

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H07-0470-25 **Applicant:** Monkwise Limited
Proposal: Change of use of golf club function room to beauty salon - Retrospective
Location: Monkwise Golf Club West Drove North Gedney Hill
Terminal Date: 17th July 2025

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
04	Approach to Flood Risk
07	Improving South East Lincolnshire's Employment Land Portfolio
24	The Retail Hierarchy
30	Pollution
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy
Section 7 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

National Guidance

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	1	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for the change of use of part of Monkwise Golf Club to a beauty salon. The application is retrospective.

Site Description

The application site comprises a portion of an existing building at Monkwise Golf Club. The golf club is located to the north of Gedney Hill, to the west of West Drove North.

The site is outside the settlement boundary of Gedney Hill, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and the accompanying policies map. The site is therefore within the countryside in planning policy terms.

The site is within Flood Zone 3, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

Planning History

H07-0698-88: (Full Application) Change of use of agricultural land (grade 2/3) to 'private golf course' - approved 17 November 1988

H07-0367-14: (Full Application) Proposed function room and snooker room extension to existing golf club house complex - approved 25 June 2014

H07-0497-20: (Full Application) Proposed extension to golf clubhouse facility - approved 14 August 2020

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the consultation period are summarised below. The responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: Only showing one parking space in the red outline but the application says 10+ with 2 disabled - justification is required to ensure that all the parking along here is sufficient for all the uses.

Gedney Hill Parish Council: No comments.

Cllr L J Eldridge: No response received.

Ecology Officer: No response received.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located.

The main issues and considerations in this case include the following:

- Principle of Development;
- Design and Visual Impact;
- Impact on Amenity;
- Highway Safety and Parking;
- Flood Risk; and
- Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the Local Plan sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

In this case, the site comprises land within the countryside, outside of any settlement boundary. Section D of Policy 1 sets out that development within the countryside will be permitted that is necessary to such a location and / or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits. Within the supporting policy text, paragraph 3.2.16 states that "Some land uses may also require a countryside location because of their functionality".

Paragraph 88 of the NPPF sets out that planning decisions should enable the development of sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside (part c).

Although the site is within the countryside in policy terms, the site is within an established golf club. The application seeks consent for a beauty salon which is intended to support the functioning of the golf club by diversifying the offer of services at the club. The development would therefore provide some economic benefits by providing employment and supporting an existing business.

Policy 24 (The Retail Hierarchy) sets out that retail and other main town centre uses should be located in accordance with the policy hierarchy, which includes the following:

- Subregional centres (Boston and Spalding);
- The District Centre of Holbeach and Local Centres such as Crowland, Donington, Kirton, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge;
- Outside the Retail Hierarchy; and
- New Local Centres within Sustainable Urban Extensions.

Part C of the policy sets out that the vitality and viability of centres in the retail hierarchy will be maintained and enhanced. Proposals for main town centre uses such as the proposed salon outside the Primary Shopping Areas, outside the town centre boundaries and where not provided for under

Policy 27, will be required to demonstrate their suitability through a sequential test in line with the NPPF. Policy 27 is not considered to be relevant in this case as this policy relates to the provision of retail.

Policy 7 of the Local Plan sets out that employment development and businesses that re-use previously developed land or redundant buildings will be supported. The building in this case is not redundant, however, the site does comprise previously developed land.

It is not considered that the proposed beauty salon would significantly undermine the nearest town centres. The salon only features 52sqm which is not a significant amount of floorspace. The development would provide some economic benefits through the provision of employment and by supporting an existing business. These benefits weigh in favour of the proposals and as such the proposal is considered to accord with Policy 1. The principle of development is therefore acceptable, as the proposed use comprises an appropriate form of development for the location which would be in accordance with the overall principles of the spatial strategy. As such, the proposed development accords with Policies 1 and 24 of the Local Plan and Paragraphs 89 and 91 of the NPPF.

Design and Visual Impact

Policy 2 of the Local Plan similarly outlines sustainable development considerations for development proposals, providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals.

Policy 3 accords with the provisions of Section 12 of the NPPF as it requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically-designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

No external alterations are proposed to the building to facilitate the change of use. The proposed change of use would not significantly alter the character of the site or the surrounding area due to the small scale nature of the proposal, and the position of the salon within an existing golf club. For example, the salon is expected to attract fewer customers than the golf club and as such the comings and goings to the site should not drastically increase if the proposal is approved. The development therefore would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and therefore accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Policies 2 and 3 of Local Plan sets out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

There are several dwellings located to the south-east of the site on the opposite side of West Drove North. According to the application form, the proposed operating hours for the beauty salon are 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday, and only one employee is proposed. Beauty treatments are provided by appointment only. It is considered that the proposed use would not generate significant levels of noise or disturbance to the nearest dwellings. It is however considered appropriate to include a condition restricting the opening hours as proposed.

It is considered that the development would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the nearest dwellings. As such, the proposed development accords with the provisions of the Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Highway Safety and Parking

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, following mitigation.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan sets out that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation.

Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal.

Policy 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

Policy 36 of the Local Plan, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards.

The golf club currently features a car park at the front of the site next to West Drove North. There is also a large car park to the south of the site on the opposite side of West Drove North. Only one employee is proposed, and it is therefore likely that only one or two customers would be in the salon at a time. The parking requirement for the proposed use is therefore not likely to be significant.

Lincolnshire County Council's Highways team have queried where the parking spaces are located as only one parking space appears to be indicated within the red line boundary. The Highways team have requested justification to ensure that the parking provision is sufficient. However, this is not considered to be necessary in this case as there is ample room for parking at the golf club on land that is within the ownership of the club. The proposal would therefore have an acceptable impact in terms of highway safety and as such, the proposal would accord with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

The site is within Flood Zone 3 as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps. Policy 4 of the Local Plan sets out that development within Flood Zone 3 will be permitted in instances where specific criteria is met.

Within the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, areas across South Holland have been identified according to the level of hazard that is posed in terms of flood risk. Appendix C of the SFRA sets out guidance in terms of the minimum measures that are required according to what hazard category areas fall under. The site is not within a hazard rating area. As such, in this case no specific mitigation is recommended by the SFRA.

Paragraph 176 of the NPPF sets out that applications for changes of use should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests in terms of flood risk. However, the application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment, which is contained within the Planning Statement. As set out above, no specific mitigation is recommended in this case as the change of use is from one commercial use to another. For example, no sleeping accommodation is proposed, and no additional built structures are proposed. The development would therefore not pose an increase in risk to people. It is therefore considered that the proposed development accords with Policy 4 of the Local Plan and section 14 of the NPPF in terms of flood risk management.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021) requires developers to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain using standardized biodiversity units measured by statutory biodiversity metrics. This is often referred to as the mandatory requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain.

"Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits".

The biodiversity gain condition is a pre-commencement condition. This relates to a condition that seeks, once planning permission has been granted, a Biodiversity Gain Plan that must be submitted

and approved by the planning authority before commencement of the development, alongside the need to submit a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

The effect of Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the "biodiversity gain condition".

The effect of this "biodiversity gain condition" is that development granted by this notice must not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan, or
- (c) the development is exempt from the biodiversity gain condition.

For applications that are submitted prior to the introduction of this requirement, the development would be exempt from the mandatory 10% requirement and as such, the Biodiversity Gain Condition would not apply. However, this application was submitted following the introduction of this legislation. As such, unless comprising development that is exempt from this mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (10%), a condition would be required, as mandatorily set. When taking the above into account, the development in this instance the application is exempt from the statutory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.

Planning Balance

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or amenity of nearby residents, and provides adequate parking, whilst conforming with the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework when viewed as a whole. In this instance, there are no material considerations that weigh against the proposal and as such, the planning balance is in favour of the development.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:

A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.

B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).

C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that

may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

Conclusion

Taking the above considerations into account, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 24 and 36 of the Local Plan, along with the identified sections contained within the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that indicate against the proposal and outweigh the consideration in favour of the proposal and the policies referred to above.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under delegated authority.