
Appeal Decisions

Inquiry Held on 27, 28 and 29 February 2024 and 7 March 2024

Site visit made on 29 February 2024

by A A Phillips BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI AssocIHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2024

Appeal A: APP/Q9495/C/22/3309401

Land on the West side of Dunmallard Hill, Pooley Bridge, Penrith

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr Ronald Richardson against an enforcement notice issued by Lake District National Park Authority.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 13 September 2022.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is:
- On 3 August 2019 planning permission was conditionally granted for the construction of replacement bridge and associated works. Condition 2 in planning permission reference 7/2019/3019 concerns the plans and details with which the development must accord, and states that:

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in conformity with the following submitted plans and details:

Drawings nos:

- CA/729/15/01 A
- CA/729/04/01 A
- CA/729/03/02 A
- CA/729/14/001 A
- CA/729/04/002 A
- CA/729/12/03 A
- CA/729/12/06 A
- CA/676/001 A
- CA/729/01/002 A
- CA/729/02/002 A
- CA/729/05/01 A
- CA/729/05/02 A
- EWC-1242-ED080-ST-DWG-00006 Rev P05
- 03/12/2018 Handrail sketch-Design and Access Statement (Knight Architects)
- Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) produced by GHD for Eric Wright Civil Engineering for Pooley Bridge – Proposed Bridge and Temporary Works (referenced EWCE – 1242-ED080-CI-REP-00020, A – For Approval, Revision P08, dated 11 July 2019)
- In River Works Pooley Bridge – Management System Method of Work Rev A
- Environmental Risk Assessment – Pooley Bridge Reconstruction Ref: C760-EA-RA-Pooley Bridge-001

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt.

It appears to the Authority that the condition has not been complied with fully, because the Land continues to be used as a car park, operational development permitted

temporarily has not been removed, and the Land has not been reinstated in conformity with the Status Post Completion as specified in the Schedule of Works on drawing CA/729/05/2 A. The development therefore fails to comply with Condition 2 of planning permission 7/2019/3019.

- The requirements of the notice are:
 - a) Permanently discontinue the use of the Land as a car park.
 - b) Reinstatement of the land to its condition before the development took place in accordance with the Schedule of Works specified on Drawing CA/729/05/2 A, as secured by Condition 2 of planning permission 7/2019/3019 and appended to this notice.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b), (c) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed and the enforcement notice is quashed.

Appeal B: APP/Q9495/C/22/3315301

Land on the West side of Dunmallard Hill, Pooley Bridge, Penrith

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr Ronald Richardson against an enforcement notice issued by Lake District National Park Authority.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 21 December 2022.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is the making of a material change of use of land from agriculture to use as a public car park and associated operational development consisting of the formation of a vehicular access; installation of hard standing; erection of fencing and gates; formation of an earth bund and the installation of a pay and display machine and associated signage.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - a) Discontinue the use of the Land as a car park, and
 - b) Remove the crushed stone and tarmac hard standings, including any geotextile and sub-base materials from the Land, and
 - c) Remove the pay and display machine and associated advertisements from the Land, and
 - d) Remove all internal fencing from the Land, and
 - e) Spread the topsoil from the earth bund across the site and seed the areas of soil with an agricultural grass seed mix at a mix amount of 20 kilograms of seed per hectare, and
 - f) Reinstatement of the western boundary of the Land with the A592 as shown in attached Image A.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is six months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Preliminary Matters

1. With respect to Appeal B, the appellant's Grounds of Appeal suggests there might be a hidden appeal on ground (e). However, at the Inquiry it was confirmed that although the construction contractors responsible for carrying out the development have not been served with the Notice, there is no hidden ground (e).
2. Since the Enforcement Notices were issued, the Government has published a new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In relation to the main issues in this appeal, Government policy has not materially changed. As such, the cases of either side have not been prejudiced.

Appeal A on grounds (b) and (c)

3. The appeal on ground (b) is that the breach alleged did not occur as a matter of fact and ground (c) is that it did not constitute a breach of planning control. Because of the linked arguments with respect to these grounds I will take them together. The appeal is made on the grounds that the car park was not built in conformity with the approved plans (in particular Plan CA/729/05/02 A) to the extent that it has been built without the benefit of planning permission altogether or that in any event condition 2 relating to the drawings did not require the removal of the car park even if it was built in accordance with the approved plans.
4. Where a condition is imposed on a grant of planning permission providing that the development should not be carried out otherwise than in conformity with the approved plans, and the development is not built in accordance with those plans, there will be a breach of planning control consisting of either a breach of the condition, if there are comparatively minor deviations between what was permitted and what is built, or development without planning permission, where there is a substantial deviation from the approved plans. In the latter scenario, none of the conditions imposed on the planning permission will have effect.
5. The appellant contends that the car park has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans but is materially different. That appears to be the National Park Authority's position in February 2023 when it asks whether it can be agreed that the car park does not have planning permission under 7/2019/3019 and that planning permission 7/2019/3019 is unrelated to the car park as constructed. There is no other reason for the letter to be worded as it is other than to confirm agreement with the appellant on its own position. The courts have held that determining whether development has been carried out in conformity with approved plans may well involve matters of planning judgment and degree. I have also taken account of the fact that the condition does not require the development to be in *strict* accordance with the approved plans. Therefore, the main question is whether the development carried out on the ground is objectively in conformity with the plans to the extent that condition 2 bites.
6. I can see that the red line shown on Plans CA/729/15/1A and CA/729/05/02A are different from the development carried out. The identification of a red line on a plan showing the boundary to which the application relates is not something that necessarily affects the overall scope of the development permitted by any subsequent planning permission, if the development is clearly shown on the other approved plans.
7. It is very clear that a car park has been built but its size and overall site coverage is materially larger than shown on the approved drawings. Furthermore, the layout and design are different as are some of the facilities provided within the works site. I agree that the development has features shown on the approved plans including a soil bund along the south-east edge, stone layering, a wide vehicle access and a vehicle turning area, but the arrangement of some of those features is materially different from those shown on the approved drawings. Therefore, as a matter of planning judgment and degree there are differences, and the development is objectively not in conformity with the plans listed on the permission. The development deviates

substantially from the approved plans and therefore none of the conditions, including the plans condition 2 take effect.

8. It is common ground that the car park and compound were not constructed in accordance with either approved drawing 7/729/05/2A or indeed drawing CA/729/06/2A, but it was constructed much closer to the latter. However, CA/729/06/2A is not listed in condition 2 and does not form part of the suite of drawings and documents to which the development should have been constructed.
9. I conclude that condition 2 is not engaged and do not need to go on to the next step with respect to the interpretation of condition 2. For the reasons given above, the appeal should succeed on ground (b). The enforcement notice will be quashed. In these circumstances, the appeals on grounds (c), (a) and (g) and the application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act do not fall to be considered.

Appeal B on ground (a)

10. The ground of appeal is that planning permission should be granted. The main issues are:
 - i. Whether the principle of a permanent car park is acceptable in this location having regard to Policy 22 of the Lake District National Park Local Plan 2020-2035 (the LP) which relates to vehicle parking to improve sustainable transport;
 - ii. The effect on the character and appearance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the English Lake District World Heritage Site with particular reference to its effect on the landscape and visual quality of the area and its extraordinary beauty and harmony;
 - iii. Whether or not the development results in safe highways conditions for pedestrians and other highway users as a consequence of the connectivity from the site to Pooley Bridge and the steamer pier.

Principle of a car park

11. All local witnesses provided evidence of problems in Pooley Bridge in terms of congestion, dangerous fly parking, parking in laybys, alongside Ullswater and verges and blocked roads. This is not disputed by the Authority. Parking problems in the village were described as chaotic and this has become worse over recent post-pandemic years. Pooley Bridge is situated at the northern entrance into the Lake District National Park and the appellant argues that is an ideal place to intercept traffic and therefore protect the wider Ullswater Valley from increasing traffic and parking problems. Policy 10 of the LP which seeks to ensure that development of the East Distinctive Area of the Lake District will reinforce distinctiveness of place, deliver key themes of the Vision and enable local solutions to specific planning issues by, among other things, supporting appropriate additional car and coach parking provision to serve Pooley Bridge and onward travel.
12. Policy 21 of the LP supports proposals which enable the provision of new modes of transport and mobility services and Policy 22 relates specifically to vehicle parking to improve sustainable transport, stating that the Authority will only support additional public parking provision that helps to reduce the need to

travel by private motor vehicle and contributes to and improve sustainable transport and movement opportunities. This will be achieved by permitting additional public car parking at Rural Service Centres, which includes Pooley Bridge, only where evidence demonstrates it is needed and it facilitates the transfer of people to sustainable transport and travel opportunities.

13. I accept that Policy 21 recognises that the private motor vehicle is the most practical means of accessing the National Park, but the appeal site is not located at Pooley Bridge as required by Policy 22 but is in open countryside and it relates poorly to the settlement and its buildings. Facilities in the village can only be accessed via the permissive path through Dunmallard Wood or along the road.
14. There is no dispute that there is demand for parking at the appeal site, but there is little clear evidence that the car park facilitates sustainable transport. Indeed, the evidence before me is that wherever car parking is provided there is never enough to serve the National Park. It is contended that the location of the car park is ideal to intercept traffic travelling into the National Park down the A592, but in my judgement it is as likely to be used as an overspill car park for those visiting Pooley Bridge rather than as a destination for visitors to then transfer onto other means of transport, such as bus. Therefore, in my view the car park in this location is more likely to encourage people to use their private vehicles rather than move onto other sustainable means.
15. Indeed, there is little evidence of how the car park has been used other than a very rough assessment which appears to show that 40% of visitors stay for 2 hours or less. This suggests the car park is being used for unsustainable travel patterns such as by local swimmers who use the facility for short stay purposes in mornings and evenings.
16. In my judgement the car park is not suitably located for easy access to the Ullswater Steamer pier because it is necessary to use the permissive path and either walk into Pooley Bridge and then out again along the roadside footpath or join the B3520 via a spur in the permissive path and walk along a section of road subject to a 60 miles per hour speed limit with poor visibility. Therefore, a far more convenient option for visitors is to park in Pooley Bridge. I recognise that Ullswater Steamers is a valued local business which has invested in new steamers, piers and improved access to the Lake and is therefore keen to link with the car park and other providers to remain a viable business, but I do not consider the car park to be suitably located to provide safe and convenient access for potential users. Those opportunities are far more likely to be suitably provided in Pooley Bridge itself.
17. The car park has also facilitated the SITU bus services around Ullswater to take visitors to various attractions in the area. It is agreed that SITU provides a modest service and that it was only a pilot project in 2023. It is my understanding that route UB1 stopped at the appeal car park, but it is a small bus with a capacity of only 16 which operates at weekends and bank holidays only. Therefore, it does provide an option for drivers, but in my view, it is unlikely to provide significant benefits in terms of modal shift. The main local bus service does not stop at the appeal site and therefore cannot form a reasonable part of any argument regarding modal shift.
18. The appellant also argues that Policy 22 supports additional parking *at* but not necessarily *in* Pooley Bridge. This is a rather pedantic point in an appeal where

the site in question is clearly neither *in* nor *at* the village itself, but in an area of open countryside. There are other proposals for car parks in or closer to Pooley Bridge which show that other options are coming forward to meet the need for parking in accordance with Policy 22 of the LP and are likely to give rise to less harm in the context of local transport policy. I can see that the other sites are not guaranteed to be delivered but they certainly appear to provide better options.

19. There are some exceptions incorporated into Policy 22, but in this case, not all of these are met because, firstly, there is no evidence that the car park resolves an unacceptable highway safety issue or hazard and all other regulatory measures and enforcement have been exhausted, nor does the development form part of a traffic management plan.
20. Therefore, in summary, I do not consider the car park to comply with relevant LP policy and could only have been justified in the context of circumstances where vehicles could not physically access Pooley Bridge because of the loss of the bridge. There is a lot of local support because it does provide more parking in the area and therefore attractive for local businesses and residents given the parking and transport pressure on Pooley Bridge. But that does not mean it is in a suitable location for a permanent car park where it has not been clearly demonstrated that it can successfully deliver sustainable onward travel movements.
21. I have also taken account of the evidence that the car park has not reduced pressure on parking in Pooley Bridge and the wider area and there is clear evidence of current chaotic conditions. Indeed, it is logical and human nature that visitors will firstly seek to use free parking opportunities in Pooley Bridge and elsewhere or pay for more conveniently located car parking to access Pooley Bridge and the Steamer Pier before resorting to use the appeal car park. It could be argued that the car park is exacerbating ongoing traffic problems in the vicinity. Therefore, on this issue I conclude that the principle of the permanent car park in this location is not acceptable having regard to Policy 22 of the Lake District National Park Local Plan 2020-2035 which relates to vehicle parking to improve sustainable transport. As demonstrated above there is also conflict with Policies 10 and 21 of the LP.

Character and appearance

22. Ullswater is a truly spectacular landscape of extraordinary beauty. Indeed, the Landscape Character Assessment notes its "*many stimulating views*", the evolving character "*with gently sloping rich pasture dropping to the edge of the lake*" and that "*there is generally little built development along the lake, outside the main settlements*". Furthermore, Dunmallard Hill is an important landscape separation between the appeal site situated in the Eamont river valley and the appeal site which is in Ullswater. It is in this landscape context that the car park has been built. The appellant accepts that the car park has resulted in some "quite large" impacts on the landscape, but their evidence in this regard does not appear to have followed any particular methodology and is surprisingly almost dismissive of the landscape context in which the car park has been built.
23. The development is a relatively stark rather urbanised feature which appears to have been casually placed into the high-quality location that was an integral part of the pastoral landscape and the recognised gently sloping pasture

dropping to the edge of the Lake. The car park is entirely inconsistent with its setting, destroying the gateway into the stunning Ullswater Valley. The fencing, hardstanding and bund draw unwanted attention to the development.

24. The site is clearly open and highly visible from local receptors and its visibility would only increase on busy days when cars and vans provide the primary visual focus rather than the surrounding countryside. Views from Dunmallard Hill from the permissive path between the appeal site and the Ullswater Way, Ullswater Way to the west, from the nearby roads A592 and B5320 and wider views from the opposite side of the Lake are particularly harmed and I totally dispute the appellant's comments that the car park as built has caused some harm but that is very much to local views over a small area. Views of the site from the surrounding landscape are extensive over a wide area of the Ullswater Valley and its surroundings. From some angles the earth bund screens the site, but this is an intrusive and alien feature on the sloping pastureland.
25. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policy 01 of the LP as it does not protect or enhance the authenticity, integrity and significance of the Lake District and it also conflicts with LP Policy 05 that seeks to protect the extraordinary beauty and harmony of the landscape. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) attaches great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks and specifically advises that development should be sensitively located to avoid or minimise impacts.
26. It may be possible to partly screen the car park through a well-planned and well-managed landscaping scheme, but that would not mitigate the harm to the sloping pasture which forms such an important part of the setting of Ullswater. Furthermore, given the overall scale of the development, it would remain visible and intrusive from important viewpoints. An illustrative scheme submitted to the Inquiry demonstrates the potential difficulty in providing an acceptable landscape scheme, but also adds to concerns relating to the lack of attention given to the harm caused by the development.
27. The National Park is designated as a World Heritage Site. As such it is a designated heritage asset, whose attributes of Universal Outstanding Value affected by the development are the extraordinary beauty and harmony of the landscape and the intactness and legibility of the agro-pastoral landscape, including land used as "inbye". In my judgement the development harms those key features and that harm is "less than substantial". Therefore, the harm must be weighed against the public benefits that arise from the development.
28. There are a number of public benefits including increasing footfall and supporting local businesses in Pooley Bridge, including shops, hotels, pubs and restaurants and the Ullswater Steamer. The car park also improves access to the public rights of way network and other recreational uses such as swimming and water sports. In my judgement, given the great weight that I must give to harm to the National Park and the World Heritage Site, those public benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
29. Therefore, on this issue I conclude that the development has a harmful and unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the English Lake District World Heritage Site with reference to its effect on the landscape and visual quality of the area and its

extraordinary beauty and harmony. That harm is not outweighed by public benefits and therefore the development conflicts with Policies 01, 02, 05, 06 and 07 of the LP and the Framework.

Highways safety

30. The Authority's position on this issue is that the car park will only be acceptable on a permanent basis if a footpath link to Pooley Bridge and other destinations is provided and is suitable for all users. Firstly, the path can be secured through a legal agreement with the landowners and be made available in perpetuity. However, at my site visit I observed that although an attractive route for some, at present the path is not suitable for all users due to steep and narrow sections with other obstacles to movement such as gates. The appellant suggests that the answer to this problem is that those who cannot use the path can be dropped off in the village or the Steamer Pier or use blue badges to park in the village. Some of these options would result in additional traffic movements in the area.
31. There is also some risk that users may choose or have no alternative option than to use the B3520 to access the Steamer pier and Pooley Bridge. The section of road to the Steamer Pier has an unrestricted speed limit at 60 mph, does not have a suitable verge or path for pedestrians and other users and has particularly poor visibility in some sections. The evidence shows that it is unlikely that the speed limit will be reduced to 20mph and therefore I attribute this very little weight.
32. Therefore, on this issue I conclude that development does not result in safe highways conditions for pedestrians and other highway users because of the connectivity from the site to Pooley Bridge and the steamer pier. As such it conflicts with Policy 22 of the LP and the Framework.

Other matters

33. Policy 19 of the LP recognises the importance of farm diversification and the car park is on a farm where subsidies will be withdrawn completely in the next few years at a time when costs of operating the farm will continue to rise. The income from the car park is significant in this context and it is accepted by the National Park Authority that this is positive and should be weighed in the overall planning balance of this case.
34. The appellant argues that there is a fallback position through which he could construct the car park shown on approved drawing CA/729/05/02A on a permanent basis. However, it is important to also determine whether there is a realistic prospect of that happening.
35. The 2019 planning permission was for "construction of a bridge and associated works" and on its face it did not allow development that is not associated with the construction of the bridge. The bridge was completed several years ago and therefore the car park could not by definition be works associated with the bridge construction. As such the construction of a car park to fit with the approved plans would fall outside the scope of the planning permission and would be unlawful.
36. Furthermore, there is little evidence that the appellant would construct the car park in accordance with drawing CA/729/05/02A because it would require creating a works site with associated infrastructure, a construction vehicle

turning space and site stores and cabins and it is clearly these would serve no purpose whatsoever. Therefore, in my judgment there is no real prospect of the appellant relying on the alleged fallback position and therefore it should attract only limited weight in the planning balance.

Overall Conclusion on ground (a)

37. There are a number of benefits from the development, including the financial support it provides to the traditional sheep farm. It also attracts increased footfall to the area and may support local businesses in Pooley Bridge, including the Ullswater Steamers. The car park facilitates access to the local footpath network and is also used by those wishing to access the nearby Lake to swim or participate in other water sports. However, this latter benefit should be tempered by the fact that direct access from the car park to the lakeside appears to involve trespass over a neighbouring landowner's property. Nonetheless, it may be said that the improved access it provides promotes enjoyment and understanding of the Lake District.
38. However, as I have set out above, there is clearly harm caused. In my judgment the car park is not supported by sustainable travel policy support set out in the LP and therefore undermines the Lake District's overall spatial strategy. It is not located on a suitable site and does not secure or promote a modal shift in more sustainable means of transport. The landscape and visual impacts are also of great importance given the design and appearance of the car park and its highly sensitive landscape context. Great weight should be given to the harm to the National Park and the World Heritage Site which is a designated heritage asset and the public benefits do not outweigh that harm. I am also concerned regarding highways safety as the development results in potentially hazardous conditions for highway users and pedestrians, in particular.
39. Because of the harm to the character and appearance of the area the development conflicts with the core purpose of National Parks to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. There is some conflict between that objective and promoting understanding and enjoyment, but the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the Lake District National Park must be given greater weight.
40. The development is contrary to Local Plan Policies 01, 02, 05, 06, 07, 10, 21 and 22 and the harms clearly outweigh the benefits. As such the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the appeal on ground (a) is refused.

