



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2026

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3375199

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 25/00314/PLF.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Erection of 1no Custom build detached dwelling and associated works'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There have been two recent dismissed appeals¹ by the same appellant at the appeal site or immediately adjacent, both of which were for a detached dwelling.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
 - whether the location of the proposed development is acceptable having regard to the requirements of the development plan policies in relation to allocated sites; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property 1 Lawrence Croft, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a field that slopes down to Easton Road. Easton Road comprises of a mix of residential development interspersed by agricultural fields. In the vicinity of the appeal site, a terrace of four residential properties bounds its western edge. Set back behind a small front garden, these front the road. Beyond, there are two pairs of semi detached dwellings, also fronting the road behind a small front garden. A cul-de-sac development extends back beyond these frontages. Development in the immediate vicinity, along this side of Easton Road is

¹ APP/E2001/W/25/3367402 dismissed in September 2025; APP/E2001/W/25/3373037 dismissed, in November 2025.

thus characterised by reasonably narrow plots with their primary elevations fronting the road, close to the pavement edge.

5. The appeal site is set back into the field adjacent to the cul-de-sac development which extends along its western boundary, defined by a close boarded fence. Open fields lie to the east bounded by hedgerows. The construction of a dwelling here, set well away from the pavement edge, at the end of a lengthy access road and behind an undeveloped parcel of land, would be markedly at odds with the prevailing character here. Seen alongside the existing residential development, and set into the adjacent field, the appeal scheme would appear as an incongruous and ad hoc form of development that would be visible for a considerable distance travelling west along Easton Road.
6. Although a single storey dwelling, its roof would be particularly high, necessitating a steep pitch, a feature that is not present amongst the properties along Easton Road. Moreover, this significant expanse of roof, alongside its narrow width and low eaves would lead to the dwelling appearing somewhat 'top heavy' and out of proportion, particularly when seen alongside the adjacent properties here.
7. Furthermore, the road-facing south elevation would have a highly bland appearance featuring just two windows with no door. Located in an area where primary elevations typically face the road, this would appear out of context here. Furthermore, the identified 'front' elevation would actually face onto a narrow gap between the dwelling and the proposed boundary hedgerow which would add to the ad hoc appearance of the proposal and its overall incongruity in its setting.
8. My above assessment is supported by the guidance contained within the East Riding Design Code (ERDC). Notably, Code C54 of the ERDC states that the primary elevation, including the front door, must front the street. The proposal would clearly conflict with this requirement.
9. Overall, for the above reasons, the proposal would appear as an awkward, incongruous and poorly designed form of development. I therefore conclude that it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document Update (2025) (ERLP SD) and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which together seek to ensure new developments represent high quality design that preserves character and appearance.

Site Allocation

10. The application site forms part of a large allocated site for around 700 houses, BRID-C, which lies within the defined development limit of Bridlington and is set out in the East Riding Local Plan Allocations Document Update (2025) (ERLP AD).
11. Policy H4 (D) of the ERLP SD requires development proposals that relate to only part of an allocated site to demonstrate how the development would form part of a comprehensive scheme for the whole site and that this will not prejudice the development of the whole site. This is supported by section 9.2 of the justification to Policy BRID-C setting out the allocation, which states that due to the number of different landowners within the site, '*it is important that individual proposals consider the wider context of the site to ensure that developments are well planned and do not compromise the ability to develop the site in a comprehensive*

manner'. In that regard, part f) of BRID-C requires that proposals are developed in accordance with a masterplan.

