
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/24/3354941

67 Quay Road, Bridlington YO16 4EL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mark Archer against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01645/PLF.
 - The development proposed is described as: Create a new dropped curb for vehicle access & new block paving to driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated. I am satisfied there are no changes of any consequence for the main issues in this appeal.
3. I note that the drawings accompanying the application incorrectly number the properties neighbouring the appeal site. I was able to confirm this during my site visit. For the purposes of clarity and certainty, as the appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling, No 65 is the attached, neighbouring property and No 69 is the detached, adjacent neighbouring property.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the area and on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. Quay Road is a main thoroughfare leading to and from the centre of Bridlington. Much of the character of the area derives from the variety of buildings, predominantly 19th- and early 20th-century semi-detached villas and terraces. The proportions and architectural features of the building façades creates a harmonious and attractive street scene, visible, in part, due to open and uncluttered front gardens.
6. The appeal site, in common with many other properties in the vicinity, is separated from the highway by a modest private space contained by low brick boundary walls with a pedestrian entrance. Most properties in the area do not have off-street

parking, and roadside parking is prohibited or restricted. This limits the visual prominence of parked vehicles.

7. Vehicles parked immediately in front of the property would partially obscure the façade and architectural features that contribute positively to the appearance of the area and would be at odds with the character of the area.
8. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan, April 2016 (the Local Plan). Among other things, this policy seeks to ensure that development promotes high quality design that has regard to the specific characteristics of the site's wider context and character.

Highway Safety

9. Paragraph 115(b) of the Framework requires development to provide safe and suitable access to a site for all users. It also states at paragraph 116 that if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, development should be refused.
10. The properties along Quay Road include shops, takeaway food outlets, local services, offices and dwellings. Side roads join the principal road at regular intervals connecting with further residential areas, businesses and local services. As a result, both the carriageway and footway are well-used.
11. The appeal site is approximately mid-way between a roundabout and the junction with St. John's Avenue. Parking along the section of road adjacent to the appeal site is controlled by double yellow lines and has a speed limit of 30 mph. Visibility between vehicles travelling from the roundabout toward the appeal site is limited by a curve in the road. It is further restricted by the boundary hedge along the front of the neighbouring property, 65 Quay Road. Turning right into Swindon Street from Quay Road, opposite the appeal site, is controlled by a right turn only filter lane shortly after vehicles exit the roundabout.
12. Space for vehicle parking on the land to the front of No 67 is limited. While there may be sufficient space for the appellant's car, it is likely to be insufficient for many vehicles to be completely contained within the boundaries of the property and the vehicle parking space would remain long after use by the appellant's current choice of vehicle. As such, vehicles parked at the property may result in obstruction of the footway, and therefore result in conflict with pedestrians, and obstruct access to the dwelling. Furthermore, the Council consider that the drawings submitted with the application do not reflect actual dimensions, and based on my own observations, I have no reason to disagree with that assessment.
13. Whether entering or exiting the proposed access from the nearside carriageway, in either forward or reverse gear, vehicles would need to manoeuvre into the available space at low speeds. It would be a similar situation for vehicles turning right across the right turn filter lane and nearside carriageway. As such, there would be increased incidents of other highway users having to slow rapidly or stop suddenly. As a matter of my planning judgement, this would result in conflict with other road users, in particular, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles turning right into Swindon Street.

14. In combination, I find that the current use of the highway, proximity to road junctions, restricted visibility and limited manoeuvring space on the property would result in an increased risk to highway users.
15. The appellant refers to an existing vehicular access to No 65. However, I do not know the circumstances under which this access was established or its status with regard to planning permission. Moreover, the presence of this access does not overcome the risk to highway safety that I have otherwise found.
16. Having considered all the evidence, including the recommendations of the highway authority and observations made during my site visit, I conclude that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable effect on highway safety. In this regard, it would conflict with paragraphs 115(b) and 116 of the Framework and Policies ENV1 and EC4 of the Local Plan. I am satisfied that these policies, referred to in the Council's decision, are relevant. Together, these seek to ensure, among other matters, that development promotes equality of safe access, movement and use, and supports and encourages access to sustainable modes of transport that minimise congestion and improve highway safety.

Other Matters

17. I acknowledge the appellant's commitment to purchasing a fully electric car. However, the benefit arising from this does not outweigh the unacceptable effect on highway safety that I have otherwise found.
18. I also note that the appellant considers that the Council has not met the requirements of paragraph 39 of the Framework. However, this is not a matter for me to address in an appeal under section 78 of the 1990 Act.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR