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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 My name is James Holmes and I am an Associate Director with Brian Barber Associates, Chartered Town Planning Consultants. I have an MA in Town Planning and am a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

1.2 I am appointed by LGSS Property Services to secure Listed Building Consent for minor alterations to the main entrance door to Sessions House, George Row, Northampton.

1.3 The application comprises the following:-

- Completed application form for Listed Building Consent
- Planning and Heritage Statement (prepared by Brian Barber Associates)
- Structural Report (prepared by BCAL Consulting)
- Photo Sheet

2. **SITE DESCRIPTION AND SURROUNDINGS**

2.1 Sessions House is a Grade I Listed Building (Listed in January 1952) in the centre of Northampton. It was built in 1675, following the Great Fire of Northampton and is considered to be one of the finest provincial courthouses in England. It is a rare surviving example of a 17th Century courthouse and was the administrative heart of Northamptonshire for over three hundred years.

2.2 By way of background, the court moved in 1993 and the building stood empty until 2010, when a new visitor centre was opened. It is constructed of stone with baroque details.
3. **THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL**

3.1 The main entrance doors to Sessions House are twin leaf and stand 4.35 metres high, with each leaf being 1.14 metres wide. Northamptonshire County Council has concerns regarding the top hinge to the left hand door leaf.

3.2 Temporary works have been carried out to support the door leaf with wedges that keep the door leaf closed and secure, but it is imperative to have this door leaf fully working, as access width is impaired with only one operational leaf. The current situation raises issues as to whether the current temporary situation complies with the latest disabled access regulations. It is, therefore, imperative that a solution to enable its continued use without undermining the fabric or appearance of the building is found.

3.3 A structural examination of the door leaf was carried out by BCAL Consulting in July 2013, with an update issued in March 2014. A copy of the report is submitted with the application. In summary, there are two hinges on the door leaf. The bottom hinge pivot pin is in a reasonable structural condition, although it is showing surface rust. However, the top hinge has been pulling out of the wall making the door leaf unusable.

3.4 The pivot pin on the top hinge is supported by a wrought iron peg, which is not a tight fit in the wall and it is evident that there have been various attempts in the past to tighten the fit with timber wedges. These attempts have not been successful in stopping the peg from pulling out of the wall.

3.5 This application for Listed Building Consent seeks to undertake remedial works to the hinges, to enable the door to be brought back into use again. A number of potential solutions have been examined (discussed in detail in Section 4), but the preferred option is to strengthen the top hinge by installing some additional fixings into the wall and the insertion of a third hinge to further distribute the weight of the door. This is in line with the
recommendations of the Structural Report (see Section 4 of the BCAL Consulting report).

3.6 To transfer the load from the top hinge pin to these new fixings, a steel bracket is required. The existing peg would be cut flush with the wall and a new steel bracket made with a new steel peg and pin. This bracket would then be fixed to the wall, using stainless steel threaded rods bonded with resin (as per the sketches below). No work to the section of hinge attached to the door needs to be undertaken for this hinge.

![Proposed replacement top bracket](image)

3.7 For the new middle hinge, a pin and bracket solution is designed to match that proposed for the top hinge once repaired. This will provide a steel bracket with threaded rods into the stone wall. A new two part barrel hinge will be fixed to the door leaf, with welded bolts connecting the two sections extending through the door. Hinge will be constructed from wrought iron to match the existing leaves in style.
4. **POLICY POSITION**

4.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires a planning application to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise. The current Development Plan comprises the saved policies of the Northampton Local Plan and the Central Area Action Plan.

4.2 The Central Area Action Plan was adopted by Northampton Borough Council in January 2013. The document represents up to date local planning policy, against which proposed development in the central area of Northampton will be assessed.

4.3 An extract of Central Area Action Plan Proposals Map (annotated with a red circle to identify the site location) is provided below. The site has the following designations:

- The site is within the Central Area Action Plan Boundary
- George Row is designated as a ‘Priority Public Realm Improvement’ area
- The site is within the Angel Street ‘Strategic Development Site’
- The site is within a Conservation Area
4.4 Paragraph 2.3 of the Central Area Action Plan notes that the area retains a considerable amount of its historical character, including much of its medieval street pattern and important Listed Buildings. The area contains some six designated Conservation Areas, which enable the Council to protect and enhance the architectural heritage and character of the area. There are also some 210 Grade I, II* and II Listed Buildings.

4.5 Policy 21 relates to the Angel Street Strategic Development Site, within which Sessions House is included. This policy states that it will be developed in a manner consistent with the Development Principles set out in Figure 6.4 ‘Policy 21: Angel Street Development Principles’ and expected to play a major role in the provision of new offices. However, a key aspect of the policy is that existing heritage assets will not be harmed.

4.6 The Northampton Local Plan was adopted in 1997. Substantial parts of this plan are now considered to be out of date due to changes to national
policy or more recently, adopted guidance. The policy in the Local Plan relating to Listed Buildings (Policy E23) was not saved by the Secretary of State in September 2007. This policy has now expired and paragraphs 126 to 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework, set out the relevant considerations.

4.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012. It seeks to conserve and enhance historic assets and emphasises the importance of putting heritage assets to viable uses, consistent with their conservation (paragraph 126).

4.8 To enable the determination of applications, the significance of any heritage assets affected needs to be described as part of the supporting information. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset’s importance (paragraph 128).

4.9 In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation (paragraph 131).

4.10 When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. Any harm or loss to heritage assets should require clear and convincing justification (paragraph 132).

4.11 Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (paragraph 134).
5. PLANNING CONSIDERATION

5.1 There are three entrance points to Sessions House from the public highway. The current access, with the damaged door hinge, faces westwards and is accessed off a wide section of paving, reflecting the set back of the adjoining building. This allows ramped access to the doorway, creating a level threshold, as well as a level public footpath roughly 2 metres wide for movements along George Row.

5.2 The other access points are through similarly sized and styled doorways that face northwards, taking access directly off George Road. This direct access would create implications for the operational use of these entrances with the Disabled Discrimination Act (due to the proximity to the edge of the pavement). Additionally, the western doorway is elevated compared to the public footpath. Ramped access would, therefore, be required, if this doorway is to be used. There is insufficient space to provide such a ramp, whilst its provision would also significantly impact upon the external appearance of the heritage asset.

5.3 To enable the use of the ground floor as a visitor centre for Northampton in 2010, internal alterations were required to the building. This included the provision of a secondary internal set of doors, creating a lobby area around the current west facing entrance. If an alternative entrance were used, this lobby arrangement, consisting of glazing panels and sliding automatic doors, would need to be repositioned. It is fixed to both the floor and wall of the building and its repositioning would result in additional harm to the fabric of the structure. Although this harm is only minor, this needs to be taken into account in order to determine the most appropriate option to rectify the current issue with minimal impact upon the Listed Building.

5.4 Before being utilised from 2010 by the Council, this property had a prolonged period of vacancy. The current access arrangements do not require the use of either door facing northwards and, as a result, it is believed that these doors have not been opened for at least 30 years.
During this extensive period, there is a high likelihood that the doors or hinges will have deteriorated to the point that opening them may cause irreparable damage. It is considered that the potential to require repairs or complete replacement of the doors facing northwards if they are forced open is significantly high to warrant avoiding undertaking such action if at all possible.

5.5 The proposed repair works to the existing doors/hinges are, therefore, considered to offer the best opportunity to minimise the impact upon the heritage asset, as required by the NPPF (paragraphs 131 – 132).

5.6 Taking this on board, the potential options to repair the left-hand door leaf of the western entrance are as follows:-

a. Provide a new bracket for the existing hinge
b. Keep the left leaf permanently fixed closed
c. Insert timber wedges to tighten the iron peg
d. Provide a rail and wheel on the base of the door
e. Introduce a third hinge

5.7 The merits of each of these options, paying particular attention to the impact upon the fabric of the Listed Building are discussed below.

**Option A: Provide a New Bracket for the Existing Hinge**

5.8 The existing peg and previous repairs have damaged the wall to the extent that this solution requires cutting off the existing peg flush with the wall and fixing a metal plate over the peg’s current location to enable new anchors to be inserted. This will provide a permanent solution to this issue. The arrangement of the bracket and anchors are shown on the ‘top down’ drawing below.
5.9 The new bracket will project 6mm from the wall, with the bolt and screw projecting beyond this. Four anchors projecting 100mm into the wall will offer sufficient strength to support the heavy door. The provision of two pairs of anchors, set roughly at 90 degrees to each other will minimise the stresses placed through each anchor and increase the tensile strength of the hinge system. Although the doors may not be original, they have been in place for a substantial period and the solution this solution minimises the works required to these important features. This solution follows the advice set out in the Structural Report.

5.10 The insertion of a new bracket and anchors enlarges the hinge mechanism for the door. However, the majority of these works are buried within the structure of the building, limiting its visual impact. This is furthered by the works being obscured from view when the leaf is open. This corresponds to the whole period that the building is open to the public. The new hinge can also be painted white to match the surrounding plasterwork and diminish its visibility. Set 3.8 metres above floor level, the replacement bracket will also be above eye level, ensuring that it is not a focal point.
5.11 Whilst this solution results in some harm to the fabric of the building, it is the option that is considered to have the least impact upon the building’s fabric. These works are considered capable of being undertaken in situ by the Structural Engineers, without the need to even remove the internal glazed doors. All works can be undertaken using a temporary free-standing scaffolding platform. The NPPF highlights the need to weigh any harm against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, it will ensure the long term occupation of a Grade I Building and allow the continued provision of public facilities in the heart of Northampton. These very minor alterations and harm, will protect the long term appearance of this important building and its use and should, therefore, be considered acceptable.

**Option B: Keep the Left Leaf Permanently Fixed Closed**

5.12 The door is at the main entrance to Sessions House, which contains a Tourist Information Centre, as well as a small exhibition space and ‘fully-accessible’ toilet facilities, including a changing places toilet. The entrance is used by members of the public as well as staff throughout the week and it is not practical for the left hand side door leaf to have to be kept permanently fixed closed.

5.13 When closed, the access is constrained in width. This results in difficulties for wheelchair users when crossing the building’s threshold. It is on the cusp of acceptability for disability access requirements and, given the launch of Changing Places, which will increase the number of people accessing Sessions House, ensuring that it is fully compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act is critical.

5.14 To enable the damaged door to be fixed in place, a number of temporary wedges have been inserted between the door leaf and the floor. These support the weight of the door. These wedges are unsightly and generate a detrimental impact upon the significance of the heritage asset.
5.15 The concept for simply locking the door leaf in place does not rectify the issue with the door/hinge. This will result in the integrity of these elements continuing to deteriorate over time, potentially leading to catastrophic failure of the door and/or hinge. This is not in the best interest in preserving the character of the building and thus not compliant with the NPPF. It is, therefore, considered that this is not a realistic option to take forward.

**Option C: Insert Timber Wedges to Tighten the Iron Peg**

5.16 The pivot pin is currently supported by a wrought iron peg taken into the wall. The peg is not a tight fit in the wall and there have been various attempts in the past to tighten the fit using timber wedges (as shown in the photo below). These attempts have only offered temporary solutions, which have resulted in the reoccurrence of the peg pulling out of the wall. Each temporary measure only seeks to increase the impact that the wooden wedges have upon the fabric of the building around the peg. Continuing to utilise this approach does not protect the long term appearance or use of the building, as noted in the NPPF and, as such, should be considered inappropriate.
Timber wedges are ineffective and have detrimental visual impact

Option D: Rail and Wheel Solution

5.17 The potential has been explored for a metal plate being fixed to the base of the door, with a wheel projecting to allow some of the weight to be transferred vertically through the base of the door leaf. This would reduce the load on the hinges, particularly the damaged top hinge. To ensure the smooth movement of the door with a wheel, it has been advised that a curved metal runner is installed flush to the floor.
5.18 This solution incorporates cutting into the original fabric of the door and floor, permanently scarring these elements. The metal runner in particular will have a strong visual impact upon the entrance, with it being clearly visible when the door is in both the open and closed positions. It is considered that alternative solutions will have less visual impact upon the heritage asset and, as such, this solution should be discounted.

5.19 The door leaf is considered within the Structural Report to weigh in the order of 250 kg. Unless the upper hinge is repaired, there would be an incredible force acting through any wheel installed to the base of the door. The movement of the door on a daily basis is likely to lead to the wheel breaking or deforming relatively swiftly. Works to the upper hinge would, therefore, still be required. This reinforces the view that the insertion of a wheel and runner is not the least intrusive solution, as the works in Option A should also be undertaken to ensure a long term solution is identified.
Option E: Introduce a Third Hinge

5.20 The potential has been explored to introduce a third hinge, sited in the centre of the door leaf, so as to spread the weight of the door over three hinges rather than two.

5.21 It is noted by the Structural Engineer that the installation of a new hinge could be undertaken in situ, and without risk of damage to the door if works to the top hinge are undertaken first (see Option A).

5.22 To insert the new hinge, holes would need to be drilled through the door, to allow the hinge to be securely fastened and provide the same appearance as the existing hinges, with a plate located on either side of the door. This would impact upon the appearance of both the internal and external elevations of the door, but once the doors have been repainted, will not be perceivable except upon close inspection. The hinge part to be affixed to the wall would also require additional holes to be drilled into the wall. This would permanently scar the building, but once installed, will be concealed when the building is open in the same manner as the proposed appearance to the repaired top hinge.

5.23 The solution proposed for the top hinge represents a final attempt to repair the hinge, through numerous pegs sunk at 90 degrees from each other. Should this solution fail in the future, the ability to offer a further solution without severe impact upon the Listed Building. The introduction of a middle hinge will reduce the potential for the top hinge failing due to the reduced forces being placed through the hinge and bracket. There can be no guarantees with regards to structural reports, and thus scope for minor additional damage to the Listed Building to further safeguard its future excessive scarring should be considered a suitable compromise.

5.24 On this basis, it is proposed that a combination of Option A and Option E is taken forward to protect both the short and long term integrity of the door and its functional capabilities.
6. CONCLUSION

6.1 In conclusion, the main entrance doors to Sessions House are twin leaf and stand 4.35 metres high. The top hinge to the left hand door leaf is deficient and has been pulling out of the wall, making the door leaf unusable. As a result, it has had to be kept fixed closed.

6.2 Several options have been considered, initially focusing around whether alternative entrances can be utilised. The two alternatives have been discounted for a number of reasons, including both operational issues and potential harm to the Listed Building.

6.3 Consideration of how to resolve the existing structural issue with the hinge has therefore been considered. A number of options have been discussed, including permanently fixing the leaf in place, although this is not practical or desirable. Four alternatives all seek to enable the door to be brought back into use.

6.4 The preferred option is to strengthen the top hinge by installing a new bracket to the wall, which would be securely anchored to the masonry to support the door (Option A). Theoretically, repair work to the top hinge would resolve the current issue, but it may fail in time. Further repair work to this primary hinge would then be very difficult without significant damage to the Listed Building.

6.5 Consequently, as a preventative measure to ensure a long term solution, the repaired hinge (Option A) will be augmented by the insertion of a new middle hinge (Option E). This will reduce the forces acting through the top hinge to enable a more permanent and fool-proof solution. Although it will result in some damage to the door and wall, it should be viewed as a minor impact to protect future damage to the structure. This forward thinking approach complies with the intentions of the National Planning Policy Framework.
6.5 Implementing this scheme is also desirable in planning and heritage terms, as it would enable the timber wedges adjacent to the hinge to be removed (inserted to try and secure the wrought iron peg) and also the removal of the timber supports under the door (inserted to support the doors substantial weight). This represents a substantial factor in support of undertaking the proposed scheme.

6.6 It is considered that the proposed works are the minimum required to enable the left door leaf to be brought back into use and offer a permanent, long term solution to the current problem. The level of harm generated will be very minimal compared to securing the long term use of the building by the Council for public services.
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1.0 **Introduction**

1.1 A structural examination of the Session House Door at the Reception for Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) offices was carried out on 2\textsuperscript{nd} July 2013 on the instructions of NCC.