12. Policy BRID-C highlights that a masterplan has been prepared for a site originally allocated in an earlier Local Plan. However, as it relates to only part of the current site allocation and having regard to its status as part of an earlier Local Plan, I see no reason to take a different view to that of previous Inspectors, and I give this limited weight.
13. I have not been provided with an up-to-date masterplan for BRID-C either by the appellant or the Council. In the absence of such a document, or similar details in relation to the wider development in the context of the appeal site, I cannot be certain how the appeal site would relate to the future development of the allocated site. Its position could influence the future location of dwellings, roads or services. This is particularly likely given the siting and orientation of the dwelling close to the eastern edge of the appeal site. The lack of compliance with a masterplan or any submitted details relating the proposal to the wider site, could prevent the delivery of a cogent and comprehensive form of development across the allocated site. It could also limit the potential of the development to make effective use of land in accordance with the provisions of the Framework and Policy H4 of the ERLP SD.
14. Furthermore, whilst all schemes for development must be treated on their own individual merits, I can appreciate the Council's concern that approval of this proposal could be used in support of such similar schemes within the BRID-C area. Allowing this appeal would likely make it more difficult to resist further planning applications for similar developments, leading to further piecemeal development of the allocated land, further eroding its potential to deliver a comprehensive development across the whole site.
15. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that it has not been demonstrated that the location of the proposed development is acceptable having regard to the requirements of the development plan policies in relation to allocated sites. The proposal would conflict with Policy H4 of the ERLP SD and Policy BRID-C of the ERLP AD in this regard.

Living Conditions

16. 1 Lawrence Croft (No 1) is a detached dwelling located at the end of the cul-de-sac development to the rear of the Easton Road terraced properties. The appeal site lies on the opposite side of the 1.8 metres high fence that defines the garden of this property. The rear garden of No 1 appears to lie at a slightly lower level than the appeal site in the vicinity of the boundary. Moreover, the appeal site slopes upwards from the south and the west, such that the north eastern corner of the appeal site is the highest point. Although there is some overlooking of the rear garden and windows of No 1, it is reasonably private owing to the presence of the fence and its position in relation to neighbouring properties, at the edge of the estate.
17. The proposal would be sited around 7 metres from the boundary with the garden of No 1, a reasonably close distance that would be less than the minimum required by the guidance contained within Code C46 of the ERDC (10 metres for Outer Neighbourhood). Moreover, the dwelling would be sited on the highest part of the appeal site. I am not provided with details of the existing ground levels or the finished floor levels in relation to that level.

18. Whilst I acknowledge the proposed dwelling is single storey, taking into account its proximity and the more elevated nature of the appeal site, the fence may not provide adequate screening of the rear garden of No1 or its rear windows. Mindful of the lack of information with regard to site levels, I therefore cannot be certain that the proposal would not lead to overlooking of the rear garden and windows of No 1. Overlooking could occur from the proposed garden or the windows of the dwelling itself. On this basis the existing privacy levels at No 1 would be diminished, to the detriment of the living conditions of its occupiers.
19. For the above reasons the proposal would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Lawrence Croft with particular regard to privacy. The proposal would conflict with Policy ENV1 (B4) of the ERLP SD and paragraph 135 (f) of the Framework which together seek to ensure new development preserves the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. There would also be conflict with Code C46 of the ERDC, described above.

Other Matters

20. Whilst the Council references the lack of provision of on-site renewable energy sources, the appellant has confirmed in his statement that solar panels would be provided. I am satisfied that the details in relation to these could be secured through a planning condition in the event of the appeal being allowed. This would allow for compliance with Policy ENV1 A) 3) of the ERLP SD and Design Code C6 with regard to renewable energy technologies.
21. That the appeal site lies close to a Garden Centre does not justify its consideration as being within a Neighbourhood Centre for the purposes of the privacy distances set out in the ERDC at C46. Inherent in my above reasoning is that the site is located amongst open fields on the fringes of Bridlington, and on the basis of the guidance contained within the ERDC, notably at section 2, it therefore lies within the Outer Neighbourhood.
22. I have had regard to the previous Inspector's conclusions in relation to a detached garage in a similar position to the appeal scheme. However, what is before me is a new dwelling, not a garage. That the Inspector concluded a garage would not be prominent in the streetscene does not therefore persuade me that the appeal proposal would be acceptable in relation to my main issues above.
23. The appellant refers to three bungalows that have been granted planning permission nearby². However, I am not provided with any details of this approval and therefore I cannot be certain that it represents a parallel with the appeal scheme or that it is within the site allocation area.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR

² Ref 24/00886/PLF.