



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2025

by **M Willis BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3373037

Land East of 110 Easton Road, Bridlington, 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 25/00312/PLF.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of 1no. self-build detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reason

Effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area

3. The western stretch of Easton Road from the A165 has a mixed character. Near the A165 junction, properties on the same side as the appeal site are generally large, set well back from the road, and occupy spacious plots. Closer to the appeal site, the character changes with properties comprising smaller semi-detached and terrace homes and a small modern housing estate (Pioneer Drive, Pirbright Close, Lawrence Croft, and Normanby Garth). Plot sizes in this locality are smaller and more tightly arranged with parking for one or two vehicles located either to the front or side of the host property. The properties which face onto Easton Road create a strong frontage whilst on the opposite side of Easton Road, properties are fewer, more varied in size and form and largely screened by established planting.
4. The proposal site lies within the defined development limit of Bridlington and occupies only a very small part of the wider BRID-C housing allocation site within the East Riding Local Plan Update 2020 – 2039 (ERLPU). This allocation covers an extensive area of land lying between the appeal site and the A165 on this side of Easton Road. The Council has confirmed there is not an up-to-date masterplan in place for the BRID-C allocation site. In the absence of an updated masterplan, the former supplementary planning guidance (SPG) entitled The Land North of Easton Road Bridlington Masterplan (September 2011) is used by the Council to help applicants when designing schemes for new development within the site boundary.

5. The SPG shows a junction onto Easton Road to the east of the appeal site and requires new dwellings to be of a high design standard, locally distinctive and reflective of both the urban areas and the nearby rural settlements. Whilst the SPG provides some useful context, given its age, status and as it only covers part of the wider allocation site, I see no reason to disagree with the previous Inspectors view that it carries limited weight. Therefore, I have similarly afforded this document limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
6. The East Riding Design Code (ERDC) is a supplementary planning document supporting the ERLPU. The ERDC seeks to ensure that all development is responsive to its context, sits comfortably in the landscape and encourages biodiverse and sustainable choices in a predominantly rural setting. Of particular relevance is section 4.1 and key guidance G5 along with section 9.2 which seek to ensure the scale, proportions and urban grain of new development has regard to the surrounding development. Development should also reflect local character whilst recognising elevational features and their proportions can enhance the physical appearance of buildings and add interest and character to a street.
7. The plans and information supporting this appeal are basic however, based on the information before me, the proposal is for a detached, two storey property with garden spaces to the side and rear. Along the eastern boundary a driveway leading to a large parking and turning area located towards the rear of the plot is proposed. The property would be set back from Easton Road reflecting the building line of the newly built properties to the west with a hedgerow planted to the front. Proposed external materials and finishes include the use of red reclaimed bricks, black concrete flat roof tiles with uPVC windows and composite doors in anthracite grey. Although not shown on the drawings solar panels are also proposed on its south facing roof slope.
8. The proposed dwelling would largely reflect that of the newly built properties located further to the west in terms of its set back, building line and proposed materials and landscaping. However, as I observed during my visit, the newly built semi-detached properties to the west feature first floor windows on their side elevations. These additions help to break up and add interest to what would otherwise appear as a large mass of brick wall.
9. Although the gable and design of the proposal is said to mimic these properties, no windows or features above ground level are proposed on the eastern elevation of the dwelling. This does not represent good design and the physical and elevational appearance of the dwelling differs from that of the nearby properties that are part of the immediate character. This elevation would be highly visible given the sites prominent location along the frontage of Easton Road and would not add any interest or character to the street scene.
10. The property itself would also sit within a much wider plot compared to the narrower and longer plots that are typical of the properties on this side of Easton Road. Whilst I appreciate the long driveway and parking and turning area would provide plenty of off-street parking, these not only increase the size of the plot but are also not characteristic or typical of the properties on this side of Easton Road.
11. Consequently, despite taking design cues from the newer properties nearby, as a single detached property and given the poor elevational design, the dwelling would appear much wider, squarer and bulkier in form compared to the smaller terraced

cottages and semi-detached dwellings that are typical along this part of Easton Road. The combination of the larger plot size, poor design and uncharacteristic parking and turning provision would therefore contrast with the properties in the immediate area and be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

12. Whilst the Council has referred to the SPG in its reasons for refusal it has also referenced Policy H4 of the ERLPU. Policy H4 is clear that proposals that relate to only part of a larger allocated site need to demonstrate how they would form part of a comprehensive scheme for the whole site and would not prejudice the development of the whole site.
13. Based on the position and layout of the proposal and information contained within the SPG, a single dwelling in this location would not prejudice the development of the remainder of the allocation site in general terms. Whilst I agree with the Council that it would be unreasonable to expect the appellant to produce a masterplan for the whole of the allocation site given the size of this proposal the appellant has failed to demonstrate how the land immediately adjoining the appeal site would be developed or how it would relate to this proposal. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with Policy H4(d) of the ERLPU.
14. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and that the appellant has failed to demonstrate how the land immediately adjoining the appeal site would be developed or how it would relate to this proposal. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies ENV1 and H4 of the ERLPU which together seek to ensure that proposals integrate high quality design that contributes, safeguards and respects the diverse character and appearance of the area through their design, layout, construction and use, and contribute to a sense of place. It also requires development to have specific regard to the characteristics of the site's wider context, have an appropriate scale and massing.
15. I also find the proposed development does not accord with a number of the ERDC general principles, notably sections 4.1 and 9.2, and the SPG which together seek to ensure that the scale, proportions and urban grain of new development has regard to surrounding development; is of a high design standard, locally distinctive and reflects local character.
16. 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.

Other Matters

17. The proposal is described as a self-build dwelling and, had the appeal been allowed, the Council suggested planning conditions could be imposed to secure this. The Council also said contributions towards affordable housing and open space would be required. Whilst the suggested conditions to secure the dwelling as a self-build are noted, I am not persuaded that these would meet the tests set out within paragraph 57 of the Framework particularly in respect of them being enforceable. A more appropriate mechanism to secure the dwelling as a self-build would be through an obligation however no such mechanism is before me.

Consequently, I am unable to attach any weight to the proposed development as a self-build proposal.

18. Similarly, there is no obligation before me to secure the financial contributions sought by the Council. Consequently, even if these were required, they do not weigh positively in favour of the proposed development.
19. The proposal is located in flood zone 1; within walking distance of services and facilities and would not be harmful to highway safety or the living conditions of the occupiers of the surrounding properties. However, the absence of harm and compliance with development plan policy in these respects is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour or against the proposal.
20. Finally, whilst I appreciate the layout and design of the development suits the appellants needs and lifestyle; would be adaptable to changes over time and would incorporate low carbon and sustainable building materials and design features, including solar panels on the south facing roof slope, I consider these to be the requirements of any well-designed development. Consequently, whilst these benefits weigh in favour of the development, they do not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area and do not alter my findings above.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out above, 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 is dismissed.

M Willis

INSPECTOR