
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: 02 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3367402

Land East of 110 Easton Road, Bridlington, East Riding of Yorkshire YO16 4DB

- 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 Phillip Slasor against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02757/PLF.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dwelling and detached garage and construction of new vehicular access and other associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. 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 not advised of any changes to the relevant policies related to this appeal, which are now part of the ERLPU, and the appeal has been determined on this basis.
3. The Council has also advised that it adopted the East Riding Design Code, Version 2, Supplementary Planning Document (ERDC) on 2nd April 2025. A copy of the ERDC has been provided and the appellant has had the opportunity to comment on it as part of the appeal process. The ERDC has been taken into account in my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The part of Easton Road that extends westwards from the A165 has a varied character. Nearest to the junction with the A165 and on the same side of the road as the appeal site, the properties are mostly large with generous setbacks from the road, and many are within spacious plots. Whereas the properties on the same side of the road that are nearest to the appeal site, comprise a terrace of four properties and a recently built cul-de-sac (Pioneer Drive, Lawrence Croft and

Normanby Garth), these properties are closer together and have smaller and narrower plot sizes. There is also a strong street frontage presence along this part of Easton Road, which gives this immediate area a distinctive character when entering Bridlington. Eastfield Garden Centre on the opposite side of the cul-de-sac, together with those nearby properties, provides some degree of transition between the rural and urban areas when travelling into or out of the Town. On the opposite side of this part of Easton Road there are fewer properties, which have much greater variety in terms of their positions, sizes and forms, but most are not particularly noticeable due to the established planting along their front boundaries. The ground levels on the appeal site rise towards its rear boundary, and with there being a gentle bend in Easton Road partly across its frontage, there are public views of it when travelling passed it in both directions.

6. The appeal site is understood to be a greenfield site and adjoins other such undeveloped land, it is also part of an allocated housing site, known as BRID C within the ERLPU. BRID C covers an extensive area, between the appeal site and the A165, on this side of Easton Road. The Land North of Easton Road Bridlington Masterplan dated September 2011 (Masterplan), relates to most but not all of the current allocation. The Masterplan shows a junction onto Easton Road to the east of the appeal site, and it requires that the new dwellings are of a high design standard, which should be locally distinctive, reflective of both the urban areas and the nearby rural settlements. However, the Council has said the Masterplan is no longer adopted supplementary planning guidance, as such I attach limited weight to it. The development of the appeal site for residential development, would not on the evidence before me, prejudice the development of the remainder of the allocation, and it is noteworthy that the Council also found similarly. Although in the absence of any firm details of how the areas immediately adjoining the appeal site are to be developed it is unclear how the proposed development would relate to it.
7. The Council's ERDC provides design guidance for new development. Of particular relevance to the proposed development are Key Guidance G5 and Code C28, which specifically seek to ensure the scale, proportions and urban grain of new development has regard to the surrounding development and that the new building line respects the existing building line. The ERDC adds that some variation to building lines can be acceptable in certain situations, its accompanying Table 9, says in areas such as the appeal site, which it regards as an 'Outer Neighbourhood', there should be no more than a 3-metre setback variation. Other key requirements of the ERDC relate to securing sustainable design features, providing appropriate landscaping, along with sustainable drainage.
8. The proposed plans are basic in terms of the elevation detail, and there are also no annotated details. The design and access statement adds little extra information regarding the external appearance of the proposed dwelling and garage. The application form specifies reclaimed brick for the external walls (although it is unclear what colour they would be), under an unspecified type of black tiled roof, with anthracite coloured uPVC window frames.
9. The proposed siting of the dwelling, even taking the appellant's lesser setback measurement of 6 metres from the pavement edge, would still be some 3 metres further back than the adjoining end terraced cottages, and even further back than the new semi-detached properties on the opposite side of the cottages, which would be much closer to the pavement edge. As a result, its proposed siting would relate poorly to those nearby properties, and it would introduce an illegible form of

development, that would be visible on the edge of the Town when travelling on Easton Road in both directions. Whilst some properties on Easton Road nearer to the A165 have generous setbacks, those setbacks are mostly much greater, and that part of the road has a much different built context. Although its variation of setback would be within the tolerance permitted by Table 9 of the ERDC (using the appellant's measurements), its siting would not respect the existing building line in this case, which is also an objective of the ERDC. Furthermore, the setback variation in respect of the neighbouring properties would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

