



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by **L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3367632

Land south of Broach Road, Hensall, Goole DN14 0QJ

- 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 W R Platt against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2024/0937/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of farm shop and cafe with access, car park, play space, landscaping and all other associated infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the landscape bearing in mind it would be within the settings of the grade II listed Hensall Schoolmaster's House, Church Lane (the School House) and the grade II* listed Church of St Paul, Church Lane (the Church) and the grade II* listed the Red House, Church Lane (Red House).
 - Whether the appeal site is an appropriate location for the proposed development having regard to local and national policies on development in the countryside.

Reasons

Character and appearance

1. The appeal site is an arable field which extends along the south side of Broach Road. To its east are a row of semi-detached dwellings. To its west, is arable land at the junction of Broach Road and Church Lane. Further west is the School House and the Church which both extend along the Church Lane road frontage. Red House is set behind the Church and the School House with only glimpsed views of it from Church Lane.
2. The Church, the School House and Red House were constructed in 1854 (with later alterations) by William Butterfield and Charles Ward of Lincoln on the edge of Hensall in the Aesthetic Functionalism style. They are visually notable as a group of traditional buildings with similar characteristics.
3. The Church is finished in red brick and slate with ashlar dressings. It has a four bay nave and a three stage tower and has a rich variety of internal and external ecclesiastical architectural features. These include a gabled turret, and chamfered

archway under hoodmould. The School House, is finished in similar materials to the Church but partly rendered. It also has a variety of high quality architectural features commensurate with its education function. These include casement and sash windows of a variety of sizes with decorative surrounds and tripartite windows set in a long dormer window. Red House, is a former vicarage. It is accessed between the Church and the School House and highly decorated with attractive traditional architectural features. These include sash windows, timber mullions, header arches and relieving arches and stacks with cogged bands.

4. Thus, insofar as is relevant to this appeal the significance of all three heritage assets is founded on their traditional architectural detailing, their group value as a group of high-quality buildings of similar age in the Aesthetic Functionalism style which are prominently located at a junction on the edge of a rural settlement. The Church and the School House also have community value as a place for worship, burials and other religious activities and education respectively.
5. The proposal would introduce a large, long and narrow rectangular building into an arable field. From Broach Road approaching its junction with Church Lane, that building would be prominently viewed on the end of a linear row of modest housing. Even though the proposed building would be set back within the site behind hedging and enhanced landscaping, it would be prominent within the setting of the Church and the School when viewed from Broach Road travelling towards its junction with Church Lane. Even acknowledging the arable gap between the proposal and the heritage assets, the prominence of the building within their settings would increase, the closer footway or road users get to the junction.
6. I acknowledge the proposal incorporates features such as timber doors and corrugated metal roofing in an attempt to make the building appear agricultural in character. I also note the proposed use of brick, slate and render is intended to compliment the nearby heritage assets. I also acknowledge the proposed use of crushed stone surfacing for the car park and the proposed landscaping which would soften the appearance of the scheme. Furthermore, I have noted that the bicycle store and service yard would not be visible alongside the heritage assets.
7. However, through its scale, elongated form, large areas of signage, and large parking areas, the proposal would have an obvious commercial appearance. It would appear as a large commercial building on the edge of a rural settlement. and would be the most noticeable building at the junction between Church Lane and Broach Road.
8. Consequently, in my view, the scheme would draw attention away from the Church and the School House. This effect would erode the prominence of the group of high quality traditional buildings on the edge of a rural settlement. Thus, the proposal would harm the setting and significance of the School House and the Church. It would also harm, albeit to a lesser degree, the setting of Red House because of its association as part of the group.
9. However, the appeal site is in the countryside adjoining a settlement. It is not subject to any local or national landscape designations and there is no substantive evidence which identifies any specific non-heritage related harm to the quality of the landscape relevant to the appeal site. Thus, whilst there would inevitably be a change in the landscape as a result of the proposal because part of a field would be replaced with a large building and other ancillary features, the appeal site is part

of a field which has a typical agricultural character. A change in the landscape does not automatically equate to harm. The harm I have identified above is concerned with the effect of the scheme on the designated heritage assets. I do not find any substantive evidence before me, to indicate there is harm to the landscape in this location, which would be additional to that which I have already identified.

10. Even so, the harm I have identified to the Church, the School House and Red House combined would be less than substantial and towards the lower end of any range. Paragraphs 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be attached to such harm and for it to be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme. I will return to this below as part of my overall balance and conclusion.

