

**From:**  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on NYM/2022/0881 - Case Officer Miss Victoria Flintoff - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP,  
**Date:** 13 January 2023 14:05:22

---

The Cottage, Sneaton Hall, Sneaton  
NYM/2022/0881 & NYM/2022/0900

Variation of condition 2 (material amendment) of planning approval NYM/2021/0379/FL & 0387/LB to change the balcony material from wood to glass.

Consultee response

Reviewing the request for a variation of condition (material amendment), I have the following comments:

- Referring to the initial consultations, it was made very clear that balconies are not historic features found on rural/agricultural buildings and would normally be resisted/not permitted. However, subject to a few conditions, we were willing to make an exceptional circumstance, such as the roadside elevation window enhancement, from uPVC to well recessed timber framed deadlights, omitting various dormers and balconies, and most importantly, timber railings instead of metal and glass (in a design which is more appropriate for a rural setting). The applicant revised plans and provided the timber balcony details, which were subsequently granted permission.

- The NPPF is clear in regard to alterations in applications, para. 135 states “Local planning authorities (LPA’s) should seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used)”. The proposed amendment is returning the design and material back into a scheme which is deemed inappropriate, and the approved is a far better scheme, which as noted above, was only permitted under a set of conditions.

- The applicant notes that to fix a wooden balcony (which the applicant designed and submitted) would nullify their guarantee. And that builders, joiners and companies across the UK said they cannot do the work, therefore recommending a glazed metal guard rail.

So to clarify the situation, it is my understanding that any material chosen for the vertical posts, be that metal or timber, would need to be secured into the roof. So, if this is the case of nullifying any guarantee, then surely metal would also prove to be useless and allow water ingress?

- Another justification for this alteration which is noted in the application form states that a glass balcony is less noticeable and will allow more light into the property. The latter statement is private benefit and will not be taken into consideration.

- Until any clear and convincing justification for this change in material and design has been provided which clarifies the situation, I cannot approve at this time.

Notwithstanding the above, following on from a site visit 12-1-23, it has come to my attention that some of the new windows and doors are not in accordance with the approved plans. This needs to be addressed, as noted earlier, it is vital that LPA’s seek to ensure approved development is not diminished through changes being made. These include openings on the rear elevation, first floor doors and side lights, and large sliding doors on the ground floor, alongside a small opening. Also, where there was originally a door (roadside), a fixed obscure deadlight timber window was approved to be recessed into the reveal. Current images show this has not been followed, and instead an inappropriate uPVC spiral balanced VSS has been installed.

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage  
Bondgate  
Helmsley  
York  
YO62 5BP

Preferred Method of Contact is: Post

Comment Type is Comment  
Letter ID: 600531