



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 April 2026

by **C Harding BA (Hons) PGCert PGDip MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6002742

Land outside 3-5 Chapel Street, Bridlington YO15 2DR

- 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 Thomas Johnston on behalf of NWP Street Ltd against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02547/PLF.
 - The development proposed is installation of a communication kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/E2001/Z/25/3376850

Land outside 3-5 Chapel Street, Bridlington YO15 2DR

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Thomas Johnston on behalf of NWP Street Ltd against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02548/PAD.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of a communication kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission for the proposed communication kiosk. Appeal B relates to the refusal of advertisement consent for the digital signage which would be an integral part of the kiosk proposed in Appeal A. I have combined the appeals into a single decision letter as they are intrinsically linked and raise similar issues, however I have considered each on its individual merits. The original application forms cite the same description of development for both permissions sought, but under Appeal B I have only assessed the proposed advertisement.
3. In relation to Appeal B, the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 stipulate that control may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Therefore, whilst the development plan policies referred to by the Council are not determinative, I have taken them into account where relevant.

Main Issues

4. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposals upon public safety with particular regard to highway safety.

Reasons

5. Chapel Street is a busy commercial street within Bridlington town centre. The appeal site is located towards the western end of the street, which is anchored by a small foodstore. The appeal site itself is within the footway to the front of the neighbouring unit. The road is a one-way street.
6. The proposed kiosk would be orientated such that it would present the advertisement to the west. The provided plans indicate that it would be located around 0.45 metres from the kerb and that a useable footway width of around 2.3 metres would remain between it and the neighbouring shop frontage.
7. As the foodstore is set back from the historic building line, the pedestrian realm to its front is wider than a standard footway, however as pedestrians move eastwards along the street, the footway abruptly narrows at the point at which the established building line is reached. Further to the east, the footway narrows again in order to accommodate a layby. The proposed kiosk would be located at the point at which the footway would first narrow and would represent a significant constriction to pedestrian flow given the width of the pedestrian area immediately to the west.
8. Moreover, the shop at the back of the footway has an extensive ground floor window. It is probable that passing pedestrians would, at times, stop to view the shop window, further reducing the useable area. Combined with the potential for users to gather around the kiosk, even though over 2m of footway width would remain, the proposed location means that a pinch point would nevertheless be created.
9. This pinch point would be further exacerbated by the volume of pedestrians using the street, which is among the primary shopping streets within the town, and therefore likely to be busy, as highlighted within the comments of the Highways Authority. This would be particularly so during the summer months when high numbers of visitors and holidaymakers might be expected.
10. Furthermore, the additional narrowing of the footway to accommodate a layby a short distance further to the east means that the width of the stretch of footway between the foodstore to the west and the junction to the east would vary considerably. Given the animation generated by shopfronts in this location, the proposal would contribute to this becoming an area of reduced pedestrian flow.
11. In such circumstances it is conceivable that faster moving pedestrians may seek to step down from the footway and into the road to avoid crowds and obstacles, or more vulnerable pedestrians or wheelchair users may find movement unavoidably constrained. Moreover, the kiosk would represent a considerable visual barrier to traffic approaching from the west, where drivers would need to be mindful of pedestrians crossing or stepping into the road. Given the proposed location of the kiosk close to the highway edge, pedestrians waiting to cross would be significantly obscured to oncoming traffic. These factors would all be to the detriment of highway safety.
12. The proposed advertisement would face westwards, towards oncoming traffic. The road layout in this location is not particularly complex and the narrowness of the road means that vehicle speeds are likely to be low. Nevertheless, given my stated concerns in relation to the kiosk itself obscuring pedestrians from oncoming traffic, the addition of an illuminated advert in this location would represent a further distraction at a point of potential conflict and risk. This would be detrimental to public safety.

13. For the reasons given, I conclude that for Appeal A the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to highway safety. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document Update 2025 which requires development to ensure no unacceptable impact on existing uses in the surrounding area, and to promote equality of safe movement for all, including access and minimising highway safety risks.
14. There would also be conflict with National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') paragraph 116 which states that development should be prevented or refused where there would be an unacceptable impact upon highway safety. Framework paragraph 117 further requires developments to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and create places that are safe, and which minimise the scope for conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards.

Other Matters

15. Framework paragraph 119 indicates that an advanced, high quality and reliable communication infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social wellbeing. The Framework also seeks to support the expansion of electronic communications networks.
16. The proposed kiosk would incorporate a range of services including online access, phone calls, wayfinding and device charging. It would also form part of a wider network of apparatus providing efficient, reliable and free-to-use public services. There is also potential for the proposed interactive screen to be made available to the Council for public service messaging and to local businesses at a reduced rate. The integrated defibrillator would provide important potentially lifesaving equipment. However, while these would all be benefits of the proposal, insofar as it relates to Appeal A it has not been shown that they could not be otherwise delivered in either an alternative form or location. Nor has it been shown that the local area suffers from poor mobile network provision.
17. It is stated that the appellant has partnered with a charity to deliver a new tree for every new kiosk installed. Although it is suggested that such tree planting could be secured by means of a planning condition, no wording has been put before me, and in any case, such a condition would be unlikely to be sufficiently precise or enforceable given it would require a third party to deliver a tree in an unspecified location. I therefore afford this commitment only very limited weight in favour of the proposal.
18. With relation to Appeal B, the Regulations state that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. There is no indication that any of these suggested benefits can be taken into account in the consideration of Appeal B.
19. The appeal site is located within Bridlington Quay Conservation Area. There is no suggestion that the proposal would lead to harm to the significance of heritage assets, nevertheless I am mindful of my statutory duty in this regard. However, as I am dismissing the appeals for other reasons, no harm can arise from my decision and there is no need, therefore, for me to consider this issue further in this case.

Balance and Conclusion

20. The appeal proposals would cause harm to highway and public safety. Appeal A therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, to suggest a decision should be

made other than in accordance with the development plan. Appeal B would harm public safety. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

C Harding

INSPECTOR