

CUMBERLAND COUNCIL DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION

1.	Reference No:	4/25/2412/0F1	
2.	Proposed Development:	PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM FORMER PUBLIC HOUSE TO A SHORT TERM HOLIDAY LETTING PROPERTY (SUI GENERIS) INCLUDING INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND DEMOLITION/REBUILDING OF REAR EXTENSIONS	
3.	Location:	ODDFELLOWS ARMS, 91/92 MAIN STREET, ST BEES	
4.	Parish:	St. Bees	
5.	Constraints:	ASC Adverts - ASC;Adverts, Conservation Area - Conservation Area, Coal - Standing Advice - Data Subject To Change, Outer Consultation Zone - Sellafield 10KM	
6.	Publicity Representations & Policy	Neighbour Notification Letter	Yes
		Site Notice	Yes
		Press Notice	Yes
		Consultation Responses	See Report
		Relevant Policies	See Report
7.	Report: Site and Location	This Application Site relates to the former licenced premises Oddfellows Arms, located within the centre of St Bees. The Site encompasses the existing building, which comprises the public house at ground	

floor level and living accommodation above, rear yard and car park, and existing flat roof store.

The Site measures 391 sq metres and is currently vacant following the closure of the public house in April 2024.

The Application Site is located within the St Bees Conservation Area. The property fronts onto the Main Street through St Bees, and is bounded to the north, south and west by residential properties.

The nearest Grade II Listed buildings (Fairladies Farmhouse and Redbourn House) are located approximately 50m to the north of the site. A Grade II Listed building (Grainger House) is also located 105m to the south of the site.

The Application Site is located within Flood Zone 1, and as such has a low probability of flooding.

The Application Site is not located within a river catchment affected by nutrient neutrality.

There are no Public Rights of Way on the Application Site.

Directly Relevant Planning Application History

4/96/0899/0 – Conservatory to rear of premises – Approved.

4/08/2328/0 – Raised deck with awning and screens – Approved.

Proposal

This Application seeks planning permission to change the use of the former public house to a short term holiday letting property (sui generis) including various alterations and the demolition/rebuilding of rear extensions.

It is proposed that the Site will be let as a whole and will include 8 letting rooms to accommodate a maximum of 16 people within the short term holiday let.

The Application Site benefits from single storey rear extensions that will be demolished as part of this proposal. These extensions will be replaced with a part single and part two storey rear extension. The single storey element of the proposal will project from the rear of the existing building by 4.46m and will extend along this elevation at a maximum of 9.19m, with an overall height of 2.8m. The proposed two storey element will project from the rear elevation of the existing building by 3.12m and will extend along this elevation at a maximum of 6.29m, with an overall height of 5m. Externally the proposed extension will be finished with painted render and a modern flat roof membrane system.

The proposal also includes the reconfiguration of the internal ground and first floor layout of the main property to create a series of bedrooms for the holiday let along with kitchen and



Cumberland Council

dining facilities within the replacement rear extension.

There are no external alterations proposed to the front elevation of the building, other than necessary repairs to render and redecoration. Any replacement windows will be of a similar mock sash design.

The existing parking area to the rear of the site is accessed via the side of the property, by an existing single width road. Access to the site will remain unaltered. The proposal includes the resurfacing of the existing gravel vehicular parking area and the retention of four existing parking spaces. A new 1.1m fence screening will be installed around the existing rear terrace and seating area, and a 1.1m post and rail fencing will also be installed around the perimeter of the site. Additional planting will be accommodated within the rear yard/parking area.

The rear of the site benefits from an existing flat roof shed. This structure will be retained and will be unaltered as part of this application. The structure and surrounding area will be utilised as an ancillary storage area.

Consultation Responses

Ward Member

A call-in request was received from Councillor Minshaw on the 24th March 2026 in relation to this application. The material reason specified for the application being referred to the Planning Committee are:

- Highways/traffic/parking;
- Economic impacts on local businesses;
- Cumulative impact of recent applications for similar use;
- Impact on the viability of the village.

St Bees Parish Council

31st December 2025

This application was discussed at some length at the meeting of the Parish Council on 15 December. The Parish Council strongly objects to the application to convert the property to a short-term holiday letting property capable of accommodating 16/17 people. The Parish Council believes that the application with this level of occupancy would have significant impacts on adjacent properties and the nature of the historic village setting. The basis of our objections is set out below.

The proposed development would seem to contravene a number of policies in the Local Plan. Housing of an affordable nature is in short supply in St Bees and there is already an ample supply of short-term lettings for holiday makers and transient workers in the village where

there are three hotels, numerous guest houses and bed & breakfast establishments, as well as a large number of properties available for short term lets. Fairladies Barn Guest House is immediately opposite which has off-road parking for its guests. Development of the Oddfellows as proposed in this application would be tipping the balance into an oversupply of tourist accommodation and cause economic harm to the local businesses already in the village. The fact that some existing short-term rentals are being converted back to domestic home units is evidence that there is no demonstrable local need for this form of development. This application would be counter to the NPPF objective of sustaining and supporting the local businesses already in the village and pose significant harm to the character and nature of St Bees community.

Additionally, the design, layout, scale and appearance of this development is inappropriate to the location of the property and will have an unacceptable and overbearing impact upon neighbouring residents due to its occupancy density, scale and proximity. This is partly counter to Policy H12 where developments should not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance. The application also includes a pod to the rear of the property which would inevitably result in disturbance to neighbouring properties.

The heart of a village is its people and people need homes and this property could easily be integrated into the heart of the village by conversion to provide much needed affordable homes. It will be a significant loss of the original property from the possibility of providing a needed and affordable housing supply into the village. The property developer is presenting a significantly lack lustre concept that has no consideration for either the local need or the local community. This is partly an aspect of policy H7 and H8. This property was once two separate dwellings, and this development could have been an imaginative and bold step to reintegrate a supply of affordable family homes back into the village. The development also appears to be contrary to sections to Policy H13 - Conversion and sub-division of buildings to residential uses.

The property is located on a particularly congested part of St Bees Main Street which is often gridlocked with vehicles trying to pass parked cars. The application is offering only four parking spaces for what is proposed as a 16/17 person occupancy. This is clearly insufficient for the level of occupancy and would exacerbate the parking problems in the centre of the village where few houses have off street parking. This indicates a significant disregard for the impacts on neighbouring properties and on the general through traffic management of the Main Street, as well as the safety issues of traffic egress and ingress onto or from the highway and construction traffic management.

In summary, the development does not align with planning policy and impacts the sensitive balance of community by introducing unnecessary and unneeded short term lets when it is actually affordable homes that are required. It would have a detrimental effect on existing local businesses, result in unacceptable disturbance to neighbouring properties and pose significant and permanent vehicle and road safety risks. For these reasons the Parish Council



Cumberland Council

believes the application should be refused.

31st March 2026

This is still a contentious application. The revision done by the applicant has done nothing to address the concerns and contradiction to planning policies.

The application is still highly overdeveloped and is still proposing the two-person accommodation pod to the rear. The overall application is still proposing a total of 17-person high density of occupancy and only 4 vehicular parking places. Therefore very little has changed since the original application, on that basis all of the previous points of objections remain valid, as this conversion to short-term lettings and the highly challenging impacts to adjacent properties and the nature of the historic village setting that is St Bees lies in the face of many planning policies.

Firstly -- the application is still incorrectly numbered as being 92 Main Street when it actually carries the address as number 91 as shown on the site location plan.

Secondly -- This proposed development would seem to cross a number of policy and strategic markers in the adopted Local Plan, and on this basis should be soundly objected to and refused. The points in question are laid out below.

Housing of an affordable nature is in short supply in St Bees and there is already ample short-term lettings for holiday makers and transient workers in the village where there are three hotels, numerous guest houses, bed and breakfasts, Fairladies Barn Guest house opposite which has ample off-road parking for its guests, and also the numerous other rental and short term lets in the village. The application makes no reasoning as to why this development adds to a need that is not there.

Development of this property in this way would be tipping the balance into an oversupply of tourist accommodation and cause economic harm to the local businesses already in the village. The fact that some existing short-term rentals are being converted back to domestic home units is telling enough that there is no demonstrable local need for this form of development. This application would be counter to the NPPF of sustaining and supporting the local businesses already in the village and pose significant erosion and harm to the character and nature of St Bees community. The heart of a village are its people and people need homes and this property could so imaginatively be integrated into the heart of the village by converting and providing much needed affordable homes.

Additionally the design, layout, scale and appearance of this development is inappropriate to the location of the property and will have an unacceptable and overbearing impact upon neighbouring residents due to its occupancy density, scale and proximity. This is partly counter to Policy H12 where developments should not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance.

It will also be a significant loss of the original property from the possibility of providing a needed and affordable housing supply into the village. The property developer is presenting a

significantly lack lustre concept that has no consideration for either the local need or the local community. This is partly an aspect of policy H7 and H8. This property was once two separate dwellings, and this development could have been an imaginative and bold step to reintegrate a supply of needed and affordable family homes back into the village – even possible would be to cleverly generate three individual homes from the single property.

The development runs contrary to nearly all the sub-sections to Policy H13 - Conversion and sub-division of buildings to residential uses and as such should be dismissed on this policy alone.

Finally, the property location is sited on a particularly highly congested part of St Bees main street and is offering only 4 vehicular parking spaces for what is proposed as a 17-person multi-home occupancy. This is a significantly woeful disregard of consideration of the impacts to neighbouring properties and to the general through traffic management of the main street, notwithstanding the significant safety issues for traffic egress and ingress onto or from the main road highway as well construction traffic management.

For all the reasons presented in this summary, the development does not align with policy, it impacts the sensitive balance of community by introducing unnecessary and unneeded short term lets when it is actually affordable homes that are required. It would have an unacceptable impact on current local businesses, poses long-term harm to neighbouring properties and significant and permanent vehicle and road safety risks. For these reasons this application should be refused.

19th May 2026

This is still a contentious application. The revision done by the applicant has done nothing to address the concerns and contradictions to planning policies.

The application is still highly overdeveloped even though the two-person accommodation pod to the rear has now been removed. The overall application is now proposing a total of 15-person high density of occupancy and only 4 vehicular parking places. Therefore very little has changed since the original application, on that basis all of the previous points of objections remain valid, as this conversion to short-term lettings and the highly challenging impacts to adjacent properties and the nature of the historic village setting that is St Bees flies in the face of many planning policies.

Firstly -- the application is still incorrectly numbered as being 92 Main Street when it actually carries the address as number 91 as shown on the site location plan.

Secondly -- The Copeland Plan was subsumed into the Cumberland Plan, and this proposed development would seem to cross a number of policy and strategic markers, and on this basis should be soundly objected to and refused. The points in question are laid out below.

Housing of an affordable nature is in short supply in St Bees and there is already ample short-term lettings for holiday makers and transient workers in the village where there are three hotels, numerous guest houses, bed and breakfasts, Fairladies Barn Guest house



**Cumberland
Council**

opposite which has ample off-road parking for its guests, and also there are numerous other rental and short term lets in the village. A lot of which is underutilised and the application makes no reasoning as to why this development adds to a need that is not there.

Development of this property in this way would be tipping the balance into an oversupply of tourist accommodation and cause economic harm to the local businesses already in the village. The fact that some existing short-term rentals are being converted back to domestic home units is telling enough that there is no demonstrable local need for this form of development. This application would be counter to the NPPF of sustaining and supporting the local businesses already in the village and pose significant erosion and harm to the character and nature of St Bees community. The heart of a village are its people and people need homes and this property could so imaginatively be integrated into the heart of the village by converting and providing much needed affordable homes.

Additionally the design, layout, scale and appearance of this development are inappropriate to the location of the property and will have an unacceptable and overbearing impact upon neighbouring residents due to its occupancy density, scale and proximity. The measures proposed to avoid noise and nuisance to neighbouring properties are inadequate to provide any reassurance to nearby residents, dealing only with problems after the event. This is partly counter to Policy H12 where developments should not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance.

It will also be a significant loss of the original property from the possibility of providing a needed and affordable housing supply into the village. The property developer is presenting a significantly lack lustre concept that has no consideration for either the local need or the local community. This is partly an aspect of policy H7 and H8. This property was once two separate dwellings, and this development could have been an imaginative and bold step to reintegrate a supply of needed and affordable family homes back into the village – even possible would be to cleverly generate three individual homes from the single property.

The development runs contrary to nearly all the sub-sections to Policy H13 - Conversion and sub-division of buildings to residential uses and as such should be dismissed on this policy alone.

Finally the property location is sited on a particularly highly congested part of St Bees main street and is still only offering 4 vehicular parking spaces for what is proposed as a 15-person multi-home occupancy. Following past precedents at least 8 off road parking spaces would be required for should a high-density occupancy. This area of road in St Bees is unable to safely accommodate further parking and is the most congested of the entire village; and it is a very real bottleneck subject to frequent traffic management tailbacks and gridlock. All of these carry risks of accidents, of which there have been many, to both vehicles and pedestrians. This is a significantly woeful disregard of consideration of the impacts to neighbouring properties and to the general through traffic management of the main street , notwithstanding the significant safety issues for traffic egress and ingress onto or from the main road highway

as well construction traffic management.

The contentious and controversial manner of this application is raising much angst in the village amongst residents for all the concerns laid out in this objection and its proposal is a step too far towards damaging both the neighbourhood, the essence of the village, businesses viability in the village and degrades further much needed family housing in the village.

For all the reasons presented in this summary, the development does not align with Policy, it impacts the sensitive balance of community by introducing unnecessary and unneeded short term lets when it is actually affordable homes that are required. It poses unacceptable impact to current local businesses and poses long-term harm to neighbouring properties and poses significant and permanent vehicle and pedestrian road safety risks. The Parish Council believes that his application should therefore be rejected.

Cumberland Council – Highway Authority

8th January 2026

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) can confirm that we have no objection in principle to the proposed development but would like the following point addressed before a final response can be issued.

- Although the car park and access is not ideal it is existing and has been for many years to serve the public house, the proposal of 4 car parking spaces to serve 7 bedrooms plus 1 pod unit is not acceptable as visitors to the proposed holiday let will likely travel via car, the required number of car parking spaces for the proposal is 8, 1 space per unit/bedroom. The LHA acknowledge that 8 car parking spaces is unachievable but still require the developer to redesign the rear car park including swept paths to maximise the amount of parking within the car parking area as parking at the front of the property is already at capacity.

In light to the above comments additional details are required from the applicant. Upon receipt of the amended plans I shall be better placed to provide full response, otherwise I will have no other alternative as to recommend objection.

31st March 2026

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have reviewed the additional information requested in our previous response and are content with the proposed, therefore we can now confirm that we have no objection to the proposed development as it is considered that it will not have a material effect on existing highway conditions nor will it increase the flood risk on the site or elsewhere.

19th May 2026

The Highway Authority understands and acknowledges the concerns raised by local residents



Cumberland Council

regarding parking pressures and traffic conditions in this part of the village. In assessing this proposal, it is important to note that the site was formerly in use as a public house. This is a lawful use which historically generated regular vehicle movements, including short stay visits, servicing, and parking turnover, often occurring throughout the day and into the evening.

While the proposed holiday let would involve longer stay parking and provides a limited level of on site provision, this type of accommodation does not generate daily commuter traffic or routine peak hour movements associated with employment or school travel.

In reaching our position, we have considered:

- The property will have seven double bedrooms and one single bedroom, with a maximum occupancy of approximately 15 guests.
- Evidence from comparable developments and established planning practice indicates that vehicle demand associated with holiday accommodation is typically lower than that associated with equivalent permanent residential use. Holidaymaker's do not generate daily commuting trips and are more likely to travel in shared vehicles, particularly where groups consist of extended families or organised parties.
- These behavioural patterns are well understood within the planning system and are regularly taken into account in the assessment of short term visitor accommodation.
- It is expected that parking limitations will be clearly communicated to guests at the point of booking and within pre arrival information, with encouragement given to car sharing and sustainable modes of travel where possible.
- Based on typical occupancy patterns and observed travel behaviour, a reasonable and proportionate expectation is that the property would generate in the order of approximately four to six vehicles per stay.
- It would not be realistic or appropriate to assume a one-to-one relationship between bedrooms, guests, and vehicles. Such assumptions are not supported by evidence and do not reflect the operational characteristics of holiday accommodation.

In addition and in recognition of the concerns raised locally, the Highway Authority will suggest to the Local Planning Authority that minor amendments to the scheme layout (such as the repositioning of bin storage and a slight alteration to the terrace and seating area high screen fence) could potentially accommodate an additional off street parking space. However, it is not considered necessary or reasonable to secure such changes by condition.

In conclusion, for a development of this nature within a constrained village centre location, the we consider that an anticipated parking demand of approximately four to six vehicles represents a reasonable and evidence based assessment, subject to appropriate management of guest expectations.

Therefore having regard to national planning policy, with its threshold for resisting

development on highway grounds being high. It is our view that the proposal is not considered likely to result in residual or cumulative highway impacts that would be severe and therefore does not justify an objection on highway safety grounds.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) can confirm that we have no objection to the proposed development as it is considered that it will not have a material effect on existing highway conditions nor will it increase the flood risk on the site or elsewhere.

12th June 2026

With regard to the additional 1 guest this would not change our response.

The bus stop and disabled parking bay on main street was taken into account before our final response issued on 19/05/26.

Cumberland Council – Environmental Health

5th January 2026

Environmental Health have concerns over possible noise disturbance and loss of privacy that would adversely affect local residential amenity from this application in its current guise.

In particular, due to the proposed provision of external first floor balcony areas at the rear, one of which is immediately adjacent to a bedroom of the next dwelling on the terrace.

The two proposed first floor balconies would also overlook the rear of other dwellings along the terrace, and appear incongruous to the present setting and style of housing in the St Bees Conservation Area.

The proposed provision of two external hot tubs and a garden pod at the rear also adds to the potential for noise disturbance, particularly during the later hours and at weekends.

Whilst Environmental Health would request the submission of a Noise Management Plan to accompany this application, the proposed development feels too intense and not in keeping with the area.

Environmental Health notes the comments from St Bees Parish Council and, in this instance, are in agreement with them as far as loss of residential amenity is concerned.

We therefore object to this application in its current form and request that it is scaled back to reflect the above concerns.

7th April 2026

The scaled back application is welcomed though it is noted that the garden pod is retained.

Environmental Health would request that the garden pod is removed from the application; it is not appropriate to have campers in this location and so close to a neighbouring residential



Cumberland Council

dwelling and garden whose amenity will be detrimentally affected.

Environmental Health therefore maintain our objection to this application.

With respect to the new documents, the construction working hours in the Construction and Environmental Management Plan should be changed to a 13.00 hours finish on a Saturday.

The Noise Management Plan should also include the name/s and contact details of the person/s responsible for overseeing the NMP at the property and a clause to ensure that a record of any complaints is kept, with action taken. This record should be made available for inspection by Cumberland Council if required.

18th May 2026

Environmental Health notes the amended construction working hours in the CEMP, the amended NMP and the removal of the rear garden pod from the proposed development as requested.

As per the comments of the Conservation and Design Officer, there is some uncertainty over the first floor balcony areas.

We requested, in our initial comments of 05.01.26, that the proposed first floor rear balconies would likely affect residential amenity through noise and lack of privacy and should be removed from the plans.

Can this be made clear on the plans?

19th June 2026

Thank you for the additional information confirming that the first floor balconies have been removed from the plans.

In light of this, Environmental Health do not object to this development.

26th June 2026

To clarify our comments of 19.06.26.

We are satisfied that the submitted documents showing the amended Noise Management Plan (dated May 2026) and the amended Construction Method and Environmental Management Plan (dated May 2026) can be conditioned as approved documents if planning approval is granted to this development.

The above CMEMP also contains proposed construction working hours, and these are acceptable to Environmental Health.

Given the other changes that were requested and implemented to the plans during the consultation process, Environmental Health would now only request a condition that the premises should be used for short-term holiday letting purposes only (ie not permanent residential accommodation).

Natural England

No comments received.

Cumberland Council – Ecology Team

11th December 2026

Suggested Planning Conditions

Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

A CEMP should be produced to detail the procedures for protecting the environment during construction to address the following points (but not limited to):

- Pollution prevention control
- Dust mitigation
- Impaction of habitats
- Species protection during construction (see below)
- A sensitive lighting scheme for bats and other wildlife

The CEMP must also include the removal of the Cotoneaster. As such it is recommended that cotoneaster is be dug up, including roots, and disposed of in line with appropriate controlled waste measures, or controlled during construction works to prevent the spread off-site.

Breeding Birds

Works should be completed outside of the breeding bird period (March – August inclusive). If this is not possible a breeding bird check should be carried out no more than 48 hours prior to the planned development to ensure no birds and their nests are present. If active nests are discovered an appropriate buffer zone should be established and works within that area ceased until the young have naturally fledged.

Small Mammals

All development work should be carried out with care to avoid small mammals such as hedgehogs. Contractors should be briefed about the potential presence of hedgehogs and a precautionary working method will be implemented during construction, including the following measures:

- Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape.
- The use of night-time lighting will be avoided, or sensitive lighting design will be



Cumberland Council

implemented to avoid light spill on to retained habitats which hedgehogs could use.

- Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations.

If any hedgehogs are found in the working area these should be allowed to disperse of their own accord or, if at immediate risk, should be moved by hand to a sheltered, vegetated area away from disturbance.

Bats

A bats-specific lighting scheme will be designed during construction to minimise light impact. This should be in line with the guidance note for Bats and Artificial Lighting (Bat Conservation Trust, 2023).

Herptiles

Owing to the nature of the proposed development and the low potential for impacts to great crested newts, further surveys are considered to be disproportionate. A precautionary working method will be implemented for common amphibians during construction, including the following measures:

- Vegetation is to be maintained to a short sward to deter amphibians from the working area.
- Any rubble piles will be dismantled by hand and debris and brash will be stored on pallets or removed from the site to prevent amphibians from utilising these areas.
- Best practice pollution prevention measures will be implemented to minimise impacts to nearby aquatic habitats that amphibians could use.
- Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations.
- If any common amphibians are found in the working area these should be allowed to disperse of their own accord or, if at immediate risk, should be moved by hand to a sheltered, vegetated area away from disturbance.
- In the unlikely event that a great crested newt is identified, works must cease and advise must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.

Enhancements

Bee Bricks

The incorporation of bee bricks (e.g. Ibstock BeeHabitat or similar alternative brand) into the fabric of the new extension would provide sheltering opportunities for pollinators.

Bird Boxes

The installation of a minimum of two bird boxes on retained buildings will provide additional

nesting habitat for birds e.g.:

- Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings)
- Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings)

Bat Boxes

The installation of one bat box, incorporated into the fabric of the new extension will provide additional roosting habitat for bats e.g.:

- Habibat Bat Box, or,
- Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box

19th March 2026

The County Ecologist accepts the amended Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and therefore amends the suggested conditions.

Suggested Planning Conditions

Enhancements

Evidence of the following enhancements must be provided to the council upon completion of development:

Bee Bricks

The incorporation of bee bricks (e.g. Ibstock BeeHabitat or similar alternative brand) into the fabric of the new extension would provide sheltering opportunities for pollinators.

Bird Boxes

The installation of a minimum of two bird boxes on retained buildings will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g.:

- Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings)
- Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings)

Bat Boxes

The installation of one bat box, incorporated into the fabric of the new extension will provide additional roosting habitat for bats e.g.:

- Habibat Bat Box, or,
- Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box

30th April 2026

The County Ecologist has no further comments to make on the amended information and the Ecology Consultation Response from 19th March 2026 still stands.



Cumberland Council

Cumberland Council – Conservation Officer

27th January 2026

Conclusion: No objection

Assessment:

- Historic map data suggests that the building was in existence by 1863, although was not at that time used as a public house. Whether the building was built in the 19th century, either wholly or in part, as a replacement of earlier buildings, or whether it was created by combining together several earlier buildings is not clear. By the OS 25" map of 1898, the building is labelled "Oddfellows Arms PH", so that use clearly persisted for over 120.
- This means there is some contribution to the historic values of the conservation area, and this building, and these will be lost when the building is converted.
- I would view this form of value as being of a low level, and justification is provided in the form of the building's unviability as a pub.
- There will be some impact to the building through removal of 20th century structures to the rear. These will be beneficial both to the building and the conservation area.
- There will be a small impact on the conservation area and setting of the building through the addition of the proposed sun room and hot tub at the end of the garden, however, I would view this as being small and has some justification in making the building more viable as a holiday let.

Summary:

- This proposal will enhance the property and this part of the conservation area by giving it a viable new use.
- Although it is not proposed to change the frontage, planning permission would likely be needed if changing the front windows at a future date. As these currently make a negative impact, there is an opportunity for improvement.
- I would draw attention to the Conservation Area Design Guide, which is a material consideration in determining such applications, and recommends a certain palette of materials for buildings of traditional appearance in conservation areas.

9th April 2026

I don't have any additional comments to make on the conservation or design implications of this proposal (I maintain that I have no objection), but I do think I can see some inconsistencies in the drawings.

Proposed elevations

- West Elevation has been updated to show the rooftop balcony wall removed, however, the South Elevation drawing still appears to show the wall running all the way around the roof perimeter.
- The Ground Floor Plan shows a large, empty opening on the West elevation of the extension, whereas the West Elevation drawing (above) shows two rather poky windows and a single door. (Incidentally, if the applicants did want to put in a larger opening here looking West over the terrace, as opposed to the little windows and the door, I don't think I'd have a problem with it)

9th June 2026

Conclusion: No objection

Assessment:

Regarding design and heritage issues:

- In my previous communication, I highlighted inconsistencies between some of the drawings in the application file.
- The proposed west elevation now has updated ground floor fenestration, so it matches the floor plan.
- The proposed south elevation has been updated so it matches the omitted balcony shown in the west elevation
- Additionally, there is an updated site plan, omitting the pod at the garden end. The D&A statement has been updated to match.

Public Representation

This application has been advertised by way of a site notice, press notice, and neighbour notification letters issued to 10 properties.

Objections:

16 letters of objection have been received in relation to this notification period raising the following comments:

- Objection due to parking issues. St Bees already suffers from a serious shortage of parking, with roads frequently overflowing.
- Where will current residents park.
- The road serving this site is heavily used as a shortcut to Sellafeld and is already a source of congestion and frustration for local residents.
- Introducing further holiday accommodation will inevitably increase traffic and parking



Cumberland Council

demand, leading to more blockages, greater risk of accidents, and further deterioration of highway safety.

- The application is contrary to the NPPF (para. 111), which states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe. In this case, the cumulative impact of additional vehicles would clearly be severe for St Bees residents.
- There is no place for cars that visit to park if they are building a pod.
- The proposed four parking spaces is not sufficient for the number of people being proposed to occupy the site.
- There have been instances of individuals who own short term let properties, putting parking cones out to try and reserve parking for visitors when residents find it difficult to park on the road at the best of times.
- Impact on pedestrian safety.
- There is a gate which is a right of way into the niehgbours garden which cannot be blocked.
- Rear access to existing properties will be affected.
- St Bees already has three hotels and numerous guest houses. The Copeland Borough Council's Site Allocations and Policies Plan emphasise the need to balance development with community sustainability, avoiding overdevelopment that undermines existing businesses.
- Previous approvals, such as the conversion of the former St Bees Private School Boarding House into apartments, short term lets have already had a significant negative impact on local guest houses. More recently, permissions for holiday pods have been granted, and the full effect on bookings is still being assessed. Adding yet another short-let property risks destabilising the accommodation market further.
- We have invested £107,000 of our personal savings to modernize and sustain our guest house. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stresses the importance of supporting a prosperous rural economy, but this proposal would undermine established businesses rather than enhance them.
- We are already struggling to keep afloat in the current economic climate, and the addition of more competition is simply not viable. The application does not acknowledge the pressures faced by existing guest houses and hotels, nor the cumulative effect of recent permissions for short-let properties and holiday pods.
- Too many airbnbs and holiday lets already,
- The village is going to lose it community feel. We need full time residents.

- The Copeland Local Plan highlights the need to protect the distinct character of villages like St Bees. Excessive short-let accommodation risks eroding the balance between residential and visitor use, impacting the long-term sustainability of the community.
- The current economic climate is already challenging for hospitality businesses. Approving this application would create an even higher oversupply of accommodation, threaten the viability of long-standing establishments, and conflict with both local and national planning policies aimed at sustainable development.
- The younger generation who grew up and have lived in the village all their lives are finding it impossible to gain a foot on the property ladder, as those property that they would have historically started out with are no longer available, as the majority of these are now short term holiday.
- There is no benefit to the local community from this proposal.
- The pub should be reopened.
- The reports from both Day Cummins and Everard Cole may be inaccurate, largely that the former Oddfellows was actually a very busy hub for the local community. This wasn't just a pub that was a "drive to" pub at all, it offered a lifeline for many people.
- My understanding is that the pub was never offered up after the last tenant left as a pub with a tenancy, that the brewery just wanted to sell this, despite various enquiries to take it over on a tenancy agreement, in fact when the last tenant retired, the pub was actually bolted up and secured as she was physically leaving the pub.
- Too many rooms are proposed within the development.
- The proposed application is an over development of the property with little concern for existing adjacent residents.
- The rear balconies will hugely impact privacy and would overlook existing properties and residential spaces.
- The proposal will offer a hot tub with the potential for rowdy parties, this is cause significant environmental noise and disturbance at all hours in a quiet area.
- When the pub was open we were not disturbed. This proposal has huge potential for constant disturbances as there is no on site management.
- The garden pod will only add to these issues.
- Concerns about the stability and long-term integrity of the existing retaining wall to the rear of the site. Any additional loading, excavation, or change in ground conditions associated with the proposed development could compromise the stability of this wall. Failure or movement of the retaining structure would pose a serious risk to adjacent



Cumberland Council

property and safety, and there is insufficient information within the application to demonstrate that this risk has been adequately assessed or mitigated.

- Concerns that the property will be let as a long term let HMO.
- I am dismayed and disappointed that the first indication of any proposed works was given to me by a neighbour and not through any official correspondence from Copeland Council.
- There has been lack of neighbour consultation and site notice.
- We have only been given 28 days to respond, this is no time to respond.
- The community and the Parish Council were not aware of this proposal prior to submission.
- I fully support the comments submitted by St Bees Parish Council.

Public Reconsultation

Following the receipt of amended/additional information for the application a reconsultation was undertaken for all neighbouring properties and those who previously commented on the application.

Objections:

6 letters of objection have been received in relation to this notification period raising the following comments:

- We maintain previous objections despite the recent amendments including the removal of the hot tub, removal of the garden pod, and reduction of the number of rooms. While these changes are noted, they do not address the fundamental concerns we raised previously, nor do they mitigate the wider planning harms associated with converting this former public house into short-term holiday accommodation.
- The responses and amendment do not adequately address the points of objection raised.
- St Bees already has three hotels and numerous guest houses. The Copeland Borough Council Site Allocations and Policies Plan emphasise the need to balance development with community sustainability and avoid overdevelopment that undermines existing businesses.
- The addition of another short-term holiday let—particularly one of this scale—would contribute to an oversupply of visitor accommodation, diluting demand and destabilising the local hospitality sector.
- Recent approvals, including the conversion of the former St Bees School boarding

house into apartments and short-term lets, have already had a significant negative impact on local guest houses. More recently, permissions for holiday pods have been granted, and the full effect on bookings is still being assessed.

- Introducing yet another short-let property at this time risks compounding these impacts and further destabilising the accommodation market.
- We have invested £107,000 of our personal savings to modernise and sustain our guest house. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stresses the importance of supporting a prosperous rural economy. However, this proposal would undermine established businesses rather than enhance or diversify the local economy.
- The cumulative effect of multiple new short-term lets is already being felt, and further additions threaten the viability of long-standing establishments that contribute to year-round employment and community stability.
- The village doesn't need more holiday let's, it needs housing for the younger generations to get on the property ladder.
- The site should stay as a public house and there are other buildings in the village that need attention before this one.
- While I would have preferred to see this building restored to local residential accommodation, I had no objection in principle to it becoming holiday lets, if that was the only way to prevent further deterioration of the now dilapidated former pub. However, the arguments put forward in support of this application are dubious, to say the least.
- The applicant states that there was “no appetite” for re-conversion to local housing. I am told this is incorrect, and that in fact a local had expressed interest, but the property was taken off the market before he could proceed.
- The applicant also claims that as the area to the rear of the property was already used for parking, no more disruption than previously experienced would be caused to neighbours of the former pub. This is misleading, as The Oddfellows Arms was very much a local pub, to which locals walked, not drove, because they were generally going there to drink alcohol.
- The parking area was not used by customers of the pub, but by the landlord /landlady and any visiting tradesmen etc. so that late-night disruption to neighbours from the parking area was not a concern.
- It is particularly misleading to claim that this pub had “the capacity to accommodate 25 or more persons” versus the maximum 17 in the proposal. As far as I know, The Oddfellows has never been used as a hotel, or even a restaurant, at least in the forty years I have lived in St Bees. The proposed accommodation for up to 17 guests is



Cumberland Council

therefore excessive.

- Even with the amended plans, the proposed use remains a high-turnover, short-term holiday operation. Such uses generate increased coming and going; noise and disturbance at unsocial hours; and transient occupancy that disrupts residential cohesion.
- This part of Main Street is predominantly residential. The introduction of a commercial holiday-let operation of this scale is incompatible with the established character of the area.
- Although the applicant has reduced the number of rooms, the intensity of use remains high. The building and its location are more suited to a permanent residence or community use rather than a commercial short-term letting enterprise.
- The amendments do not include any enforceable management plan, occupancy limits, or noise-control measures. Without such safeguards, the risk of disturbance remains significant.
- The introduction of a short-term holiday let may lead to increased noise, disturbance, and antisocial behaviour, particularly due to frequent turnover of occupants. This could negatively affect the quality of life for nearby residents.
- The proposed demolition and rebuilding of rear extensions, along with the addition of a garden pod, may constitute overdevelopment of the site. The scale and design could be out of character with the surrounding area and negatively impact visual amenity.
- Loss of privacy and noise disturbance to existing residents.
- St Bees already suffers from a serious shortage of parking, with roads frequently overflowing. Main Street is heavily used as a shortcut to Sellafield and is already a source of congestion and frustration for residents.
- Additional holiday accommodation will inevitably increase traffic and parking demand, leading to: more blockages, reduced visibility, increased risk of accidents, and further deterioration of highway safety.
- This is contrary to NPPF paragraph 111, which states that development should be refused where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network are severe. In this case, the cumulative impact would clearly be severe for St Bees residents.
- Short-term letting properties often generate increased and unpredictable vehicle movements. This may exacerbate existing parking pressures and highway safety concerns in the area.
- Where are the users going to park? Residents can't even park on Main Street.

- The applicants' statement that rental will only be agreed with large parties taking the whole of the property is completely disingenuous and does not guarantee a reduction in the demand for parking. The desired solution - an increase in spaces available to renters - does not seem to have been considered and is not proposed by the applicant.
- The applicant claims only single groups, e.g. "families", would be accommodated in each let. This does not take into account the frequent use of such properties for family gatherings which involve travel from different locations in multiple vehicles. Three cars per "family" would not be unusual. It is therefore highly probable that the number of guests' vehicles would exceed the small number of on-site parking spaces available.
- Guests would undoubtedly seek to park extra cars on Main Street, adversely affecting its residents, since parking there is already severely limited.
- Even those who do park in the spaces provided would be unfamiliar with the difficult, almost blind exit from the lane onto and across the Main Street pavement. This would therefore pose a risk to on-coming pedestrians.
- Existing access to rear gardens should be maintained.
- Concerns that the property may become a HMO in the future.

Petition of Objection:

As part of the reconsultation on this application a petition of objection has been received. This petition states that even with recent amendments residents believe that the proposal will have a negative impact on the village and should be refused, or at a minimum, referred to the Planning Committee for full consideration. The reasons for objection are: parking and traffic concerns; impact on residential amenity; cumulative impact on the village; and scale and intensity of use. This petition has been signed by 81 residents.

Support:

1 letter of support has been received in relation to this notification period raising the following comments:

- The building is in desperate need of maintenance which is very visible from the outside.
- It will actually benefit the community.
- My only concern is parking and it would be appreciated if the owner introduced themselves when they are around.
- I just hope they get accepted fast as the building has suffered over the winter months and letting the look of the village down



Cumberland Council

Public Reconsultation

Following the receipt of amended/additional information for the application and an amendment to the application description a reconsultation was undertaken for all neighbouring properties and those who previously commented on the application.

Objections:

6 letters of objection have been received in relation to this notification period raising the following comments:

- We still haven't received answers to the questions we originally raised, and the updated information provided does not address any of our concerns. None of it remotely covers the issues we have repeatedly highlighted.
- I formally restate and consolidate our objections to this application including concerns arising from the recently submitted amended and additional documents. Despite raising these issues multiple times and submitting a petition now totalling 90 signatures, we have not received any acknowledgement or substantive response from the planning department. Meanwhile, further documents have been uploaded by the applicant without addressing the concerns raised by residents, local businesses, or the Parish Council.
- Highways originally objected to this proposal due to the clear and well-documented parking pressures and safety risks on this section of Main Street. Their initial assessment reflected the daily experience of residents.
- Highways has since withdrawn its objection without explanation, despite the following incidents occurring within the last 12 months: a vehicle overturned and became lodged between the pavement and a residential property; a bus became stuck and collided with a home; a bus mounted the large dropped kerb and came close to a front window; school buses regularly struggle to pass during peak times; residents frequently unable to park near their homes; and daily stand-offs and road-rage incidents outside our property
- This stretch of road is also heavily used by primary school children walking to and from school, and by secondary pupils waiting for the school bus. Any increase in vehicle turnover or on-street parking in this location presents a foreseeable safeguarding risk.
- Since the completion of the recent roadworks, the situation has worsened further. The reinstated bus stop has been extended and a new disabled parking bay has been added, resulting in the loss of four on-street parking spaces that were previously available to residents. This significantly reduces the already limited parking capacity on Main Street and directly contradicts the assumptions made in the applicant's parking assessment. It also means that Highways' revised position is based on conditions that no longer exist. The cumulative impact of these changes must be

reassessed before any planning decision is made.

- Under the Highways Act 1980, the authority has a statutory duty to ensure the highway is safe for all users. The pattern of collisions, near misses, and obstructions demonstrates that the risks here are not theoretical but established and escalating.
- The applicant proposes four parking spaces for a property capable of hosting up to 17 people (including the rear pod). This is wholly inadequate.
- Historically, accommodation providers in St Bees have been required to provide one parking space per bedroom.
- Main Street already suffers from: severe parking shortages; congestion; visibility issues; heavy Sellafield commuter traffic.
- Under NPPF Paragraph 111, development should be refused where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network are severe. In this case, they clearly are.
- While we welcome the removal of the camping pods from the application, could I ask if the council are aware that one of the proposed parking spaces blocks the right of access to the rear of the properties further south on Main Street?
- The development will create parking issues for residents on Main Street.
- St Bees already has a significant concentration of visitor accommodation.
- As owners of a guest house, we have already experienced a decline in occupancy due to the cumulative impact of recent approvals. We have invested £107,000 of our personal savings to sustain our business, and further oversupply threatens the viability of long-standing establishments that provide year-round employment and community stability.
- Official data from Booking.com shows that accommodation occupancy in St Bees is down by 22% this month compared with the same period last year. This demonstrates a clear and immediate decline in demand across the village. Approving further short-term holiday accommodation in the middle of a documented downturn would exacerbate the oversupply problem and place additional pressure on existing businesses already struggling to maintain viable occupancy levels.
- The Parish Council has also highlighted that some existing short-term rentals in the village are now being converted back into domestic homes, which is clear evidence that demand is falling and that the market is oversaturated. This application therefore fails to demonstrate any local need, contrary to the NPPF and the Copeland Local Plan.
- The Parish Council correctly notes that St Bees has a shortage of affordable homes.

This property was historically two dwellings and could be converted into two or even three much-needed family homes.

- Instead, the proposal removes a valuable opportunity to provide affordable housing and replaces it with a high-density, short-term commercial use that does not meet local housing needs conflicting with policy H7, H8 and H13 of the Local Plan.
- The Parish Council is clear that the proposal fails to meet the criteria of Policy H13 and should be refused on this basis alone.
- Even with the amended plans, the proposal remains a high-turnover, short-term holiday operation. Such uses typically generate: frequent comings and goings; noise and disturbance at unsocial hours; and transient occupancy that disrupts residential cohesion.
- The Parish Council has also raised concerns about the overbearing impact of the development due to its scale, density, and proximity to neighbouring properties. This is contrary to Policy H12, which requires developments to avoid unacceptable harm to neighbours' amenity.
- This part of Main Street is predominantly residential. The introduction of a commercial holiday let of this scale is incompatible with the established character of the area and conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 130(f).
- The applicant states that noise monitors will be installed, yet: there is no on-site management; no enforcement mechanism; no response plan; no evidence that noise monitoring will be effective. This offers no reassurance to neighbouring residents.
- The applicant's own documentation and rental agreement refer to events and parties being permitted with written consent. This is a significant concern for residents.
- The development poses a substantial risk to residential amenity.
- The building is more suited to a permanent residence or community use than a commercial holiday let. No enforceable management plan has been provided.
- Objection to the pods and party house as I wish for my house to remain pleasant and quiet.
- The development will not be beneficial to the village or local people.
- I do have some concerns regarding the rear 1st floor elevation, on one drawing It's showing as an emergency exit following the removal of the balconies, but doesn't show any stairs or steps down for such an emergency exit, and on another it's showing as a terrace, if this indeed is to be a terrace it will look directly into our bedroom at the rear of our property and severely infringe our privacy.

- The proposal has the potential for late night noise, outdoor activities, alcohol related disturbance, this is not compatible with the quiet residential area that this property is situated in.
- The applicant proposes to use domestic bins for what is clearly a commercial operation. As business owners, we pay significant fees for trade waste collection, as required by law.
- The applicant's documents refer to tenancy agreements, which are not typically used for short-term holiday lets. This raises legitimate questions about the intended long-term use of the property.
- We are not asserting that the applicant intends to convert the property into an HMO. However, the wording used creates ambiguity, and the planning system must ensure clarity and enforceability.
- We therefore request that, if permission is granted, the following conditions are imposed:
 - o The property shall be used solely as short-term holiday accommodation
 - o No individual may occupy the property for more than 28 consecutive days
 - o The property shall not be used as an HMO (C4 or Sui Generis) without separate planning permission
 - o Maximum occupancy shall be fixed and enforceable
- Residents have already experienced significant disruption from works carried out at the site without any prior notification, despite the applicant's documents stating that neighbours would be informed and treated with respect.
This raises concerns about compliance with planning controls and the applicant's willingness to follow required procedures.
- Noise from construction works is already unbearable and effects day to day living.
- I am suspicious that the party wall had been made shorter, due to the extent of the drilling, thus giving more room inside the pub but diminishing the soundproofing on my side of the party wall.
- No Party Wall Act has been served on neighbours prior to these works commencing. The notice cannot be served retrospectively.
- This is apart from the fact I'm now seriously concerned that the work may have caused structural damage to my property already, the necessary steps haven't been taken to prevent any possible damage happening.



Cumberland Council

- For the fact that these works have already been carried out brings into question the integrity of the builders and the current owner, and their plans on going forward, should the planning be approved, with regards noise pollution, noise monitoring and lack of any on site management, I did question the on site management and was advised that the site manager lived in Whitehaven and “could be here in minutes” this is not acceptable.
- Given the seriousness of the safety issues, policy conflicts, and procedural concerns raised, residents must be assured that the decision-making process is lawful, transparent, and robust.
- If the Council is minded to approve this application despite the evidence presented, residents will need clarity on the formal routes available to challenge the decision. These include: judicial review, local government ombudsman complaint, referral to the Council’s monitoring officer. Residents may request an investigation into whether the decision breaches statutory duties or planning law.

Planning Policy

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Development Plan

On 1st April 2023, Copeland Borough Council ceased to exist and was replaced by Cumberland Council as part of the Local Government Reorganisation of Cumbria.

Cumberland Council inherited the local development plan documents of each of the sovereign Councils including Copeland Borough Council, which combine to form a Consolidated Planning Policy Framework for Cumberland.

The inherited the local development plan documents continue to apply to the geographic area of their sovereign Councils only.

The Consolidated Planning Policy Framework for Cumberland comprises the Development Plan for Cumberland Council until replaced by a new Cumberland Local Plan.

Copeland Local Plan 2021 – 2039 (LP)

Cumberland Council continued the preparation of the LP as commenced by Copeland Borough Council.

The LP was adopted by Cumberland Council on the 5th of November 2024 replacing the Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028 and the saved policies of the Copeland Local Plan 2001-2016.

The following policies are relevant to this proposal: -

Strategic Policy DS1: Settlement Hierarchy

Strategic Policy DS2: Settlement Boundaries

Policy DS4: Design and Development Standards

Policy DS5: Hard and Soft Landscaping

Strategic Policy DS6: Reducing Flood Risk

Policy DS7: Sustainable Drainage

Strategic Policy E1: Economic Growth

Strategic Policy E2: Location of Employment

Strategic Policy R4: The Key Service Centres

Strategic Policy T1: Tourism Development

Policy T2: Tourism Development along the Developed Coast

Strategic Policy N1: Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Strategic Policy N2: Local Nature Recovery Networks

Strategic Policy N3: Biodiversity Net Gain

Strategic Policy N6: Landscape Protection

Strategic Policy BE1: Heritage Assets

Policy BE2: Designated Heritage Assets

BE4: Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Strategic Policy CO4: Sustainable Travel

Policy CO5: Transport Hierarchy

Policy CO7: Parking Standards and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

Other Key Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide (NDG)

Cumbria Development Design Guide (CDDG)

The Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit (CLGC)

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (CHSR)

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCA)

Conservation Area Design Guide (2017)

Assessment

The key issues raised by this application relate to the principle of development; impact on community facilities; creation of new tourist facility; settlement character and landscape and visual impact; scale, design and impact on residential amenity; highway safety; impact on heritage assets; flood risk and drainage; and impact on biodiversity and ecology.

A call-in request was received from Councillor Minshaw in relation to this Application. It was however determined by the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee in conjunction with the Service Manager for Development and Implementation, at the Committee Agenda Setting Meeting that this application could be determined at Officer Level under Delegated Powers given the material planning issues have been addressed.

Principle of Development

This Application relates to the former Oddfellows Arms, located within the centre of St Bees.

St Bees is identified in Strategic Policy DS1 of the Copeland Local Plan as one of the Local Service Centres, which have a supporting role to Copeland's towns containing a broad range of services. These settlements also operate independently from the main towns to meet day to day needs or as a well-connected cluster, linked to a neighbouring town or village of a similar scale by a frequent public transport service and/or safe pedestrian routes a mile or less in length. It is stated that the focus for development in Local Centres will be to support the retention and small scale growth of existing services and businesses, with development focused on existing employment allocations, moderate housing allocations, and windfall and infill developments.

The settlement boundary for St Bees is defined in Strategic Policy DS2. It is stated that development within the defined settlement boundaries will be supported in principle where it accords with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The application site is located within the defined settlement boundary for St Bees.

The Application seeks to change the use of an existing commercial building within the settlement boundary of St Bees to tourist accommodation. The principle of the proposed change of use is therefore considered acceptable subject to site specific matters.

Impact on Community Facilities

Policy SC5 of the Copeland Local Plan states that the loss of existing community facilities through change of use or new development requiring planning permission will only be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Council, that its continued use as a community or cultural facility is no longer feasible, having had regard to appropriate marketing, there is sufficient provision of such facilities in the area, and/or sufficient alternative provision has been, or will be made elsewhere which is equally

accessible and of the same quality or better than the facility being lost.

The licenced premises ceased operation in April 2024, the site has been vacant since. The Application is supported by a Marketing and Viability Assessment. The marketing states that in April 2024 Everard Cole were instructed to explore a sale of freehold interest, however these were all rejected due to the renovation costs, remote location, layout and a history of poor trading. The statement then confirms that they were then instructed to go to market with the property reduced in value twice due to little interest. When reduced for the final time 4 offers were received from local developers to change the use of the site to residential use, there was no interest for continued pub use due to demand in the area and the significant cost of bringing the property back into a tradeable condition. The Assessment also sets out the number of alternative public houses, hotels and restaurants located within the surrounding area. It is concluded that there are 4 licensed outlets within St Bees which provide identical services to that of the Oddfellows.

Whilst the Application will result in the loss of a community facility, the site has been advertised for a significant period indicating that the use is no longer feasible for the site. There is also considered to be sufficient alternative provision within St Bees following the loss of this licensed premises. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy R5 of the Copeland Local Plan.

Creation of New Tourism Facility

The NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

Paragraph 88 of the NPPF further states that in order to support a prosperous rural economy planning policies and decisions should enable: the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed, new buildings; the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses; sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; and the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

The Local Plan seeks to direct new tourism development to the most sustainable locations in Copeland. The Development Strategy and Policy T1 sets out the hierarchy for sustainable development for both visitor attractions and accommodation. In respect of overnight and longer stay visitor accommodation new build development should be directed to the towns and Local Service Centres. The development of overnight and long stay visitor accommodation below the Local Service Centre tier should be restricted to the diversification and change of use of existing buildings.

Strategic Policy T1 of the Local Plan supports the creation, enhancement and expansion of



Cumberland Council

tourist attractions, new built visitor accommodation and infrastructure in locations consistent with the settlement hierarchy. All tourism development must be of an appropriate scale, located where the environment and infrastructure can accommodate the visitor impact, and where it does not result in unacceptable harm to environmental assets or the character of the area. Proposals for tourism development outside of defined settlements will be supported where: the proposal is for a specific activity or function that requires a location, the proposal enhances the borough's existing place bound assets; The proposal is for the change of use, or diversification of an existing building, to provide overnight or longer stay visitor accommodation; or The proposal is for a farm diversification scheme in a rural area that will provide or enhance tourist provision.

The Application seeks to change the use of an existing property within the centre of St Bees to a short term holiday let. The property will be let as a whole to a maximum of 16 people. This proposal is considered to expand and build additional capacity of tourist accommodation within the former Copeland area.

Whilst concerns have been raised that there is no need for additional visitor accommodation within St Bees, the proposal seeks to offer an alternative form of accommodation for large groups. The Copeland Local Plan states that the Council will monitor the number of holiday homes/lets in Copeland as there are concerns that large concentrations within rural villages can reduce community cohesion and increase property values to the detriment of local residents. However, this issue cannot be addressed through local Planning Policy at present.

The Parish Council have stated that the site should have been considered for affordable housing which had a greater need in St Bees. The Local Planning Authority however have to consider and determine the application presented to them, which seeks to change the use of the site to a holiday let, on its merits.

The Application is therefore considered to diversify the tourist offer within the Local Centre which will attract additional visitors to St Bees and create economic benefits for the village and the wider Borough through the use of an existing vacant property. It is therefore considered that the development complies with Policies T1 of the Copeland Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

Settlement Character, Landscape Impact and Visual Impact

Policy N6 of the Copeland Local Plan states that the Borough's landscapes will be protected and enhance by: supporting proposals which enhance the value of Copeland's landscapes; protecting all landscapes from inappropriate change by ensuring that development conserves and enhances the distinctive characteristics of that particular area in a manner commensurate with their statutory status and value; ensuring development proposals demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will conserve and where possible enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Lake District National Park and Heritage; and Requiring a Landscape Appraisal, and where appropriate a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, to be submitted where development has the potential to

impact upon landscape character or a protected landscape. Where harm is identified the development will only be permitted where the benefits of the development outweigh any potential harm and mitigation and compensation measures must be provided. This policy further states that development proposals must be informed by the Council's Landscape Character Assessment, Settlement Landscape Character Assessment the Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit and where appropriate, the Lake District National Park Landscape Character Assessment¹⁰⁸ from the earliest stage.

The Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit (CLCGT) identifies the site as being within Sub Type 4 'Coastal Sandstone'. The Key Characteristics of the land comprise: coastal sandstone cliffs, sandstone rolling hills and plateaus, large open fields, prominent hedge banks bound pastoral fields, small woodland blocks along valley sides, and exposed coastal edge moving to intimate and enclosed farmland inland.

The Guidelines for development include: strengthen definition between town and country by using extensive buffer planting to screen the built up areas and reduce the impact of industry, improve visual containment of caravan parks close to the coast with landscape works and discourage further large scale developments, such as wind energy, in prominent coastal locations, conserve and enhance the traditional farm buildings and features within their own setting, and reduce the impact of any new buildings by careful siting and design.

The Application Site is an end of terrace property located within the centre of St Bees. The property fronts onto Main Street, and is bounded to the north, south and west by existing properties. The majority of the conversion will be contained within the existing footprint of the building with minimal changes to the main elevation of the property. The proposal will however include the demolition of the existing extensions to the rear of the site and their rebuilding. Although the alterations to the rear of the site will create an additional storey within part of the extension, the development will be viewed in the context of the existing and surrounding sites and will therefore not have a detrimental impact on the overall landscape or settlement character.

It is therefore considered that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the overall landscape in accordance with Policy N6 of the Copeland Local Plan and provisions of the NPPF.

Scale, Design, and Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DS4 of the Copeland Local Plan requires all new development to meet high-quality standards of design. This includes creating and enhancing locally distinctive places, the use of good quality materials that reflect the local character, including high quality and useful open spaces, providing high levels of residential amenity, adopting active travel principles, creating opportunities for social interaction, and effective use of land whilst maintaining amenity and maximising solar gain.

The Application seeks to change the use of a former licences premises within a predominantly residential area to a short term holiday let. Whilst there will be minimal



**Cumberland
Council**

changes to the front elevation of the property, and the majority of the change of use will be within the footprint of the existing building, the proposal does seek to demolish and rebuild the existing extensions to the rear of the site. Whilst the proposed extension will be larger in footprint than the existing and will create an additional storey within part of the extension, the development is considered to be of an acceptable scale within a site of this size. The proposed extensions are considered to reflect the character of the existing rear elevation of the main property through the use of similar materials and incorporating flat roofs into the overall design.

Due to the location of the property, concerns were originally raised with the agent regarding the potential impact from the development on the amenity of neighbouring properties through overlooking due to the proposed use of the flat roof areas to the rear of the site as terrace areas. Based on these concerns amended plans were submitted to remove the use of these areas for amenity space. To safeguard amenity this will be secured by condition. The use of a flat roof and lack of side facing windows also ensures that the proposed extension will not have an impact on neighbouring residential properties.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer originally raised concerns with the proposal in relation to noise disturbance and loss of privacy that would adversely affect local residential amenity. These concerns were reiterated through objections from residents and the Parish Council. Based on these concerns the agent submitted a Noise Management Plan and Short Term Rental Agreement to support this application. The rental agreement is to be in place between the applicant/property manager and each rental customer and will be in place along with the Noise Management Plan to form the management of the use of the property. The reference to the siting of two hot tubs on the rear terrace/seating area have also been removed following concerns raised.

Further to these amendments concerns were still raised from Environmental Health, the Parish Council, and residents, therefore the application was further amended to remove the inclusion of the proposed pod accommodation within the rear of the site to further protect the amenity of existing residents.

Whilst the Parish Council and local residents maintain their objections to the proposal, the Council's Environmental Health Officer has removed their objections to the proposal.

Conditions will be placed upon any decision notice to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted Noise Management Plan and Short Term Rental Agreement.

Conditions will also be placed upon to secure full details of any replacement windows required as these details are currently not provided within the application.

Given the location of the property and the previous use of the site the development is considered to be of a scale and design which is an acceptable form of development. The amendments to the scheme also mitigate the impact on residential amenity. Therefore subject to the inclusion of the conditions outlined above, it is considered that the proposal complies

with Policies DS4 of the Copeland Local Plan, and provisions of the NPPF.

Impact on Heritage Assets

Strategic Policy BE1 and BE2 of the Copeland Local Plan seek to protect or enhance heritage assets and their setting. Proposals that better reveal the significance of heritage assets will be supported in principle.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, states that “special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of [a conservation] area.”

Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) asserts that “Development that is not well designed should be refused”.

NPPF para. 210 states that “In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation...”

NPPF para. 212 states, in the case of designated heritage assets, “great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation”, irrespective of whether potential harm is substantial, less-than-substantial, or total loss. Where harm to a designated heritage asset is less-than-substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para. 208).

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when making decisions.

Opportunities should be sought for new development within conservation areas and the settings of heritage assets that enhances or better reveals their significance. (para. 219)

Referring to assets in a conservation area, NPPF para. 220 states that loss of an element that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area should be treated as either substantial (under para. 214) or less-than-substantial harm (under paragraph 215).

The Application Site is located within the St Bees Conservation Area. The Site is not Listed.

The Council’s Conservation Officer has offered no objections to this application and has confirmed that this proposal will enhance the property and this part of the Conservation Area by giving it a viable new use. The Officer also states that there is benefit to both the building and the Conservation Area through the removal of the existing 20th Century structures to the rear of the site. Furthermore, it is confirmed by the Officer that whilst there will be some impacts on the Conservation Area, these are small and justified in making the building more viable.

The Application is therefore considered to enhance the St Bees Conservation Area through the reuse of the existing vacant building and is therefore considered to comply with Policies BE1 and BE2 of the Copeland Local Plan, and provisions of the NPPF.

Highway Safety

Strategic Policy CO4 requires that proposals must include safe and direct connections to routes that promote active travel, such as cycling and walking routes where appropriate. Support in principle is outlined for developments which encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, in particular: proposals that have safe and direct connections to cycling and walking routes where appropriate and those that provide access to regular public transport services; proposals that make provision for electric vehicles; and proposals for the integration of electric vehicle charging infrastructure into new developments. It is required that developments that are likely to generate a large amount of movement secure an appropriate Travel Plan and be supported by a Transport Assessment.

Policy CO5 details the Transport Hierarchy and prioritises sustainable methods of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport.

Policy CO7 of the LP requires that new development provides adequate parking provision.

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states 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, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

The property benefits from an existing rear parking area, which is accessed via an existing single width road to the side of the property. Access to the site will remain unaltered as part of the proposed works. The proposal will resurface the existing vehicular parking area, retaining the existing four parking spaces serving the property.

Concerns have been raised by residents and the Parish Council regarding the proposed parking provision at this site and the impact the development will have on highway safety and parking for residents.

As part of the original consultation on this application the Highway Authority requested additional information to maximise the amount of parking within the onsite parking, as it was stated that the proposed spaces are not sufficient to serve a 7 bedroom holiday let plus a 1 bed pod.

In response to these comments the agent for the application has submitted an amended site plan to redesign the proposed parking arrangements at the site, the pod accommodation has also been removed. Whilst it is confirmed that the site cannot accommodate more spaces, it is noted by the agent that the existing and established parking area served the former public house. Based on this response and the amended parking layout, the Highway Authority confirmed no objections to the proposal as the development is not considered to have an adverse impact on existing highway conditions.

Following this confirmation from the Highway Authority, concerns have been raised by residents and the Parish Council regarding this change in position.

As part of the additional reconsultation removing the pod accommodation from the

application, the Highway Authority have provided additional commentary on their position with this application. It is reiterated within these comments that the site was formerly in use as a public house which is a lawful use which historically generated regular vehicle movements, including short stay visits, servicing, and parking turnover, often occurring throughout the day and into the evening. While the proposed holiday let would involve longer stay parking and provides a limited level of on site provision, this type of accommodation does not generate daily commuter traffic or routine peak hour movements associated with employment or school travel. The Highway Authority have stated that it could be requested that an additional space is accommodated within the site, however it is not considered reasonable or necessary to secure this condition in this instance. It is therefore confirmed by the Highway Authority that having regard to national planning policy, with its threshold for resisting development on highway grounds being high, the proposal is not considered likely to result in residual or cumulative highway impacts that would be severe and therefore does not justify an objection on highway safety grounds.

Given concerns raised in relation to highway safety, a condition will be included upon any decision notice to ensure the amended parking layout is implemented prior to the first occupation of the holiday let to ensure four cars can be accommodated within the onsite parking area.

Subject to the inclusion of the conditions outlined above, it is considered that the proposal complies with Policies CO4, CO5 and CO7 of the Copeland Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

Drainage and Flood Risk

Policy DS6 seeks that development will not be permitted where: there is an unacceptable risk of flooding and or, the development would increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Policy DS7 requires that surface water is managed in accordance with the national drainage hierarchy and includes Sustainable Drainage Systems where appropriate.

The application site is located within Flood Zone 1, and is therefore not supported by a Flood Risk Assessment.

The agent has confirmed that the drainage arrangements at the site will remain unaltered. The proposal will not increase impermeable surfacing at the site.

No objections have been received to the application from the LLFA as it is confirmed that the development will not increase the flood risk on the site or elsewhere.

The proposal is therefore considered to be compliant with the Policy DS6 and DS7 of the Copeland Local Plan, and provisions of the NPPF.

Impact on Ecology and Biodiversity

Policy N1 of the ELP seeks to ensure that new development will protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and defines a mitigation hierarchy.



Cumberland Council

Policy N3 requires that all development, with the exception of that listed in the Environment Act must provide a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain over and above existing site levels, following the application of the mitigation hierarchy set out in Policy N1. This is in addition to any compensatory habitat provided under Policy N1. It is stated net gain should be delivered on site where possible and where on-site provision is not appropriate, provision must be made elsewhere in accordance with a defined order of preference.

