



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3366442

Regent Hotel Residential Home, 11 North Marine Drive, Bridlington, East Riding of Yorkshire YO15 2LT

- 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 Mr M Stuart against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02785/PLF.
 - The development proposed is the alterations to the existing roof to create 2 no. in-roof apartments.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development as specified on the application form in the banner heading above, as it accurately describes the proposal, and I have not been made aware of any agreement for changes to it.
3. Planning decisions must be based on the development plan policies prevailing at the time of determination. The Council has recently adopted the East Riding Local Plan Update 2020 – 2039 Strategy Document, dated April 2025 (ERLPU). As a result, the ERLPU now forms part of the development plan. It has replaced the previous East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document 2012 -2029 adopted April 2016, which is cited in the reason for refusal. The Council has advised that Policy ENV1 remains unchanged in the newly adopted ERLPU. The appeal has been determined on this basis.
4. In its statement the Council has clarified the extent of the proposed development's conflict with ERLPU Policy ENV1 (referred to in its reason for refusal), which it says relates only to subsections A.1, B.1 and B.3 of Policy ENV1. The appeal has also been determined on this basis.
5. Since the Council's notice of decision, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised (December 2024 and amended on 7 February 2025). However, the main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant changes to the Framework in regard to the proposed development, as part of the appeal process.
6. It is understood that part of the appeal property that faces onto North Marine Drive has recently had its elevation clad in a different material, and that alterations have been made, including to a wall, to create a parking area. These aspects are not part of the proposed development, as such they are separate matters that are beyond the consideration of this appeal.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, with particular regard to its scale and design.

Reasons

8. The appeal property faces onto North Marine Drive in a seaward direction with the northern section of Bridlington's promenade located on the opposite side of the road, it sits amongst residential properties and other holiday units. The appeal property is three storeys high with a hipped roof that slopes away from North Marine Drive. To one side of the appeal site is The Expanse Hotel, a tall flat roofed building of a particular architectural style, occupying a prominent corner location between North Marine Drive and Third Avenue. On the opposite side, are two storey detached properties up to the point that North Marine Drive tapers away from the promenade. Part of the appeal property is also visible from the rear from Third Avenue due to the road's diagonal alignment, and because of the height of the appeal property along with the position of other properties nearby.
9. There is considerable architectural variety and scale in the properties within the immediate area, including some roof extensions and alterations, but most of the properties, The Expanse Hotel being a notable exception, have pitched roofs that slope away from the promenade, including buildings that face seawards immediately beyond North Marine Drive (Lime Kiln Lane Public Toilets and White Rose Care Home). The orientation of the sloping roofs contributes positively to the immediate areas character and appearance. Even where there are roof extensions and alterations including balconies in the immediate area, along with front gabled elements, these usually sit within or alongside these sloping roofs.
10. The proposed roof extension to add 2 no. holiday units within the building, would increase the height of the appeal property by no more than 0.5 metres. However, its altered design would extend directly upwards on its seaward side, removing the sloping roof and adding a mansard roof at third floor level. In addition, its window openings and additional balconies within the property's roof space would dominate its front elevation and be visible along the nearby section of the promenade. Furthermore, the introduction of the mansard roof form would not be locally distinctive to this immediate area, it would be an alien feature, forming an incongruous and visually jarring addition to the well-proportioned appearance of the appeal property. The proposed development would as a result harm the character and appearance of the host property.
11. Its much-altered roof design and front elevation that would have four storey accommodation, would harmfully contrast against the lower two storey properties on one side of the appeal property. Its scale and design would also make the appeal property very prominent along this part of North Marine Drive, and it would fail to form a legible transition between The Expanse Hotel and the adjoining two-storey properties. As a result, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
12. Both main parties have referred to a property with a mansard roof nearby, said to be approximately 0.5 kilometres from the appeal site (and said to be the closest such roof form to it). I saw on my site inspection that it is located close to other taller buildings and not directly face towards the promenade, and its roof ridge runs

parallel with the road, as opposed to running front to back as proposed in this case. Consequently, I did not find it to be directly comparable to the proposed development and its presence did not lead me to conclude differently regarding the proposed development.

13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and there would be conflict with ERLPU Policy ENV1, subsections A1, B1 and B3, which require new development to be high quality, safeguard and respect the diverse character and appearance of the area, including by way of its design and layout and by having an appropriate scale, height and massing. There would also be conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it requires development to add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and be sympathetic to local character and history.
14. In addition, I also find the proposal due to its inappropriate scale and design to be inconsistent with the key objectives of Policies I1, C1, and C2 of the National Planning Design Guide, dated 2021, insofar as they seek to ensure well-designed development that responds to local character, vernacular, the area's historical development, and the built context.

Other Matters

15. I have had regard to the planning history of the appeal site raised by both main parties insofar as it relates to the proposed development, and I note that the appeal has addressed a previous reason for refusal. Nevertheless, this has not altered my findings on the main issue.
16. It is acknowledged that the proposed development could optimise the use of the appeal property; that it is within a sustainable and well-connected area, and that it would make an effective use of land as required by the Framework. In addition, the appellant has also referred to policies of the ERLPU and the Bridlington Area Action Plan's vision that amongst other things promote tourism development, including self-catering and year-round tourism, along with the associated economic benefits. These aspects weigh in favour of the proposed development, however, given the small scale, relating to 2 no. 3-bedroom units, such benefits are somewhat limited, and they do not outweigh the identified harm and conflict with the development plan as set out above.
17. The appellant has said that apart from Bridlington Town Council, there were no objections from statutory consultees including from the local highway authority; that the appeal property is not listed nor is it within a conservation area; that it will not affect any public rights of way; there would be no harmful effects on trees and landscaping; that the principle of the development is acceptable; that there would be no harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; and there would be no unacceptable highway safety, flood risk, or biodiversity impacts. However, most of these aspects are likely to be requirements of any such well-designed scheme and are neutral factors that neither weigh in favour or against the proposed development.
18. There have been objections raised by local residents and others, in addition to the main issue above, including but not limited to, the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, particularly the

potential overlooking of nearby properties including a school; that the proposed development would be an overdevelopment of the site; questioning the importance of the contribution of the additional tourism units to the area; and highway safety matters. Whilst I can understand the concerns raised, subject to planning conditions as would be appropriate, there is no compelling evidence before me that would lead me to come to a different conclusion to the Council on these matters.

Conclusion

19. I therefore conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including those raised by the appellant and the Framework, which outweigh that conflict. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR