PLANNING AMENDMENT

For office use only

Application No. H16/0134/96

Date Registered 01 MAY 1996

Case Officer DR

1. Please complete in block letters

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT

MR. C. HERD
10 LONDON ROAD
SPALDING.

Tel. No.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF AGENT
(if form completed by agent)

M. E. CRESSWELL MSIAT
HORSESHOE BRIDGE
SPALDING PE11 3JA

Tel. No. 72 3656 (Contact) Mary Cresswell

Please complete in block letters

FULL POSTAL ADDRESS OF THE APPLICATION SITE

16 NEW ROAD. SPALDING

OFFICE COPY

Please complete

APPLICATION No.

This amendment **cannot be considered** unless the relevant reference is stated

H16/0134/96

Building Regulation reference relating to same development (if any)

—

2. Please tick **one** box only

A — *Amendment is proposed where permission already granted* — If yes, submit two forms and two plans. [ ]

or

B — *Amendment is to a proposal currently being considered* — If yes, submit four forms and four plans. [✓]

Please complete

I attach the necessary plans and request that the changes described below be accepted as an amendment. I understand that the Council may require a fresh application, together with fee if appropriate. If the amendment relates to a current application, I agree to an extension of the terminal date.

Signed . M.E. Cresswell ..... Date . 30 April 1996 .....

3. Please complete in block letters

FULL DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT IN ORIGINAL APPLICATION

NEW SHOP FRONT

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.)

PARTLY RECESSED SHOP FRONT (SET BACK 220mm)

State drawing no's of the current submission

146/2A

Has this amendment been requested by the Council? (If so, state Officer dealing with the application)

YES / NO — Mrs. D. Roberts.

Describe any part of the original development which is excluded by virtue of the amendment, and state any alteration to plot numbers

N/A

Has a similar amendment been submitted under Building Regulations? Yes / No

AMENDMENT RECORD SHEET – LIVE APPLICATION

Admin

Validation:

Inadequate/Inappropriate ☐

Clarification/Details required:

Appears valid ✓ HL

Registered 8/8/15

Terminal date/committee updated .....

DC Procedural Assessment

Is the information given correct? Yes/No (If No, state above what details are needed)

Has this amendment been requested? Yes/No *
If Yes, is it what was asked for? Yes/No *

Who do you need to reconsult as a result of this amendment? PC WM Press Residents Other – None ✓

Is it an amendment in principle? Yes/No

Is it the same character/description for fee purposes? Yes/No (Refer to Admin ?) •

If No, but Yes to (*) requested :-

Do development objectives outweigh financial objectives? Yes/No Confirmed.....

REJECTED as an amendment – new application needed

Confirmed: .....

Notes/Advice/Rejection Reason:

☐ Tick if you wish this note to be a paragraph in the Rejection Notice

AUTHORISED to treat as amendment

Confirmed: 22/3/15

Superseded details removed NP

Give a revised description if the details accepted are different to the submission:

Acceptance issued:
Public register updated:

DC Professional Assessment

NOTES:

Discussed Rob Smith - he is happy with revision.

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL
HOUSING AND PLANNING SERVICES DEPARTMENT

CONSERVATION OFFICER
Development Consultation

To D.C - D. Roberts File nr 328/96/ Job nr 20

SUBJECT

16 New Road Spalding

Application nr H16/0135/96

PROPOSAL

- ○ Demolition
- ✓ Alteration
- ○ Extension
- ○ Change of Use
- ○ New Development
- ○ Enhancement
- ○ Article 4
- ○ Advertisement

ITEMS AFFECTED

- ○ Ancient Monument
- ○ Listed Building I
- ○ Listed Building II*
- ○ Listed Building II
- ○ LB - Interior
- ○ LB - Curtilage
- ○ LB - Setting
- ○ Local Heritage Interest
- ○ TPO
- ○ SSSI
- ○ Archaeology
- ○ Adjoining area
- ○ Local Nature Reserve
- ○ Footway
- ○ L A ownership
- ✓ Conservation Area

CONTACT

- ○ RCHME
- ○ English Heritage
- ○ DOE
- ○ DNH
- ○ National Amenity
- ○ Archaeology Service
- ○ English Nature
- ○ Countryside Commission

Signed [signature] Date 24 04 96

CONSULTATION PROCESS

INITIAL CONSIDERATION

- > No comment ○
- > Additional consents required ○
- > Meeting required: Applicant/Agent ○
- > More detail required from Agent ○
- > Minor matters to be resolved ○
- > Detailed scrutiny required ○
- > Joint site visit required ○
- > Refuse ○

DEFINITIVE MATTERS

- > Statutory requirement ○
- > DOE/DNH Advice/Guidance ○
- > Local Plan/policies ○
- > Conditions to be applied ○

RECOMMENDATION LIAISON

- > Comment on amended plans ○
- > Advise if requirement not adopted ○
- > Advise if advice not adopted ○
- > Advise if conditions not adopted ○
- > Advise for committee attendance ○

OBSERVATIONS

Proposed change to the right hand shop will provide a better relationship to the buildings traditional character and offer an example for a mirror image on the left. The shop front design in one plane is acceptable, but it would be preferable if the front face matched in line with the facade plane, with the cornice element springing from the plane line of the central facade. Also the right hand pilaster would then need to be clear of the building's right hand quoins.

Further information required about proposed colours.