
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2026 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3374359

Former 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 Michael Stuart against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03715/PLF.
 - The development is the installation of cladding to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The application was submitted retrospectively, and I saw during my site visit that the development, subject of this appeal, had been carried out.

Background and Main Issue

4. In April 2024, the Council granted planning permission at the appeal site for a change of use of residential care home to holiday apartments¹, a scheme which included the construction of balconies, the installation of patio doors and windows and the application of render on all elevations. I understand that the property's front elevation was previously facing red brickwork, and that during the course of the implementation of this permission, Moondust Grey RAL 7155 composite cladding was installed to this elevation instead of cream render as approved. An application seeking to regularise this change in material was subsequently refused by the Council for reason of its visual impact, leading to this appeal.
5. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. 11 North Marine Drive is a sizeable three storey detached residential building occupying a prominent seafront position in Bridlington. It sits between the

¹ Council's reference: 24/00274/FUL

substantial Expanse Hotel to one side and smaller sized detached dwellings on the other, within a predominantly residential area. Although buildings in the locality differ in their individual design and scale, their materials are generally red brickwork and/or light-coloured render below red roof tiles, with the appeal property being one example of this aesthetic prior to its recent change of use. Notwithstanding the sporadic incidence of cladding or other secondary finishes, this limited palette of main materials unifies the appearance of buildings in the area, in doing so helping to establish a sense of place and positively contributing to its character.

7. During my site visit, I observed that grey cladding had been installed in three sections to the property's front elevation, with a secondary, dark blue cladding used above the lower and middle patio doors. The cladding covers the entirety of the front elevation and meets the newly rendered forward-most sections of the building's flank walls on either side.
8. The installation of the cladding has introduced a visually prominent new material across the building's highly conspicuous sea front elevation. By virtue of its pronounced and jarring contrast with the retained brickwork and rendered side elevations and red tiled roof, and through the extent of its coverage, the cladding presents a harmfully discordant feature that detracts from the building's appearance. Furthermore, because the property sits amongst buildings that characteristically possess brickwork and light-coloured render as primary materials, the change to a fully clad three storey elevation reads as an incongruous departure from the area's established character.
9. The appellant's evidence refers to examples of composite cladding elsewhere within Bridlington, including as part of a suite of materials used on recent housing developments at Belvedere Parade and Ward Hills. Though other examples of existing schemes can be a factor in determining the compatibility of a development with an area's character and context, each case must be considered on its own merits based on the specific circumstances at each site. I agree that cladding of this type can contribute to achieving good quality design in coastal locations. However, the different nature of these comprehensively planned new-build schemes together with their locations in distant parts of the town is such that neither have a similar context to the appeal site and the development before me.
10. I appreciate that the appeal site is not within, or adjacent to, a conservation area and that the neighbouring Expanse Hotel, through its sheer size, has a greater presence within the streetscene. Even so, these factors do not obviate the need for development to respond appropriately to its immediate context and broader setting, particularly in such a prominent location. I also acknowledge the appellant's willingness to paint the cladding should an alternative colour be considered acceptable. However, as the harm arising from the development stems from the inherent incompatibility of the material itself with the character of both the building and its surroundings, painting it a lighter colour would not remedy its fundamental unsuitability.
11. On this basis, I find that the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and area. Consequently, it conflicts with Policies A2A and ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Update 2025 – 2039 (2025) (Local Plan) which together require development in Bridlington to raise design standards and contribute to a sense of place, including by having regard to the specific characteristics of the site's wider context and surrounding character and having

appropriate materials. It would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to character and adds to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

12. Both parties have referenced the National Design Guide (NDG) in support of their case. The Framework indicates that this document should be used to inform decisions only in the absence of locally produced design guides or design codes. As the Council has adopted a Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (2025) (the SPD), I have, in this context, given no significant weight to the NDG.
13. Code C52 of the SPD requires that when extending an existing building, proposed elevational and roofing materials must match the existing colour, size, and texture of the host building. Supporting guidance suggests that when this is not possible, alternative materials may be discussed with officers and justified within the application. As the development before me results from an unauthorised deviation from the previously approved alterations and extensions associated with the building's change of use scheme, it is reasonable to treat this Code as a relevant material consideration in determining the appeal.
14. In seeking to justify the use of non-matching cladding, the appellant's Statement relies in part on a Structural Report (the Report) appended to a Planning Statement accompanying the original application for its retention. In summary, this Report explains that during the course of implementation of the planning permission, various defects were identified with the condition of the building's front elevation, including spalling brickwork, cracking, distortion and outward movement. Read alongside the appellant's statement, it is apparent that the cladding was installed in order to avoid the need to repair the affected elevation.
15. Owing to the absence of any substantiating evidence to verify the alleged problems with the wall, I cannot confidently rely on the Report's assertions. Even if the stated defects were proven, I agree with the Council that it has not been demonstrated why the wall could not be repaired to a standard that would both allow the application of the approved render and for the installation of the balconies. Although the appellant contends that such repairs would have made the wider development unviable, no supporting information has been provided to substantiate this point. In addition, it is unclear how the cladding has achieved the plumb surface stated to be necessary for fixing the balcony frames, when render was rejected as incapable of doing so. Taken as a whole, due to the omissions from the evidence before me, I afford very limited weight to the justification put forward regarding the condition of the wall.
16. I recognise that the cladding provides benefits in terms of long-term maintenance, however such an advantage is private in nature to the appellant. Furthermore, whilst I have noted the contention that the works support the tourist economy through improvements to existing accommodation, for the reasons already given it is not definitive that the appeal scheme would have been the only means of making the necessary improvements. Consequently, I attach only very limited weight to these points.
17. Although the development does not result in harm to neighbouring living conditions, highways, parking, biodiversity, flood risk and drainage, these matters are not in dispute and so are neutral considerations that weigh neither for nor against the

appeal. Similarly, whilst Local Plan Policy A2A is broadly supportive of tourist accommodation development, the principle of the change of use is not an issue before me and accordingly attracts no weight.

18. Overall, the above considerations are insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate that permission should be granted. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR