



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2026

by E Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/25/3376079

Willow Water, 20 Coppergate, Nafferton, Driffield, East Riding of Yorkshire, YO25 4LL

- 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 Sam Parker against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application ref 25/02371/PLF, dated 14 August 2025, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2025.
 - The development proposed is the erection of domestic garage/carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to the setting of a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
3. The plans were amended during the Council's consideration of the planning application and I confirm that I have determined the appeal on the basis of the amended plans upon which the Council made its decision.
4. I have taken the description of the development proposed from the planning application form.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Nafferton Conservation Area, and whether it would preserve the setting of the nearby Grade I listed building Church of All Saints (Ref: 1346661).

Reasons

The conservation area and the setting of the listed building

6. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling which has a large front garden area that has been laid to hardstanding and a driveway running along its eastern side. It fronts on to Coppergate where the Church of All Saints and its churchyard sit in an elevated position at the west end of the road. The dwelling is set well back in the plot and there is a tall mature beech hedge on the boundary with Coppergate.
7. The appeal site is within the Nafferton Conservation Area. This covers much of the settlement and has a long established rural village character arising from its historic

buildings, traditional architecture, street layout, and natural features. At the heart of the attractive well preserved Yorkshire Wolds village, set around a roughly axial cross plan, is the Mere and the impressive Church of All Saints and its churchyard which sit in a prominent elevated position. I consider that the significance of the conservation area, in so far as it relates to this appeal, is derived from its history and development over the centuries, as well as the quality and variety of the historic buildings there and their relationship to each other.

8. The appeal property is a detached modern bungalow. The Council accepts it appears out of keeping with its surroundings due to its design and set back position. Unlike other traditional buildings in Coppergate which are built close together at the back edge of the pavement, the appeal property is a more recent addition and sits deep in its plot well back from the road. Even so, despite these factors, the appeal site's open frontage and mature beech boundary hedge are well established features in the street scene. They are not particularly at odds with their surroundings and add to the richness of the conservation area. Overall the appeal site allows an appreciation of the village's traditional rural character and does not detract from its authenticity or charm. Thus, I find that the appeal site contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area and its significance as a heritage asset in relation to this appeal.
9. The nearby Church of All Saints is Grade I listed and as such is deemed to be of exceptional interest and of significant national importance. This impressive medieval parish church dates to the 12th century with later additions/alterations. Constructed of ashlar with a slate roof and a west tower it sits in a dominant and elevated position within the village and is a distinctive and imposing feature there opposite the Mere. In so far as relating to this appeal, the significance of the church is derived from its architectural and historic interest as an important long standing place of worship, along with its role in the settlement and relationship with the rest of the village.
10. The setting of the church, and the contribution that it makes to the significance of that asset, in so far as it relates to this appeal, is derived mainly from the historic character of the village townscape and the traditional buildings in this part of Nafferton. This contributes positively to the understanding and the special interest and significance of the church along with the ability to appreciate it.
11. The Framework defines setting as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. The appeal property is on the south side of Coppergate east of its junction with Middle Street where the church sits in an elevated position at the end of Coppergate. Whilst the bungalow is set well back in the plot, the appeal site's frontage and boundary hedge are visible in the street scene of Coppergate where some contextual views of the church looking westwards include the appeal site. Thus the appeal site has a visual relationship with the church and the village townscape, and therefore contributes to its setting. I have had special regard to this matter in considering this appeal.

The effect of the proposal

12. The appeal site is within the development limits of Nafferton which is classified as a primary village and the proposed domestic garage would not introduce a new use to the site or enlarge the appeal property's curtilage. The proposed domestic garage has been reduced in size via amended plans and would be constructed in

brick with a pantile roof to match the host dwelling. It would be 2.72 metres high overall and located in the north west corner of the property's frontage. It would be set away from the driveway and its junction with the road (to allow sufficient forecourt depth) and positioned behind the existing front boundary hedge.

13. The mature hedge is agreed by the parties to be some 4.2 metres high, and is tall and dense providing substantial and robust screening to much of the site's frontage when viewed from Coppergate, notably in views from the west and when facing the site directly. The appellant argues that the retention of the hedge and its future maintenance could be secured via condition and refers to other examples where the Council has taken this approach elsewhere.
14. Nevertheless, even assuming the retention of the hedge, and despite its modest height, the proposed garage would be seen in views taken from the east in Coppergate. These views would be possible down the appeal site's driveway and across its frontage, as well as across the frontage of the neighbouring property at No 22 which has a low front boundary hedge. I am not persuaded that these views would be fleeting.
15. The position of the proposed garage would align with the forward building line of other buildings in Coppergate and respect the boundary of the site as established by the existing hedge. I also accept that the proposal would be appreciated in the context of the other buildings nearby, notably in front of the flank wall of the adjoining property to the west which has an extension with a similar roof line.
16. Despite these factors, the proposal would introduce a modern detached structure forward of the host property that would detract from the open nature of the frontage and be visible in the foreground of some views taken eastwards and towards the listed church from Coppergate. On balance, I find that it would be seen as a rather incongruous addition to the site and a visually intrusive and somewhat distracting feature in views towards the listed church. In coming to this view I have had regard to my own observations on site and the photomontages provided by the appellant.
17. Bringing matters together, whilst it has not been put to me that the proposal would interfere with any landmark views or vistas of the church, in introducing the proposed garage building to the appeal site within the setting of the nearby historic church, for the reasons given the proposal would unacceptably detract from the surrounding traditional townscape. Thus it would diminish the contribution of the setting of that listed church to its significance. For these reasons I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the setting of the nearby listed church.
18. In undermining the setting, which also contributes to the historic significance of the conservation area, the proposal would also detrimentally affect how the conservation area is experienced. I therefore consider that the proposal would cause harm to the significance of the conservation area and would fail to preserve its character and appearance.

The heritage balance

19. I therefore conclude on the main issues that the proposal would fail to preserve the significance of the conservation area and would not preserve the setting of the nearby listed building. I give this harm considerable importance and weight in the balance of this appeal.

20. The Framework advises at paragraph 212 that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets or from development within their setting and that this should have a clear and convincing justification.
21. I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires that less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
22. The building would provide secure storage for the appellant's vehicles which are currently stored/parked on the hardstanding in front of the dwelling. The appellant argues that this would allow the site to be tidied up to provide a more efficient and orderly use of the frontage and to improve its present unkempt appearance. However, I am mindful that the frontage could be used in a more orderly way and tidied up in the absence of the appeal proposal. Moreover, the continued parking of vehicles on the frontage would not be precluded by the appeal proposal which would occupy only part of the frontage. Given the harm I have identified in relation to the proposed garage, I am not convinced that any visual betterment would arise in this regard.
23. It is also argued that the proposal would assist in ensuring that vehicles are not displaced onto Coppergate. However, it has not been put to me that the garage would increase the capacity of the frontage to accommodate vehicle parking. I have seen no evidence to suggest that on street car parking associated with the appeal property is currently a problem that results in any highway safety concerns or impacts on the living conditions of nearby residents. Nor have I seen any evidence to suggest that the hedge would be at risk of loss or poor management in the absence of the appeal scheme.
24. Accordingly, having regard to all these matters, whilst accepting that some private benefits would arise to the appellant from the provision of secure vehicle storage, I find that the proposal would not result in any public benefits that taken either individually or together, would be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets I have identified.
25. The proposal would be contrary to Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document Update (ERLP SDU) which seeks to achieve a high quality of design. It would also conflict with ERLP SDU Policy ENV3 which indicates that development that is likely to cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset will only be granted where the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the potential harm. Thus overall the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the Framework and would be in conflict with the development plan.

Other Matters

26. I understand that the appellant has worked hard to improve the appearance of the host property, and that the proposal would not harm privacy, lead to a loss of light, involve the loss of any historic fabric, or harm the living conditions of nearby residents. I have also had regard to the letters of support for the scheme and note that there are no objections from the Parish Council. However, the absence of harm in these regards is not a reason to allow development that would be harmful.

27. Whilst not part of the reason for refusal, the Council raises concerns about the proximity of the proposed garage foundations to the hedge. However, given my findings in relation to the main issues in this case it has not been necessary for me to consider this matter further as part of this appeal.

Conclusion

28. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all the other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

E Worthington

INSPECTOR