10. The proposed dwelling would also be much wider than the nearby properties on this side of the road, and its two-storey part would also be much deeper than the adjoining cottages, and the resultant views of it would appear bulky and discordant against the more modest scaled properties. In principle, a front facing gable is acceptable, however, the proposed gable running front to back, along with a much shallower gable running into it, from its outer side, would be wholly uncharacteristic of this immediate area. The combination of its footprint and scale, different roof pitches, and lack of any set back or break in the elevations, would harmfully contrast with the properties in the immediate area.
11. Although there is no objection in principle to having larger areas of glazing on the front (southern side), as proposed they contrast poorly with the smaller sized windows, and there is a lack of detail on the design of the surroundings of these openings. The small sized windows also appear to have a much different solid to void ratio than many of the nearby properties. Overall, there is a lack of articulation in the design detail and the proposed development would introduce an alien form of development, which, together with its inappropriate siting, large scale and poor design would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
12. The proposed detached garage would have a similar footprint to some of the nearby dwellings, although it would be single storey and much lower than them, and its overall height, notwithstanding its raised position and rear location would ensure it was not a prominent feature from Easton Road. Whilst there is also a lack of design detail regarding its openings, given its location and scale, in the event the appeal was allowed, this could be the subject of a suitably worded condition. As such, its siting, scale and design would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
13. The proposed 1-metre-high front brick wall would relate well to the front boundary wall in front of the adjoining cottage, and with suitable landscaping behind it, there would also be no harm to the character and appearance of the area from this aspect. It is noted that sustainable drainage is not specified on the application form, although the appellant has said gravel and impermeable surfaces could be used, nevertheless, I consider if the appeal were to be allowed surface water drainage details could be conditioned to ensure that the development would be undertaken in accordance with the drainage hierarchy. Similarly, it is also noted a scheme of soft and hard landscaping could also be required by condition. It is also noted that the proposed dwelling would have a timber frame, and incorporate low carbon and sustainable design features, including solar panels on its south facing roof slope. However, these aspects, even taken cumulatively, would not outweigh the identified harm regarding the siting, scale and design of the proposed dwelling.

14. The appellant has said that the design of the proposed dwelling relates to no.80 Easton Road, and that it is a combination of the front facing gabled properties on Lawrence Croft and the adjoining terraced cottages. I am not necessarily convinced that the proposed development would be representative of no. 80, and, whilst individually the nearby properties are part of the immediate character, it does not automatically follow that this would be the case when they are added together. Furthermore, it would also be substantially greater in its scale than those properties, and I am not persuaded that the design and appearance of the proposed dwelling would be locally distinctive.
15. My attention has been drawn to examples of other dwellings and garages that have been approved, both on and near to, housing allocations in Bridlington; three properties near BRID E allocation, one on Kingsgate and two on Belvedere Parade; new bungalows to the rear of no. 62 Easton Road; and a detached garage for no. 62 Easton Road. As I did not identify any harm in relation to the proposed garage, it is not necessary for me to have any further regard to the garage example at no.62 in my decision. Regarding the two properties on Belvedere Parade, whilst their appearance has some similarities to the proposed development, their designs incorporate detailed elements, different setbacks within the building's front elevation which break up its mass, they also have a much different context facing onto the sea. The property on Kingsgate appears to be part of a comprehensive form of planned development, again in a much different context to the appeal site. The proposed bungalows to the rear of no. 62 Easton Road, (also said to be part of BRID C) are located behind a property and are within a part of Easton Road that has a different character and appearance. In addition, they do not have the same street presence as the appeal site. Consequently, these examples are not entirely comparable to the proposed development, and they have not led me to alter my findings.
16. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and there would be conflict with ERLPU Policy ENV1, which amongst other things requires new development to be high quality, safeguard and respect the diverse character and appearance of the area in its design and layout, and by having an appropriate scale. 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 layout, and sympathetic to local character and history.
17. In addition, the proposed development would also be contrary to the ERDC and the Masterplan, in terms of the requirements which are set out above. Finally, 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 (NDG), 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

18. The appellant has raised their rights contained within Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) which requires that decisions ensure respect for private and family life, and the home. The particular concern relates to the need to be adequately housed. The appellant says that the proposed dwelling is to provide a home for his

family, including two adult children and their partners. In reaching my decision, I have kept these interests at the forefront of my mind. However, they are qualified rights, and interference may be justified in the public interest. The concept of proportionality is key.

19. I recognise the paramount importance of the rights of the appellant and two adult children and partners to have their home, private, and family life respected and this is a primary consideration. A dismissal of the appeal could interfere with those rights. Any such impacts in that event, would weigh against the proposal in these respects.
20. In this case, the appellant has made the planning application from an address in a nearby settlement. It is unclear whether the appellant's adult children and their partners currently live with the appellant, or indeed why they would have to live with the appellant, in terms their housing options. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the appellant is at risk of being homeless, or that there are no other suitable properties nearby that could be bought or rented that would provide a suitable home with 3 no. bedrooms, for the appellant and two adult children and partners.
21. Having regard to the legitimate and well-established planning policy aims of securing well-designed development that positively contributes and enhances the local area, allowing the appeal based on the evidence before me regarding the appellant and adult children and partners housing need, would not be proportionate and necessary, or consistent with the requirements of the HRA.
22. It is said that the proposed development would be a self-build property, and the appellant has made the planning application on that basis. It is also noted that the Framework provides some support for the delivery of mixed tenures including self-build properties. However, in this case, I am not persuaded that the suggested conditions by the Council would adequately safeguard the proposed development as a self-build property in accordance with the tests set out within paragraph 57 of the Framework, particularly relating to whether they could adequately ensure the occupation by a person who had a primary input into the design of the proposed development. There are also significant doubts as to whether the suggested conditions would be enforceable in the event there was no compliance with one or more of them. Alternatively, there is also no obligation provided that would secure the proposed dwelling as a self-build. Consequently, I am unable to attach any weight to the proposed development as a self-build proposal.
23. Similarly, whilst it is said that the appellant has agreed to make off-site contributions towards affordable housing and open space, whether these can be reasonably required or not, there is no obligation before me to secure them. Consequently, even if they were required, they do not weigh positively in favour of the proposed development.
24. It is noted that the proposed development would incorporate solar panels on its south roof slope, together with low carbon and sustainable design features; that it could incorporate sustainable drainage; and that it would be adaptable accommodation. These factors weigh in favour of the proposed development, however, in this case they do not outweigh the harm identified above.
25. The appellant has said that the proposed development would not be harmful to highway safety; that it is within the settlement's development limits; that there

would be no harmful effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; adequate bin storage could be provided; it is located within flood zone 1; that no conflict has been identified with the source protection zone; that there are no objections in terms of its density; and a comfortable living environment could be provided for its intended occupiers. Nevertheless, these are likely to be requirements of any well-design development and they neither weigh in favour or against the proposal.

26. Although the Council say its needs information relates to a requirement for more 1-bedroom dwellings, it does not raise objection to this 3 -bedroom dwelling in this case, and I see no reason to disagree.
27. I have had regard to the planning history relating to the appeal site insofar as it is relevant to the proposed development and I acknowledge the appellant's comments about engaging with the Council and members of Bridlington Town Council regarding the proposed development. However, these factors do not alter my findings above.

Conclusion

28. 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