



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2025

by **H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 December 2025

Appeal Ref: **APP/K0940/W/25/3373199**

Post Cottage, The Square, Allithwaite, Westmorland and Furness LA11 7QF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Paula Smith against the decision of Westmorland and Furness Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1292/FPA.
 - The development is change of use from ancillary residential use to self-contained holiday accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council determined the planning application retrospectively, and I have dealt with the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway safety, having particular regard to parking provision.

Reasons

4. Post Cottage is accessed via The Square. The Square is not served by pavements, and the road is tightly bordered by properties, their boundaries and telegraph poles and lampposts. Stretches of the neighbouring Church Road and Holme Lane have similar characteristics. During my visit, I noted that on-street parking was quite prevalent near to the site. Therefore, The Square, and other roads in the surroundings of the appeal site, are subject to constraints which limit capacity, necessitate pedestrians and vehicles sharing the carriageway and which hamper the passage of oncoming vehicles.
5. Policy DM1 of the South Lakeland Development Management Policies Document (the DMPD) establishes general requirements for all developments. Amongst them is the requirement that developments ensure adequate and safe movement of highway users, and parking and servicing. DMPD Policy DM2 sets out design principles developments are expected to meet. This includes that developments should respond appropriately to local context, including by ensuring that their design and layouts meet needs and cater for users.
6. Policy CS10.2 of the South Lakeland Local Development Framework Core Strategy (the CS) concerns the transport impacts of development. It sets out criteria against which developments will be assessed, and this includes a criterion

that developments incorporate parking in accordance with any adopted and emerging policy and guidance.

7. These relevant parking standards are contained within the Cumbria Development Design Guide (the Design Guide) Appendix 1. Post Cottage is a 3-bed property and the self-contained holiday accommodation created is 1-bed. The Design Guide sets out that a total of 3 parking spaces should therefore be provided.
8. The submitted plans include the dimensions of the drive within the appeal site. These set out its width as being 6.3 metres (m), whilst its length, taken from the road to the nearest part of the 1-bed holiday accommodation building, is 6.4m. The submitted plans only depict 2 parking spaces on the drive.
9. Even though a section of boundary wall has been demolished within the site, no plan has been submitted which demonstrates that 3 cars can together park on the drive. Given its dimensions, and the manoeuvring constraints caused by the siting of Post Cottage, the holiday accommodation building, a lamppost, and even some planters, I have no good reason to conclude that they could. Therefore, the 3 parking spaces recommended by the Design Guide are not provided by the development.
10. In failing to provide sufficient on-site parking, the development has the clear potential to result in more on-street parking. Given the constraints of local highways, this poses a problem: it would worsen capacity issues and make passage more difficult for drivers, while pedestrians are forced to walk on the road. Therefore, in failing to provide sufficient on-site parking, the development exacerbates existing risks to highway safety.
11. In coming to these views, I note the appellant's submissions that they do not use a car, which limits parking demand at the site, and that they have permission for cars to park at another property when needed. However, these are personal circumstances which I have no certainty would endure in the long-term. Consequently, these matters do not adequately address my concerns. Given this, and the highway safety risks I have set out, a departure from the Design Guide's parking standards guidance is inappropriate in this case.
12. Therefore, due to inadequate on-site parking being provided, the development results in unacceptably prejudicial effects on highway safety. As a result, the development conflicts with the aforementioned Policies DM1 and DM2 of the DMPD, Policy CS10.2 of the CS, and the Design Guide. It also conflicts with the Allithwaite and Cartmel Neighbourhood Development Plan which sets out that planning decisions need to reflect its objectives, one of which is to ensure the tourist economy grows in a way which supports and enhances the environment and does not adversely impact on traffic and parking issues. Conflict also arises with policy within the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out that development causing unacceptable impacts on highway safety should be prevented.
13. Finally, the Council's reason for refusal cites conflict with Policy CS1.1 of the CS. This Policy establishes 11 sustainable development principles which developments are expected to meet. However, none of these concern parking or its implications on highway safety, and the development does not conflict with it as a result.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has set out that there is other holiday accommodation in the area which is not served by on-site parking. However, I have limited evidence before me in relation to it and the circumstances which led to it coming into fruition. Moreover, I must consider the development the subject of this appeal on its own merits, having regard to the evidence before me and its particular site and contextual characteristics. In such circumstances, the existence of the cited holiday accommodation does not provide sufficient justification to permit a development which results in the unacceptable harm I have identified in my main issue.
15. The development contributes to the choice of holiday accommodation in the area, it provides support for local businesses and services, and the change of use undertaken is sympathetic to the appearance of the area. In addition, the planting provided would have some modest carbon sequestration value and the development would achieve a biodiversity net gain. Altogether, these are benefits of the development, but they are modest ones, and they are insufficient to outweigh the harm I have found in my main issue.
16. The development may not harm the living conditions of local residents and occupants, but the absence of harm in this and other regards is of neutral consequence.

Conclusion

17. The development conflicts with the development plan, and there are no material considerations which indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR