SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices
Priory Road
Spalding
Lincolnshire
PE11 2XE

tel: 01775 761161
fax: 01775 710772
web: www.sholland.gov.uk

Application no: H13-0816-10

Applicant: Stepford Homes Ltd
Heatherdown
Elm Lane
Low Fulney
Spalding Lincs
PE12 6EQ

FILE COPY

Agent: Stepford Homes Ltd
Heatherdown
Elm Lane
Low Fulney
Spalding Lincs
PE12 6EQ

Description: Details of external materials, arboricultural method statement and ecology report, hard and soft landscaping including management plan and implementation, ground investigation report, storage of domestic and recycling waste, archaeological specification, surface water drainage :

Location: Adjacent 49 Church Lane
Moulton
Spalding
Lincs
PE12 6NP
PE12 6NP

Amendment: Revised road and sewer layout and external works
(dwg. nos. 09/009/009 B and 1011/01-A)

Letter Sent: 23rd December 2010

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

Head of Planning & Development

PLANNING AMENDMENT

For Office Use only
Application No: H13-0816-10-A1
Date Registered: 22 DEC 2019
Case Officer: JMG.

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

(Please complete using block capitals and black ink)

APPLICANT NAME AND ADDRESS	AGENT NAME AND ADDRESS
Stepford Homes Telephone:	Telephone:

SITE ADDRESS DETAILS

Adj 49 Church Lane, Moulton

CURRENT APPLICATION NO: This amendment cannot be considered unless the relevant reference is stated.	H13-0816-10
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:

FULL DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT OF CURRENT APPLICATION THAT THIS AMENDMENT RELATES TO	conditions 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16 + 18 of H13-0632-09	
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 road + sewer layout + external works	
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 22-12 Registered ☑ 23/12

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 The Development Objectives Outweigh The Financial Objectives
Senior Officer's Signature: ..... **Date:** .....

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

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

Residents/Other ☐ - *Name/Address*: .....

Diane F. - 10 days.

.....

.....

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 ..... DMG ..... **Date** ..... 23/12 .....

Admin To Complete

Agreed Term Date Updated ☑ Re-Consultations Carried Out (*if necessary*) ☑ DIANE INTERNAL

Public Register Updated ☑ SCANNED Acceptance/~~Rejection~~ Letter Issued ☑ 23/12

(Plus Library if Re-Consulting Residents)

Porter, Karen

From: Gedney, David
Sent: 22 December 2010 10:46
To: Porter, Karen
Subject: FW: Condition compliance application H13-0816-10. Affordable housing development, adj 49 Church Lane, Moulton
Attachments: let3 soakaways.pdf; 101101 road & sewer Layout rev A 21.12.10.pdf; External Works rev B 21.12.10.pdf

Amended plans

From: Mark Dennis Stepford Homes [mailto:mark.dennis@stepfordhomes.com]
Sent: 21 December 2010 16:49
To: Gedney, David
Subject: re: Condition compliance application H13-0816-10. Affordable housing development, adj 49 Church Lane, Moulton

Dear David,
I write in response to your two emails of 24th & 30th November 2010, regarding the above development.

Re: Email of 24th November: Tree Officers Comments

- The proposed soakaways have been re-positioned so they do not fall within the tree spread – A revised road and sewer layout is attached 1011/01 rev A
- The bin collection areas have been altered with a surface material of grasscrete now proposed. A revised entrance detail as also been incorporated – External Works Plan 09/009/009 rev B is attached

Re: Email of 30th November: Resident Comment

- As response to the residents comment regarding soakaways is attached – by BRD Environmental Ltd

We trust these now satisfy the queries raised and look forward to receipt of discharge notice in due course.

Kind Regards
Mark

Kind Regards,

Mark Dennis
Design & Planning Manager
Stepford Homes Ltd

T: 01775 720995
F: 01775 720996
W: www.stepfordhomes.com

SHDC
Planning & Development
22 DEC 2010
Ref: 0816-10

Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

This message may contain privileged and confidential information solely for its intended recipients and others may not distribute, copy or use it.
If you have received this communication in error please tell us either by return e-mail or at the numbers above and delete it, and any copies of it.

We have taken steps to ensure that this message (and any attachments or hyperlinks contained within it) are free from computer viruses and the like.
However, in accordance with good computing practice the recipient is responsible for ensuring that it is actually virus free before opening it.

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.

BRD Environmental Ltd
33a Crouch Street
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX16 9PR
Tel: 01295 272244
Fax: 01295 270098
www.brdenvironmental.co.uk

Mr S Lyon
Technical Director
Stepford Homes Ltd
Elm Lane
Low Fulney
Spalding
Lincs PE12 6EQ

Our ref: H:\projects\241228\let3

21 December 2010

SHDC
Planning & Development
22 DEC 2010
Ref: 0816-10

Dear Steve

SOAKAWAYS
CHURCH LANE, MOULTON

I write further to your email that forwarded the council's email requesting a response to comments from a nearby resident concerning surface water.

The resident's comments were as follows: "I note with interest within the site survey report that insufficient time was available to perform repeat tests within the trial pits dug to determination percolation rates due to low rates of infiltration. Common practice is to perform three refills of the trial pits to get accurate readings. The three pits that were able to be used (others not being suitable due to collapse possibly caused by infiltration of groundwater) are not all in locations where soakaways will be employed on-site".

I would question the comment that 'common practice' is to undertake three refills. It is correct that the applicable guidance, BRE Digest 365, calls for three tests at each location i.e. an initial test plus two refills. However, BRE Digest 365 is in my opinion one of the worst technical documents we have to work with as it was written with insufficient appreciation of the various practical difficulties in undertaking the test. Due to these difficulties, common practice is actually to only achieve one or possibly two tests at each location. BRD are well aware of common practice as we regularly review the work of others in the industry as a matter of routine as part of the services offered to Clients.

For the vast majority of ground conditions, the repeat tests do not actually give markedly different results to the initial test. The lack of three tests at each location does not therefore impact the accuracy of the test results provided. Indeed, BRD are of the opinion that it is far more important to obtain test results from different locations than it is to conduct the repeat tests.

The local resident misunderstands the ground investigation process as soakage tests were only ever planned for the three trial pits where they were conducted in. The other trial pits were excavated for different geotechnical purposes and so the comment regarding the suitability of the other pits is erroneous.

BRD Environmental Limited
Registered in England number 4012417 Registered office: 33a Crouch Street, Banbury, Oxfordshire, OX16 9PR

Whilst the infiltration tests are best located at planned soakaways locations, the importance of this is dependant upon the actual ground conditions at any particular site. It is also not always possible to undertake tests at planned locations for such reasons as precise location of soakaways is not always known before the site works, limited access for the tanker, length of delivery hose, etc. It is therefore always a matter of professional judgement of whether soakage test results at one location are applicable elsewhere at the same site.

In this case, the site has one of the most consistent soil profiles I have ever encountered and so the soil infiltration test results are applicable regardless of where the soakaways are actually located. This point is proven by the similar grading curves of the two Particle Size Distribution (PSD) tests. The PSD curves are also useful in verifying the drainage characteristics of the soil as confirmation of the soakage tests.

I trust that the above comments will provide the reassurance that the use of soakaways remains feasible at this site.

Yours sincerely

Brian Devonshire
Principal Consultant
BRD Environmental Ltd

Email: brian@brdenvironmental.co.uk