Appeal B on ground (f)

41. The ground of appeal is that the steps required by the notice to be taken exceed what is necessary to achieve the purpose. The purposes of an enforcement notice are set out in s173 of the 1990 Act and are to remedy the breach of planning control (s173(4)(a)) or to remedy injury to amenity (s174(4)(b)). Since the notice requires the cessation of the use of the land as a car park and for it to be reinstated to its condition prior to the breach of planning control taking place, the purpose is clearly to remedy the breach.
42. The courts have held that an enforcement notice directed at a material change of use of land can require the removal of ancillary operational development if

the works were intended to facilitate the unlawful use. Therefore, the Notice is perfectly entitled to require the removal of fencing and other items which are part and parcel of the unauthorised development that has taken place. In any case, associated operational development is part of the alleged breach of planning control. There is little evidence that the fences or the widened access might be needed for sheep farming purposes.

43. Leaving any part of the development in place would not achieve the purpose of the Notice and in this respect the appeal on ground (f) fails.

Appeal B on ground (g)

44. The ground of appeal is that the time given to comply with the requirements is too short. The six months given would be sufficient to discontinue the use of the car park and carry out the removal of items and works to restore the land to its condition before the breach of planning control took place. The twelve months suggested by the appellant would be excessive having regard to the ongoing harm caused by the development.
45. Should the appellant find proven difficulty in complying with all the requirements of the Notice he would be able to negotiate with the Authority an extension of the time for full compliance. The appeal on ground (g) fails.

Formal Decisions

Appeal A

46. The appeal is allowed and the enforcement notice is quashed.

Appeal B

47. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld. Planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

A A Phillips

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ned Westway of Counsel	Appointed by Lake District National Park Authority
------------------------	--

He called

Ben Long

Izindi Visage

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Miss Nicola Allen of Counsel	appointed by Peter Winter
------------------------------	---------------------------

She called

Miles MacInnes – Barton and Pooley Bridge Parish Council

Jim Walker of Lake District Estates

Martin Robinson

Peter Winter MRTPI

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Helen Thornley

Micheal Firth	Sustainable and Integrated Transport for Ullswater Group
---------------	--

Robert Hazell-McCosh	Dalemain LLP
----------------------	--------------

Colin Hindle	Ullswater Association
--------------	-----------------------

Dr Allan Rich	Parish Councils of Martindale, Patterdale, Matterdale and Dacre
---------------	---

DOCUMENTS EXCHANGED AT INQUIRY

- 1 Summary Proof of Evidence of Peter Winter
- 2 Witness Statement by Miles MacInnes on Behalf of Barton & Pooley Bridge Parish Council
- 3 Witness Statement of Martin Robinson
- 4 Witness Statement of Helen Thornley
- 5 Witness Statement by M J Firth
- 6 Witness Statement of R Hazell-McCosh on Behalf of Dalemain LLP
- 7 Witness Statement by Colin Hindle
- 8 Witness Statement by Dr Alan Rich
- 9 Westmorland and Furness Council letter dated 6 September 2023 from Stuart Taylor Flood and Development Management Officer to Ben Long
- 10 SITU information document
- 11 Correspondence dated 26 February 2024 regarding Dunmallard Illegal Car Parking
- 12 Westmorland and Furness Council report regarding Approval of a new 20mph Speed Limit Policy
- 13 Letters of support for the retention of the car park