
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/25/3369332

30 Eppleworth Road, Cottingham, East Riding Of Yorkshire HU16 5YE

- 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 and Mrs Jenkinson against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00578/PLF.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached double garage to front.
-

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 Matters

3. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the revised wording that was agreed between the Council and appellant, and as is entered on the Appeal Form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including with regard to an adjacent tree.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 30 Eppleworth Road is a sizeable detached dwelling positioned well back from the highway within a suburban setting. The property possesses a recessed garage to one side and to the front of the house is a large area of hardstanding for vehicle parking and turning. I observed during my site visit that the frame for the proposed garage had been partially constructed upon part of this driveway.
6. In common with the majority of surrounding properties, an established evergreen hedge stretches across the appeal site's front boundary, whilst a large Beech tree is also prominently situated within the front garden of adjacent No 32 Eppleworth Road. Notwithstanding the individual design and scale of dwellings extending along the road's northern side, these properties are unified by the distant spacing of their buildings away from the highway, together with the absence of structures within their generous front gardens. These shared qualities, along with the frequency of

mature trees and hedges, affords the street scene a spacious, uncluttered and verdant appearance that positively contributes to the character of the locality. Accordingly, the appeal site in sharing these characteristics, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposed double garage would be sited adjacent to existing front and side boundary hedges. Despite the proposed hipped roof design and sympathetic materials, due to its considerable size and in particular its forward positioning, the building would disrupt the undeveloped appearance at the front of the property. By introducing a substantial structure directly in front of the house, irrespective of its design merit, the scheme would be harmfully at odds with the well-established pattern of development along the road.
8. I acknowledge that the property's well-established hedges would serve to soften and screen views of much of the garage from the public realm, albeit this effect would depend on their maintained condition and height. Even so, the fundamental incongruity of the proposal to its context would still be apparent from the road. I am mindful that these boundary treatments are not permanent features and may change over time, yet in any case, limited public visibility does not obviate the need to achieve good design which has regard to its surrounding character.
9. The appellant's evidence refers to two nearby buildings positioned close to Eppleworth Road as examples of the type of development proposed. I observed that these buildings are associated with properties on West End Road, and therefore unlike the appeal scheme, are sited to the side or rear of their host dwelling. In addition, their separation from the appeal site is such that they do not form part of its immediate visual context. The circumstances at these two properties are therefore materially different. Although I note the similarities in design and scale of the garage example in particular, the highlighted structures both have an anomalous presence within the locality owing to their unusual proximity to the road and therefore do not demonstrate good design. I therefore find that these existing buildings do not justify unacceptable development at the appeal site.
10. In refusing the application, the Council objected to an absence of information concerning the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring Beech tree, which is subject to a Preservation Order. The parties agree that this is a good quality tree, and I observed on my site visit that it makes a significant positive contribution to the area's character.
11. The appellant's evidence includes an Arboricultural Report prepared in response to this objection, included within which are Implications and Method Statements together with proposed protection measures. In commenting on this Report, the Council now appear to be generally satisfied that the tree will be protected from harm, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring adherence to protection measures. I have considered the non-invasive method of construction together with the separation distance to the tree and its associated canopy spread, and am satisfied that the tree would be appropriately safeguarded. However, the absence of harm in this respect is a neutral factor that does not weigh in favour of the scheme.
12. Overall, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. In doing so, it would conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Update 2025 – 2039 which requires development to be of high

quality design that respects the character and appearance of its area, including through having regard to the characteristics of the site's wider context and by being of an appropriate scale and massing.

Other Matters

13. As I understand it, the appeal site is located opposite the boundary of Cottingham Conservation Area, within which Dene Woodland across the road is included. I note that the Council has not raised any concerns over the impact of the proposal with specific regard to the Conservation Area. Whilst I agree with this assessment and therefore find no conflict with the Development Plan or the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in this respect, the absence of harm in these terms does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. I have found that the proposal would not adversely affect the neighbouring Beech tree. Nevertheless, due to its siting and scale, it would lead to harm to the character and appearance of the area. I conclude the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. It is for this reason and having had regard to all other matters raised that I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

B Plenty

INSPECTOR