1.2 NCC has concerns regarding the top hinge to one of the main door leaves.

1.3 Temporary works have been carried out to support the door with wedges and keep the door leaf shut and secure but it is imperative to have this door fully working as access width is impaired with only one operational leaf.

1.4 This report covers the findings of this structural examination, comments as necessary and makes preliminary recommendations for remedial and strengthening works that may be required.

1.5 The weather was overcast but dry at the time of the inspection.
2.0 **Description and history of the Property**

2.1 The Sessions House is a Grade I listed building located in the centre of Northampton and built after 1675 following the Great Fire of Northampton.

2.2 The external walls are of stone construction.

2.3 The main entrance doors are twin leaf and stand 4.35m high with each leaf 1.14m wide. The left hand door leaf (when viewed from outside) is the subject of this report and has a problem with its top hinge.

2.4 The right hand door leaf was original split into two at mid height and so has a total of four hinges. The two sections have been bolted together to form one leaf. The left hand leaf has only two hinges and these are 3.0m apart.

2.5 The hinges used are two part barrel hinges which are mortised into the door. The hinges are made from wrought iron. The pivot pin section is set into the stonework.

2.5 It is estimated that the left hand door leaf weighs approximately 250kg.
3.0 **The Inspection**

3.1 Defects noted during the inspection are shown in sketch form in Appendix A; photographs of the door are shown in Appendix B; and sketches showing the proposals are shown in Appendix C.

3.2 Other comments and defects noted during the inspection are noted below:

(a) The left hand door leaf had been bolted in the closed position and wedged underneath to keep it vertical as we understand the top hinge has been pulling out of the wall making the door leaf unusable.

(b) There are two hinges both of which appear to be made from wrought iron. The hinges are substantial in size and form a “tee” shape which is recessed into the door. The hinges are fixed to the door with eleven rivets each. There is no sign of any structural problem between the hinges and the door.

(c) The bottom hinge pivot pin is recessed into the stone jamb plaster slightly but appears to be in reasonable structural condition although showing surface rust.

(d) The top hinge pivot is situated further out from the stone jamb with about 10-15mm clearance between the hinge barrel and the wall face. The pivot pin is supported by a wrought iron peg taken into the wall. The peg is not a tight fit in the wall and there have been various attempts to tighten the fit with timber wedges. These attempts have not been successful in stopping the peg from pulling out of the wall.

(e) Immediately behind the door a lobby has been formed with a modern structural glass enclosure. It should be noted that there is very little room between an opened door leaf and this glass enclosure.
4.0 **Comments**

4.1 We understand that a survey was carried out previously using an endoscope which concluded that timbers between the peg and the wall had rotted probably due to damp. New timber wedges have been installed but were unsuccessful in strengthening the peg to wall interface sufficiently to prevent it pulling out of the wall under the weight of the door.

4.2 The door leaf is estimated to weigh approximately 250kg. In order to remove the door leaf it would need to be opened fully and raised off its hinges. The glass lobby screen severely hampers this operation and would probably have to be removed.

4.3 Due to the difficulties in removing the door leaf it would be preferential if the necessary repairs could be carried out with the door left in its closed position.

4.4 To strengthen the top hinge it is considered necessary to install some additional fixings into the wall. To transfer the load from the hinge pin to these new fixings a steel bracket is required.

4.5 The steel bracket cannot be successfully welded to the existing wrought iron peg due to the difficulties with the impurities in the wrought iron laminations.

4.6 Wrought Iron consists of layers of slag interlaced with almost pure Iron. Therefore if you are welding there is strong possibility that you will get laminar tearing (pulling the layers apart).

4.7 It is therefore recommended that the existing peg is cut flush with the wall and a new steel bracket made with a new steel peg and pin. This bracket would then be fixed to the wall using stainless steel threaded rods bonded with resin, (see sketches contained in Appendix C)

4.8 This work should be performed out of hours to avoid the need to close the entrance to the public.
5.0 **Conclusions**

5.1 The top hinge of the left hand door leaf has pulled out of the wall despite previous attempts of strengthening with timber wedges.

5.2 Full access to the top hinge would not be possible unless the door leaf is removed and this would necessitate removal of the glass lobby.

5.3 It is therefore necessary to strengthen the top hinge of the door whilst in-situ. A new steel plate bolted to the wall seems to be the most structural sound solution to enable the door to put back into use.

5.4 The works are likely to subject to Listed Building consent.

6.0 **Recommendations**

6.1 The top hinge is strengthened by using a new bracket bolted to the wall as shown in Appendix C.

6.2 This report should be forwarded to the conservation officer for his approval.
7.0 **General Exclusions**

7.1 This report is confined to structural matters only, but does not cover the deterioration of structural members through fungal or insect attack, nor does it deal with other defects of a non-structural nature, although some of the defects may be noted in the report. We have no liability for the presence of asbestos or our failure to discover the presence of asbestos although some may be noted in the report.

7.2 The limit of our liability for any claim is £2,000,000 except that our liability for any claim arising out of or in connection with pollution and contamination is excluded. We have no liability for the presence of asbestos or toxic mould, or our failure to discover the presence of asbestos or toxic mould.

7.3 We have not inspected woodwork or other parts of the structure which are covered, unexposed or inaccessible and we are therefore unable to report that any such part of the property is free from defect. Unless otherwise noted no wall or floor coverings were removed so the opinions expressed in this report are based on evidence from a visual inspection only.

7.4 This report is provided for the sole use of the named client and consequently is confidential to the client and his professional advisers. The Contracts (rights of third parties) Act 1999 does not apply. No responsibility whatsoever is accepted to any other person than the named client and, consequently, the contents of this report should not be relied upon by third parties for the whole or any part of its contents.

7.5 This report is made on behalf of BCAL, no individual is personally liable, and by receiving this report and acting upon it, the client – or any third party relying on it - accepts that no individual is personally liable in contract, tort, or breach of statutory duty (including negligence).

For BCAL Consulting
Signed

Date: 5th July 2013
APPENDIX A

Survey Sketches
Pull out force:

\[
\frac{250 \times 0.67}{3.0} = 56 \text{ kg}
\]

Shear force per leaf:

\[
\frac{250}{2} = 125 \text{ kg}
\]
PLAN ON TOP HINGE

(Scale 1:5)
DETAILS OF TOP HINGE

PLAN ON TOP HINGE (1:2)

SIDE VIEW ON TOP HINGE (1:2)
APPENDIX B

Photographs
Overall view of the Entrance to the Session Hall

View of the entrance doors to the Session Hall.
Note that the left hand door leaf is the subject of this report.
View of the left hand door leaf top hinge from outside.
Note the rivets can be seen which hold the hinge plate to the door.

Closer view of the left hand door leaf top hinge from outside.
Note the rivets can be seen which hold the hinge plate to the door.
View of the left hand door leaf from inside.

Temporary wedges in place between door and floor to support the weight of the door leaf.
View showing inner lobby formed using structural glass.

View from inside the Sessions House showing the inner lobby formed using structural glass.
View of bottom hinge which is recessed slightly into wall. This would make lifting the door off its hinges difficult and disruptive.

View of top hinge viewed from below.
View of top hinge.
Note the recent timber wedges inserted in an attempt to strengthen the hinge.

View of the top hinge from above.
Note that there is a gap of between 10 and 15mm from the barrel of the hinge and the wall which should be able to accommodate some strengthening plates.
Locking bolt to bottom of door.

Locking bolt to top of door.
APPENDIX C

Remedial Works Proposals
ELEVATION OF PROPOSED REPLACEMENT TOP PIN BRACKET. (SCALE 1:2)
PLAN OF PROPOSED REPLACEMENT TOP

PIVOT PIN BRACKET (SCALE 1:2)

STAINLESS STEEL M12 RESIN ANCHOR SET 200MM INTO WALL.

M10 STAINLESS STEEL RESIN ANCHOR SET 100MM INTO WALL.

CLEARANCE TO ALLOW FOR DRILLING WHilst DOOR IN PLACE.

BRACKET MADE FROM 6MM THICK MILD STEEL.