Location

11. Policy SP2 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) (CS) states "Development in the countryside (outside Development Limits) will be limited to the replacement or extension of existing buildings, the re-use of buildings preferably for employment purposes, and well-designed new buildings of an appropriate scale, which would contribute towards and improve the local economy and where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, in accordance with Policy SP13 of the CS.
12. Policy SP13 of the CS supports sustainable development in rural locations such as the appeal site, "which brings sustainable economic growth through local employment opportunities or expansions of businesses and enterprise". It goes on to give support for "the diversification of agriculture and other land based rural businesses or the expansion of local services and facilities in accordance with Policy SP14 of the CS". However, there is no detailed guidance in the development plan on what should be considered to be an appropriate scale for the type of development proposed in this location.
13. The appeal scheme would be subject to an appropriate planning condition which would ensure that a minimum of 30% of the products sold in the proposed development would be made from produce from the appellants farming enterprise. That enterprise, spread over a large land holding, producing potatoes, beans, peas, wheat, maize, barley, oats and farming livestock including cattle and sheep is significant. It is clearly sufficient to provide the minimum 30% of produce as indicated. In doing so, the proposal would clearly assist to diversify the agricultural enterprise and this would inevitably make the wider agricultural enterprise more resilient, although to what degree is not known.
14. What is known, is that 70% of the products required for the proposal could therefore be sourced from elsewhere. There is no detailed substantive financial or other related evidence before me to indicate why this proportion is necessary to make the proposal viable or indeed to help sustain the wider agricultural enterprise in any way.
15. Furthermore, even if I were to accept the proposal would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, in the absence of detailed financial and other relevant information, I cannot be satisfied that the proposal for a significant amount of floor space for use as a farm shop and café is an appropriate scale in this countryside location as required by Policy SP2 of the CS. For the same reason, I am not

satisfied the proposal on balance fully constitutes the diversification of agriculture as required by Policy SP14 of the CS.

16. I acknowledge Policy SP14 of the CS also supports local shops and services outside of town centres by among other things promoting the establishment of new facilities to serve the day-to-day needs of existing communities and the planned growth of communities. I also accept that although the proposal is in the countryside, the facility could be easily accessed by Hensall's residents and others living nearby.
17. However, whilst clearly some of the products and the café would support the needs of the local rural community, there is no substantive evidence before me which justifies the scale of the proposed development and the range of products offered within the terms of Policy SP14 of the CS. Consequently, without substantive financial or other justifiable evidence, I must take a precautionary approach and also find the proposal would provide a level of development far exceeding that needed by the existing community or any future growth in the locality without clear justification.
18. Therefore, overall, whilst I acknowledge the economic and social benefits in terms of providing local jobs, local education opportunities, local services and facilities, due to the unjustified scale of the proposal, I find the appeal site would not be an appropriate location for the proposed development having regard to local and national policies on development in the countryside. It would therefore conflict with Policies SP2, SP13 and SP14 of the CS and saved Policy S4 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005), which taken together form part of a spatial strategy to guide the sustainable development of the district. For the same reasons, it has also not been demonstrated that the proposal accords with the aims of paragraphs 88-89 of the Framework.

Other Matters

19. I have noted the examples of development involving farm shops and or cafes in other countryside locations. However, the full details of those schemes are not before me. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its merits, on the basis of the evidence before me and the specific location of the appeal site which cannot be directly comparable.

Conclusion and Balance

20. The proposal would provide a new farm shop, café and car park including additional car parking space for the nearby school which would benefit highway safety. It would also provide education/play space/field to fork area relating to the nearby school providing clear social benefits. It would be a service/facility which could be easily accessed by residents of Hensall and dwellings immediately nearby without dependence on a private car. There would also be economic benefits associated with the resilience of the wider farming enterprise, construction and new jobs created. These are significant public benefits, which collectively carry substantial weight in favour of the scheme.
21. However, all these benefits combined, even though substantial, on the basis of the evidence before me, are in my view, insufficient to outweigh the great weight I must attach to the harm I have identified to the designated heritage assets. The harm associated with my finding that the appeal site is not an appropriate location

for the proposal and the associated conflict with the spatial strategy of the development plan, only adds further weight against the scheme.

22. Overall, on balance, the proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan as a whole, particularly policies SP2, SP13, SP14, SP18 and SP19 of the CS and saved Policies ENV1 and S4 of the LP which, taken together and amongst other matters seek to ensure new development is appropriately located, a good standard of design and that proposals do not harm heritage assets or the historic environment without justification. The harm within the setting of designated heritage assets means the scheme is also not sympathetic to local history, including the surrounding built environment. This means it is in conflict with paragraphs 135 as well as the historic environment sections of the Framework.
23. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR