the house will make a significant difference to the disabled occupant.

3. The chimney stack should be more imposing
   - The drawings have been amended in light of these comments.

4. The windows should be timber and side opening with a central glazing bar. The doors should be timber

and more traditional in terms of design/appearance

- The drawings have been amended to show side opening casement windows with a central glazing bar in light of the above comments.

- The design of the doors remain the same as it is considered that they are in keeping with the window design. Entrance doors having a glazed side light is a common feature in the design of traditional, vernacular buildings in the area and is not considered to look out of place within the design for this application.

- The Client has expressed concerns associated with the maintenance of the windows if they should be constructed of timber, particularly as the occupant is reaching retirement age and his wife is disabled. For these reasons it is considered necessary for the windows and doors to remain as UPVC, however the style and colour of these will be sympathetic to maintain a cottage like appearance.

5. The dormers should be more traditional in terms of appearance (eg, as attached)

- The drawings have been amended to show dormer windows of a more traditional design appearance.

6. The roofing material should be either a traditional slate or terracotta pantile. The external walls should be constructed in a red stock brick and not a multi. The eaves should have brick detailing and not fascia boarding, with metal guttering on rise and fall brackets

- The drawings have been amended to show a blue slate roof and a red stock brick for the external walls.

- A corbeled brick detail to replace facia boarding at the eaves, with gutters on rise and fall brackets was already part of the design so no amendment has been made to reflect this comment, however it has been noted that guttering should be of metal in material type. Cast iron guttering is considerably more expensive than more commonly used plastic guttering. My Clients intention will be to specify imitation cast iron guttering in light of the comments made and hopes that this will be deemed as acceptable.

7. The soil pipes should be reduced in height or be less prominent

- The drawings have been amended to make the soil pipes considerably less prominent in light of the above comments.

8. The rooflights should be of traditional design, having a slim metal frame and central vertical glazing bar.

- The drawings have been amended in light of the above comments.

Further to this and in light of comments made during the consultation period, I would like to add the following:

In response to comments made by Highways - The request for conditions relating to vehicle access to the public highway, to be included in any permission given by the Local Authority, are considered to be unnecessary as the proposals do not include any alterations to the existing access from the public highway. In response to comments made by the Water Board - The proposals are for surface water to be disposed of via the existing watercourse. Proposals do not include the construction of any new outlets into the Water Boards watercourse. It is not anticipated that soakaways will be required, however if in the future, the occupants consider it to be necessary to install soakaways at the property, then the concerns raised by the Water Board will be addressed accordingly when the time comes.

I hope the amended drawings are considered acceptable and that this now provides you with sufficient information to allow you to continue with the application process. I will be on leave from Wednesday next week, returning on 17th September. If there is anything requiring my urgent attention, please try to make me aware of this before COB on Tuesday, otherwise any further issues will need to be dealt with on my return.

I will look forward to hearing from you.

Kindest Regards

Amie Ladyman

From: DGedney@sholland.gov.uk
To: amieladyman@outlook.com
Subject: Planning Application H07-0567-15 - Replacement dwelling, Heading House, 56 Mole Drove, Gedney Hill
Date: Wed, 15 Jul 2015 10:48:03 +0000

Dear Amie,

I write in relation to the above application.

In accordance with Local Plan Policy HS17 and a subsequent Committee resolution, replacement dwellings are only permitted that are more than 20% larger than the original if they reflect the design of traditional, vernacular buildings in the area in terms of scale, character, materials of construction and architectural detailing, and are of exceptional design.

The D & A Statement indicates that the house is designed to reflect a traditional cottage. A number of revisions are therefore considered necessary to make the proposal acceptable in design terms. They are outlined below:

1. All openings should have segmental arches (not soldier courses);
2. An integral garage is considered inappropriate. A detached garage should be utilised with single side opening doors and archways above;
3. The chimney stack should be more imposing;
4. The windows should be timber and side opening with a central glazing bar. The doors should be timber and more traditional in terms of design/appearance;
5. The dormers should be more traditional in terms of appearance (eg, as attached);
6. The roofing material should be either a traditional slate or terracotta pantile. The external walls should be constructed in a red stock brick and not a multi. The eaves should have brick detailing and not fascia boarding, with metal guttering on rise and fall brackets.
7. The soil pipes should be reduced in height or be less prominent;
8. The rooflights should be of traditional design, having a slim metal frame and central vertical glazing bar.

I look forward to amended plans that reflect the above in due course.

Regards.

David Gedney

David Gedney | Senior Planning Officer| **South Holland District Council**
dgedney@sholland.gov.uk
DDI: 01775 764468 |
www.sholland.gov.uk