Online Comment

Application	H16-0818-24
Location	38 Spring Gardens Spalding PE11 2XL
Proposal	Details of arrangements for public and/or private refuse/recycling collection and details of boundary treatments including schedule of walling, railing & fencing levels, heights and materials (Conditions 9 & 12 of H16-1131-21)

Name	Greg Watkinson
Address	Conservation Officer
Date Submitted	20-11-24
For/Against	Objections

I wish to object to the proposal due to an unacceptably negative impact upon the historic environment as presented by the proposed boundary treatments.

It should be noted that Policy 29 of the SELLP confirms that proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building. Furthermore, it goes on to assert that proposals within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting.

Firstly, it is noted that the applicant has sought in the proposed block plan to retain the existing steel fence which was erected unlawfully without consent. The owner was approached by the SHDC Enforcement Team regarding this matter, and was informed that the fence is inappropriate to the historic setting, presenting a harsh, modern industrial appearance to an otherwise attractive and prominent Listed and conservation area building. It was agreed that due to the ongoing works on the site, enforcement action would not be initialised on the understanding that this fence would be removed as part of the approved works. I am therefore not satisfied that the owner should be permitted to retain the steel fence, owing to the unacceptably harsh visual impact this would have on the setting.

Furthermore, the applicant has proposed to utilise a 1.8m standard timber board fence to the front and sides of the site. Not only is the fence itself of an inappropriate style to the setting of the Listed Building, appearing totally modern in the setting of the heritage asset, the applicant has also proposed to 'box in' the historic asset to the northeast side of the property, where there is currently an open plot to the side, it is proposed to partition the listed building physically from the remainder of the plot to the east. Therefore, this 1.8m fence, covering the site from all visible angles would be visually inappropriate in its own right, and due to its height and impermeable visual nature, serve to visually block and imprison the listed building as appreciated from the public realm, inflicting an exceptionally harsh impact upon the asset, and obscuring rather than better revealing the significance of the asset.

I therefore recommend that this application be refused for breach of Policy 29 of the SELLP as well as S16 of the NPPF.