

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H09-0832-25 **Applicant:** Tesco PLC
Proposal: Proposed New Timpson Pod
Location: Tesco Boston Road South Holbeach
Terminal Date: 6th March 2026

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
27	Additional Retail Provision
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

Representations:

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

SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	0
---------------	---	---	---	---

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for a Timpson pod on land to the front of a Tesco store in Holbeach. The pod is proposed to measure 4.3m by 4.3m, featuring a flat roof that measures 2.65m in height. The pod is proposed to feature timber cladding on its facades, with various advertisement panels that are pending determination under application H09-0833-25.

Site Description

The application site comprises land at Tesco, located along Boston Road South, Holbeach.

The site is within the settlement boundary of Holbeach, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and the accompanying policies map.

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

Planning History

H09-0870-80 (Full Application) Siting of Portable office unit at Boston Road, Holbeach - not determined 17 September 1980

H09-1187-86: (Full Application) Change of use - production stores into showroom for retail sales - approved 06 February 1987

H09-1157-97: (Outline Application) Demolish existing buildings, construct Class A1 retail food store with ancillary access, car park, landscape, link, etc - approved 03 June 1999

H09-0923-99: (Reserved Matters) Erection of A1 retail food store, access, car park, servicing and landscaping - approved 13 April 2000

H09-1490-00: (Full Application) Erection of plant and machinery - approved 21 March 2001

H09-0073-04: (Full Application) Change of use of house to retail outlet with apartment above - approved 16 March 2004

H09-0603-08: (Full Application) Proposed storm lobby - approved 09 July 2008

H09-0641-11: (Full Application) Alterations to front elevation of shop and replacement of trolley bays - approved 17 October 2011

H09-0387-25: (Full Application) Proposed Replacement of Plant Unit for Decarbonisation - approved 30 June 2025

H09-0833-25: (Advertisement) Proposed Signage - approved 24 February 2026

Consultation Responses

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: The proposed development would not be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact upon the local highway network or increase surface water flood risk and therefore does not wish to object to this planning application.

Environmental Protection: No comments.

Cllr N J Chapman: I've seen many of these pods and are they are not too intrusive.

Holbeach Parish Council: No response received.

Cllr S E Hutchinson: No response received.

Cllr T Carter: No response received.

SHDC 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;
- Visual and Amenity Impact;
- 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.

The site is within the settlement of Holbeach which is identified as a Main Service Centre. Policy 1 of the Local Plan sets out that development will be permitted within Main Service Centres that supports their role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities.

The proposed development is for a Timpson pod which will feature retail space. Although the application form does not indicate the proposed use class, it is considered that the use falls under Use Class E.

The site is within Holbeach Town Centre. Policy 24 sets out that within district centres such as Holbeach, town centre uses will be permitted where they, on their own or cumulatively with other permitted development, will generate no significant harm upon the vitality and viability of that centre or any other centre within the hierarchy. Part B is the most relevant part of the policy as this sets out five criteria that new development within Holbeach district centre should accord with, which include the following:

1. Be physically integrated and have good pedestrian and cycle links, with the rest of the centre;
2. Generate a reasonable level of footfall and be open to the public;
3. Contribute to an appropriate balance of uses;
4. Achieve an acceptable level of amenity, including provision of refuse and recycling facilities; and
5. Achieve an acceptable level of highway access, parking and servicing.

In terms of the above referenced five policy criteria, customers could access the site either on foot, using public transport or via their own vehicles and the pod would be open to the public. The pod is relatively small, and it is not considered that the pod would result in an inappropriate balance of uses within the area. The amenity impact of the proposed development is assessed later within this report and it is considered that the impact would be acceptable. For example, there are no residential dwellings next to the site and the proposed use is not expected to generate significant levels of noise or disturbance. Furthermore, the opening hours of the site would be limited by condition to further protect the residential amenity or dwellings within the area. Lastly, the development would be acceptable in terms of highway safety. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to accord with the policy criteria.

Furthermore, the proposed development would deliver some benefits in terms of employment generation and a small contribution to the local economy. This carries some weight in favour of the proposal. Therefore, it is considered that the principle of development is acceptable in this case as the proposal accords with Policy 24 of the Local Plan.

Visual and Amenity Impact

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.

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.

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.

Policy 30 of the Local Plan sets out that development proposals will not be permitted where, taking account of any proposed mitigation measures, they would lead to unacceptable adverse impacts upon the amenities of an area or by way of noise.

The pod is proposed to measure 4.3m by 4.3m, featuring a flat roof that measures 2.65m in height. The pod would be positioned in front of the Tesco retail store within an existing area of hardstanding. The pod is proposed to feature timber cladding on its facades with various advertisement panels. It is considered that the pod would be an appropriate addition to the area given that there are various commercial business near to the site. The pod is also an appropriate addition to the area given its backdrop next to a much larger retail premises.

The site is not adjacent to any dwellings, and it is not considered that the pod would result in a

significant degree of noise or distance.

No opening hours are indicated on the submitted application form; however, it is considered appropriate to include a condition restricting the opening hours to be consistent with the neighbouring Tesco store.

Therefore, the development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and the amenity of nearby residents, in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 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 identified within a hazard rating area of both 'low'. The SFRA does not recommend any specific mitigation for commercial development such as the proposed pod within low hazard areas.

The proposed pod is considered to fall under the category of 'less vulnerable' within Annex 3 of the NPPF. Therefore, it is not necessary for the proposed development to pass the exception test.

Whilst the proposal is required to pass the sequential test, National Planning Practice Guidance requires a proportionate approach to be taken when applying the sequential test. In this case, the proposal seeks to insert an additional retail pod within an existing retail premises within the town centre policy area of Holbeach. The vast majority of Holbeach is within Flood Zone 3, with some areas of Flood Zones 1 and 2 within the town centre which is mostly covered by Holbeach Conservation Area. The proposed pod is unlikely to be a suitable addition within the Conservation Area and as such, it is considered that the sequential test is passed in this instance. Furthermore, the pod would be placed on an existing area of hardstanding thereby not resulting in an increase in the impermeable area within the site.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development accords with Policy 4 of the Local Plan and the intentions 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.

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 the amenity of nearby residents. The proposed development is considered to accord with the Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF 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, 24 and 30 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.