In England, BNG is now mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). Applications must now deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10%, resulting in more or better-quality natural habitat than there was before the development. Some developments are however exempt from these BNG requirements. In this instance the development is considered exempt from BNG as the development is for a change of use with the existing footprint of the building so there will be no or only a de minimis impact on onsite habitat.

The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment. This report concludes that the development will result in the loss of small areas of sparsely vegetated land which is likely to have a minimal impact on biodiversity due to the low ecological value of these habitats. The report further concludes that the habitats present on-site, are considered to provide limited suitability for invertebrates, reptiles, amphibians, badgers, riparian animals, hazel dormouse, or hedgehogs. The buildings are also not considered to have evidence of nesting birds and have a negligible habitat value for bats. The Assessment also sets out enhancement and mitigation measure to be incorporated into the development, including mitigation and precautionary checks for contractors, and the installation of bee bricks, and bird/bat boxes.

Whilst the Council's Ecologist has offered no objections to the application, she did request the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), and requested conditions in relation to specific species, and the enhancement measures to be incorporated within the development.

The agent therefore submitted a Construction Method and Environmental Management Plan to support this application. This document outlines how the development will be carried out, including the proposed traffic management plan, construction operation hours, road cleaning measures, and dust, noise and vibration control measures. The plan also includes environmental management plans for the development, including pollution prevention control, removal of non-native invasive species, species protection during construction, and proposed enhancement measures for the development.

Based on this information the Council's Ecologist has confirmed their acceptance of the CEMP and therefore suggested amended conditions to require evidence of the installation of the proposed enhancement measures once the development is completed.

Conditions will also be included to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures outlined within the submitted Construction Method and

Environmental Management Plan and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment.

No comments have been received from Natural England.

Subject to the inclusion of the conditions outlined above, it is considered that the proposal complies with Policies N1 and N3 of the Copeland Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

The Application Site is located within the centre of St Bees, which is identified as a Local Service Centre. The proposal seeks to redevelop a vacant former licenced premises to a short term holiday let. The proposal complies with the type of development permitted within the settlement boundary for St Bees.

The licenced premises ceased operation in April 2024 and the site has been vacant since. The Application is supported by a Marketing and Viability Assessment. Whilst the Application will result in the loss of this community facility the site has been advertised for a significant period indicating the use of no longer feasible. Alternative provision can also be found within St Bees.

The proposed change of use will create a short term holiday let within the centre of St Bees that will be let as a whole and will accommodate a maximum of 16 people. The proposal will diversify the tourist offer within the Local Centre, attracting additional visitors to St Bees and creating economic benefits for the village and the wider Borough through the reuse of an existing vacant property. Whilst concerns have been raised that there is no need for additional visitor accommodation within St Bees, the proposal seeks to offer an alternative form of accommodation for large groups.

The scale and design of the proposed development is considered acceptable given the location and previous use of the site. Whilst significant concerns have been raised with regard to the impact of the development upon residential amenity, the proposal has been amended to reflect these concerns through the removal of the stand alone pod accommodation, hot tubs, and roof terraces. A Noise Management Plan and Short Term Letting agreement has also been provided to support this application. The Council's Environmental Health Team have offered no objections. Conditions will be utilised to protect residential amenity.

No objections have been raised from the Council's Conservation Officer.

Whilst significant concerns have been raised with regard to highway safety, the Highway Authority have confirmed that the proposal is not considered likely to result in residual or cumulative highway impacts that would be severe and therefore does not justify an objection on highway safety grounds.

No issues are raised in relation to drainage and flood risk, or ecology and biodiversity subject to conditions.



Cumberland Council

	On balance, the proposal is considered to be an acceptable form of sustainable development which is compliant with policies of the Copeland Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.
8.	Recommendation: Approve (commence within 3 years)
9.	Conditions: <u>Standard Conditions:</u> 1. The development hereby permitted must be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. Reason To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. 2. This permission relates to the following plans and documents as received on the respective dates and development shall be carried out in accordance with them: - Application Form (Amended), received by the Local Planning Authority on the 30th July 2026. - Site Location Plan, Scale 1:1250, Drawing No: 004, Rev: -, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 5th December 2025. - As Existing Site Plan, Scale 1:100, Drawing No: 002, Rev: -, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 5th December 2025. - As Proposed Site Plan (Amended), Scale 1:100, Drawing No: 005, Rev: G received by the Local Planning Authority on the 28th April 2026. - As Existing Plans Sections and Elevations, Scale 1:50 & 1:100. Drawing No: 001, Rev: -, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 5th December 2025. - Proposed Plans, Sections and Elevations (Amended), Scale 1:50 & 1:100, Drawing No: 003, Rev: H, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 30th July 2026. - Market Viability Report, Prepared by Everard Cole, Ref: JB27102925SB, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 5th December 2025. - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment, Prepared by Arbtech November 2025, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 5th December 2025. - Design, Access & Heritage Statement (Amended), Prepared by Day Cummins July 2026, File Ref: 6165, Rev: E, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 30th July 2026.

- Construction Method and Environmental Management Plan (Amended), Prepared by Day Cummins January 2026, File Ref: 6165, Rev: D, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 1st May 2026.
- Short-Term Rental Agreement, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 19th February 2026.
- Agent Response Letter to LPA and Consultees, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 27th January 2026.
- Noise Management Plan (Amended), Rev: B, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 1st May 2026.

Reason

To conform with the requirement of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Prior to First Use/Occupation/Installation Conditions:

3. Prior to the first use of the development hereby approved, the proposed four off street parking spaces must be constructed and brought into in line with the following approved plan:
 - As Proposed Site Plan (Amended), Scale 1:100, Drawing No: 005, Rev: G received by the Local Planning Authority on the 28th April 2026.

The off street parking spaces must be retained at all times in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development and must not be altered within the prior consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure the undertaking of the development does not adversely impact upon the fabric or operation of the local highway network and in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety in accordance with Policies CO4, CO5 and CO7 of the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039.

4. Prior to the first installation at the site, full details of any replacement windows must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The replacement windows must be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason

To safeguard the traditional appearance of the Heritage Asset in accordance with Policies DS4, BE1 and BE2 of the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039.

5. Prior to the first installation at the site, an external lighting scheme for the development must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting must be installed prior to the first use of the site in accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity and to protect the ecological interest evident on the site in accordance with DS4, N1 and N3 of the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039.

6. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, evidence of the installation of the ecology enhancement measures detailed within the approved document 'Construction Method and Environmental Management Plan (Amended), Prepared by Day Cummins January 2026, File Ref: 6165, Rev: D, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 1st May 2026', must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The enhancement measures must be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity and to protect the ecological interest evident on the site in accordance with DS4, N1 and N3 of the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039.

Other Conditions:

7. The flat roof areas to the rear of the site, as shown on the approved plan 'Proposed Plans, Sections and Elevations (Amended), Scale 1:50 & 1:100, Drawing No: 003, Rev: H, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 30th July 2026', must at no time be used as a balcony/roof terrace/amenity space for this property.

Reason

In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers in accordance with Policy DS4 of the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039.

8. The development must be carried out in accordance with and implement all of the mitigation and enhancement measures set out in the approved document:

- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment, Prepared by Arbtech November 2025, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 5th December 2025.
- Construction Method and Environmental Management Plan (Amended), Prepared by Day Cummins January 2026, File Ref: 6165, Rev: D, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 1st May 2026.

The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved document at all times thereafter.

Reason

To protect the ecological interests evident on the site in accordance with Policy N1 and N3 of the Copeland Local Plan 2021 – 2039.

9. Following approval of the development, construction activities must be carried out in accordance with the following approved document:

- Construction Method and Environmental Management Plan (Amended), Prepared by Day Cummins January 2026, File Ref: 6165, Rev: D, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 1st May 2026.

The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved document at all times thereafter.

Reason

In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers during the construction of the development in accordance with Policy DS4 of the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039.

10. The use of the site must be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents:

- Noise Management Plan (Amended), Rev: B, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 1st May 2026.
- Short-Term Rental Agreement, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 19th February 2026.

Reason

In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers in accordance with Policy DS4 of the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039.

Informative Notes:

1. Biodiversity Net Gain – Exemption Applies

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition “(the biodiversity gain condition”) that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the local planning authority, and
- (b) the local planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of the Biodiversity Gain Plan is Cumberland Council.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements is/are considered to apply.

Applicable exemptions: Development subject to the de minimis exemption.

2. Bats

During construction if any bats or evidence of bat is found within this structure the application should contact the National Bat Helpline on 0345 1300 2288 for advice on how to do works lawfully.

Statement:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and negotiating with the applicants acceptable amendments to address them. As a result the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal in accordance with Copeland Local Plan policies and the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: C. Burns	Date : 03.08.2026
Authorising Officer: N.J. Hayhurst	Date : 05.08.2026
Dedicated responses to:-	