

## Online Comment

**Application** H16-0621-24  
**Location** Castle Sports Complex Albion Street Spalding PE11 2AJ  
**Proposal** Construction and operation of a micro energy storage facility

---

**Name** Greg Watkinson  
**Address** Conservation Officer

**Date Submitted** 12-08-24  
**For/Against** Comments

I wish to raise no objections to this proposal.

It is true that this proposal is within the conservation area, and that it is of a rather modern, industrial and harsh appearance not typically befitting the setting. Additionally, the proposed installation is directly adjacent to the Grade II Listed Ship Albion Public House. However, the immediate area is already characterised by harsh C20th municipal development and already features an electric substation, directly adjacent to the Listed Building, fronting onto Albion Street. Regardless, the site is also set back from the streetside by a significant distance and screened from view by extant structures. Furthermore, whilst the proposed development is situated within close proximity to the Grade II listed pub, its positioning is relatively obscure when viewing from the main road, and owing to plot widths and the extant boundary wall is situated in a location that I do not consider to influence the wider appreciation of the special interest characteristics of the listed property. I therefore consider the proposal to pass the requirements of development in the setting of a Listed Building set out under Policy 29, Section A, subsection 3 of the SELLP.

Nevertheless, the proposal must still be considered to present a form of harm to the Heritage Assets (in this instance, the Spalding Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Ship Albion Public House), and owing to the mitigating factors and minor scale of the development, I assign this development as representing 'less than substantial harm' in accordance with Paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) (NPPF). As per that same paragraph, great weight must be given to the conservation of the designated heritage assets.

As the proposal represents 'less than substantial harm', in accordance with Para. 208 of the NPPF, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. In this instance, I find the proposed harm to be so minor, and the public benefits associated with the improvements to the local energy infrastructure and assistance with local decarbonisation to be so significant as to conclude that the public benefits do indeed outweigh the risk of harm to the designated heritage asset.

Therefore, I raise no objections