



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/D/25/3372033

1 Main Street, Normanby, Lincolnshire, DN15 9HY

- 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 Barnes against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2025/689.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed replacement windows'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision refers to the proposed development as 'Install replacement windows to all elevations of the dwelling'. As this describes the proposal more fully, I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the building at 1 Main Street, a non-designated heritage asset, and whether it would preserve or enhance the significance of the Normanby Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation. I have also had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) as amended.
5. The significance of this CA derives from its historic association as a small estate village attached to the house and grounds of Normanby Hall, with a linear form along Main Street. Buildings date mainly from the early C19th and early C20th. Whilst some of the C20th dwellings have upvc windows (thirteen according to the appellants), I am unaware of the age or planning status of those and whether or not they have permission but in any case those do not predominate in this CA. Furthermore, they lack the detail that is seen where original windows remain and detract from the quality of the CA. As such, they do not set a precedent for this proposal. Most of the older C19th buildings I saw during my visit, retain their

original timber windows and those contribute to the quality and significance of the CA.

6. 1 Main Street is the first building seen on the southern side of Main Street in the approach from the east into the village and in the approach through the village from the west it lies within the context of an important view eastwards towards the wrought iron gates (grade II listed) at the entrance to Normanby Hall. The appeal dwelling is a locally designated Building of Townscape Merit in the CA and retains its original late C19th timber sash windows. Those display the detailed design and proportions that contribute significantly to the character and historic value of both the building and the CA.
7. The proposal would replace those windows with heritage-style, white grained upvc, double glazed sash windows. Having looked carefully at the proposed plans and the existing windows, I find that whilst their design would broadly match that of the original windows, their detail would not. The increased glazing depth, modern trickle vents, non-matching sash horns and glazing bars and visible balance chamber covers are discreet details which, whilst not immediately obvious, can be clearly discerned even from the street and would cumulatively detract from the authenticity of the windows and the character and appearance of the building and the CA. This would be exacerbated by the upvc material which is likely to have a more reflective finish than painted timber although I have noted that no samples have been provided. Although the rear windows would not be seen from the street, they nevertheless play an important role in forming part of the intrinsic character of the CA and the dwelling.
8. I have noted the appellants' confusion regarding the two Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) documents but the document provided by the Council, Normanby CA SPG (adopted 11 June 2004), advises that for Buildings of Townscape Merit, *'every effort should be made to retain all existing traditional architectural features of these buildings, the removal or loss of which will need to be fully justified within the context of any adverse impacts which this loss will have on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Alterations will need to incorporate matching designs and materials appropriate to the age and character of the building.'*
9. I conclude then that, by reason of their design and material, the proposed windows would result in significant harm to the significance of the building and would fail to preserve or enhance the significance of the CA. Whilst the harm in this case would be less than substantial and at the lower end of the spectrum, it still carries considerable weight and the Framework also requires that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Where the harm is less than substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The appellants say that the windows are necessary because having recently bought the house, they were unaware until after the purchase that seven of the eleven windows cannot be opened as they have previously been painted shut. They are keen to have windows with improved thermal performance and energy efficiency benefits for the house which currently has a poor energy performance rating, together with sound insulation and emergency access benefits. A letter of support from a local resident also refers to those benefits. Whilst I sympathise with the appellants' position and have noted their points regarding costs, even if timber replacements are not feasible, I have insufficient evidence to conclude that the

windows are beyond repair and or that other measures such as draught proofing or secondary glazing could not be employed. Those matters do not, therefore, amount to the sufficient public benefits that would justify the proposed windows or alter my findings in this case.

11. As such, the proposal would be contrary to development plan policy HE2 in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2003) which seeks to ensure that development respects the architectural style and detailing of the CA and to the Council's SPG.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR