

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H07-0472-25 **Applicant:** Monkwise Limited

Proposal: Change of use of part of golf club facility to provide 2 residential units for rent

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
- 10 Meeting Assessed Housing Requirements
- 11 Distribution of New Housing
- 17 Providing a Mix of Housing
- 23 The Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use
- 28 The Natural Environment
- 30 Pollution
- 33 Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network
- 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 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Section 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy
- 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
- Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for the change of use of part of a golf club facility to provide two residential units for rent.

The part of the building where the change of use is proposed was granted consent as an extension on 14 August 2020, under permission H07-0497-20. According to the applicant's agent the extension was completed at the end of June 2023. Conditions 4 and 5 of permission H07-0497-20 were not discharged, nor were any applications submitted to apply to discharge these conditions. Condition 4 is required to be discharged prior to the first use of the building, however, condition 5 was a pre-commencement condition and required details of a contamination assessment to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority. It is considered that condition 5 goes to the "heart" of the permission as it was necessary to ensure the site is safe for future users. As such, the permission does not appear to have been lawfully implemented. Furthermore, the extension has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans as the placement of windows and doors on the elevations does not align with the approved plans.

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.

Gedney Hill Parish Council: No objections.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board: I note the applicant proposes to utilise existing soakaways, we recommend that you satisfy yourselves that the existing soakaways are in good condition, appropriately sized for the development and therefore are able to adequately drain the proposed building, as per current building regulations. If the applicant intends to alter their proposed drainage strategy and surface water is proposed to discharge to a watercourse, consent would be required under Byelaw 3. Please note that we recommend that any discharge is in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), therefore the Board is unlikely to grant consent for discharges in excess of greenfield rate. A surface water development contribution is likely to be payable as a condition of any consent granted under Byelaw 3 in line with the WMA's Development Control Charges and Fees. I note that the applicant intends to treat foul waste using a existing package treatment plant however I cannot see that the applicant has indicated how they intend to dispose of this water once it has been treated. If the applicant proposes to discharge treated foul water to a watercourse, consent would be required under Byelaw 3. I note the presence of a watercourse which is not maintained by the Board (a riparian watercourse) north of the site boundary. Whilst not currently proposed, should the applicant's proposals change to include works to alter the riparian watercourse, or if works are proposed to alter the watercourse at any time in the future, consent would be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and byelaw 4). There are no Board maintained watercourses within or adjacent to the site boundary therefore Byelaw 10 does not apply.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: No objections. The proposal is for the change of use of part of golf club facility to provide 2 residential units for rent. Four Parking spaces exist and is sufficient for the size of units. The road already serves several residential properties and a golf club this will not have an adverse effect on the public highway or surface water flood risk.

Environmental Protection: I request a standard land contamination condition be applied at this location.

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 11 of the NPPF states that decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and for decision taking this means:

"c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date(8), granting permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance(7) provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or

ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination."

Footnote 8 clarifies that this includes "for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where: the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites".

According to South Holland District Council's (SHDC) 5-Year Housing Land Supply Assessment (5YHLS) (June 2025), SHDC can demonstrate 5.5 years of housing land supply. Furthermore, SHDC have scored at least 162% for the Housing Delivery Test over the last three years (Paragraph 1.4 of the 5YHLS Assessment). In accordance with Paragraph 232 of the NPPF, it is therefore not necessary to apply the tilted balance in favour of sustainable development in the determination of the current application.

In terms of Policy 1, it is necessary to consider whether the proposals are necessary for the location. It is also necessary to consider whether the proposals meet the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits that would arise from the proposals. These matters are considered below:

- *Economic*: In economic terms, limited construction employment would be generated as the proposal does not entail any extensions or new development externally. Some short term

employment would likely be required for the proposed internal works. The proposals could result in longer-term benefits such as spending from occupants on local services and facilities as Gedney Hill. Any economic benefits to the golf club are unclear due to the lack of information that has been provided.

- *Community*: In community terms, two dwellings would provide a minor contribution to the district's housing supply, albeit in an unsustainable location. No affordable housing is proposed as the development would not meet the affordable housing threshold. The applicant has also not presented any specific community benefits.

- *Environmental*: In environmental terms, the proposal would not provide a net gain in biodiversity and no planting is proposed. The proposal would re-use an existing building, which potentially represents an environmental benefit by re-using existing space. The dwellings are however, in an unsuitable location and any future occupants would likely be reliant on the use of private cars. For example, the nearest bus stops are located in Gedney Hill approximately 1.2km to the south of the site and infrequent bus services are offered from these stops.

The proposed development would therefore result in limited benefits. There is limited justification for the proposed dwellings within the submitted planning statement. The following sets out the parts of the statement which explain the justification for the proposed development:

"This extension was completed some years ago but it is considered that this particular element of the facility would better serve the business by providing some positive income and attract more visitors to the club as rental accommodation. The proposal requires no alterations to the external appearance of the building and the available floor area adapts easily to provide attractively located and energy efficient accommodation..."

The proposal has a functional link with the existing family run golf course and will add to facilities within the locality."

Therefore, limited information has been provided to justify the proposed dwellings. For example, no information is provided setting out whether the club is struggling financially or how much income is expected to be generated from the market dwellings. There are multiple businesses, including golf clubs, that could benefit from additional income provided by rent from market dwellings, however, this does not mean that such dwellings are necessary or appropriate for those businesses. The benefit of additional income is not considered to be sufficient justification for a departure to the Local Plan, specifically Policy 1. Furthermore, the planning statement provided for application H07-0497-20 for the extension originally justified the space as necessary to provide extra facilities to support the golf club. For example, an additional function room was deemed necessary, in addition to storage space, customer toilets, office space and a space for private meetings. No reference to this is made in the current submission and it is therefore unclear why this space is no longer required for the golf club. It is not considered that the provision of two market dwellings for rent is a necessary addition to the golf club or a suitable means of diversifying the offer of services at the club.

Policy 23 of the Local Plan is also relevant in this case as this policy relates to the re-use of buildings in the countryside for residential use. Policy 23 sets out that proposals for the conversion of existing buildings which are located outside defined settlement boundaries to residential use will be permitted provided that criteria 1 to 5 are addressed:

*"1. the building is structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for significant extension, alteration or rebuilding;
2. the building is of architectural or historic merit or makes a positive contribution to the character of the landscape, to justify conversion to ensure retention;
3. the proposal is in keeping with its surroundings;
4. the design is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the building in terms of architectural detailing and materials of construction; and
5. development leads to an enhancement of the immediate setting of the building."*

The proposed development is for the conversion of part of the golf club building into two dwellings. The part of the building where the dwellings are proposed is relatively new, and it is considered to be capable of conversion without significant alterations. The proposal therefore accords with part 1 of the policy.

In terms of part 2, the building is not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit to justify its conversion. The extended part of the building where the dwellings are proposed comprises a two-storey structure with a gable end roof form. Whilst the design of the extension was found to

be acceptable through the determination of permission H07-0497-20, the extension is not considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the landscape. The design of the extension is relatively generic. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not accord with part 2.

In terms of part 3, the two dwellings would be located within a golf club facility. There are some dwellings located on the opposite side of West Drove North, to the south-east of the site. There are no dwellings to the north-west of West Drove North, where the site is located. This side of the road is characterised by the golf club building which mostly comprises a single storey building which expands into a two-storey structure at the northern end of the building. This side of the road is therefore characterised by an existing leisure / commercial use rather than residential development. It is therefore not considered that proposal would be in keeping with the surroundings of the site and as such, the proposal does not accord with part 3.

In terms of part 4, no external changes are proposed other than the proposed change of use of land next to the building to provide two gardens. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with part 4.

In terms of part 5, there would be no visual changes along the street scene as no external alterations are proposed to the building and there is an existing 1.8m high timber fence and gate that runs along the site frontage. No soft landscaping is proposed. It is not considered that the development would lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting of the building. The proposal would therefore not accord with part 5.

To summarise, the proposed change of use is therefore not considered to accord with Policy 1 which seeks to direct housing development in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, concentrating on the most sustainable settlements to enable access to everyday facilities and services. It is not considered that the benefits of the development would outweigh the harm that would result from the provision of residential development within an unsustainable location. The development is also considered to be contrary to Policy 23 of the Local Plan, as the proposal would not accord with parts 2, 3 and 5 of the policy, as set out above.

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.

The golf club building is already in place on the site. No external changes are proposed to the building such as extensions or additional windows. As set out previously, it should be noted that the building has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans from permission H07-0497-20. The proposed external physical changes include the erection of 1.8m fencing which would not be visible from the street scene as there is existing fencing along the site frontage. The proposed external changes are therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and therefore accord 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. The nearest dwelling is 74 West Drove North and there is approximately 22m between the

nearest elevation of the existing golf club building, and No. 74. This is considered to be a suitable separation distance to prevent an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

No extensions are proposed and as such, the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing to nearby dwellings.

Both of the proposed dwellings would accord with the nationally described space standard and as such, sufficient internal living space is proposed. Furthermore, both dwellings are proposed to be provided with external amenity space.

The proposed dwellings would be connected to the golf club building and the room next to the dwelling has recently been granted retrospective consent as a beauty salon under permission H07-0470-25. The operating hours of the salon are restricted from 8am to 6pm Mondays to Saturdays. It is considered that the salon would not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the proposed dwelling by virtue of noise generation or general disturbance from customers.

The development would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the nearest dwellings and future occupants. 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.

There is an existing area of gravel at the front of the building where four parking spaces are proposed. The site plan does not clarify if the proposed parking spaces are for the proposed dwellings, however, this is presumed. There is therefore considered to be sufficient room for parking within the site. Lincolnshire County Council's highway team have not raised any objections to the proposed parking arrangements. 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. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment does however recommend out that the finished floor levels should be set 300mm above the surrounding ground levels.

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.

The development would not increase the impermeable area within the site as no extensions are proposed and the development would 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 proposed development in this instance would provide two dwellings, providing a very minor contribution to the supply of homes within the district. This is a minor contribution and is afforded limited weight. The local planning authority is able to demonstrate a supply of deliverable sites equivalent to in excess of 5 years through the latest Housing Land Supply Assessment (5.5 years as of June 2025). Therefore, full weight can be attributed to the policies in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2019. The minor benefits associated with the proposed development would not outweigh the harm that would result from the conflict with Policy 1 of the Local Plan by locating dwellings in an unsuitable location. The proposed development would therefore undermine the purpose of the Local Plan and the development is considered to conflict with Policy 1 of the Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF when viewed as a whole.

The proposed development would also conflict with Policy 23 of the Local Plan, specifically parts 2, 3 and 5 of the policy. The building that is proposed to be converted to residential use is not considered to be of architectural or historic merit, nor does it make a positive contribution to the character of the landscape in order to justify its retention. The development would also not lead to an enhancement of the setting of the building. As such, the proposed development would not

accord with Policy 23 of the Local Plan.

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 these factors into consideration, the proposal would not accord with Policies 1, 11, 17 and 23 of the Local Plan. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Therefore, the planning balance is against the proposal.

Recommendation

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