

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Mark Simmons.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
26/01484/LBC	Replace existing front door (as amended by drawing no. 1.1 and revised specification received on 28.07.2026)	57 High Street Ashwell Baldock Hertfordshire SG7 5NP

Submitted Plan Nos

Drawing no. 1.1 Quotation Location Plan

HE1 Designated heritage assets

SECN16 Conserve + enhance historic environment

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 See planning history below (excluding TCA and GEN).

98/00542/1LB - Removal of internal partition wall and replacement doors.
CON 22.06.1998

01/01927/1HH - Single storey rear extension.
CP 18.03.2002

01/01929/1LB - Single storey rear extension.
CCON 18.03.2002

07/01791/1LB - Internal alterations to Kitchen and Utility/shower areas.
CCON 25.09.2007

07/00292/1LB - Installation of staircase between ground floor and cellar. Insertion of fire place in lounge. Alterations to first floor layout. Block up one window and replace one first floor window to rear elevation. External lights to front elevation (as amended by drawing no. 756.01A received 02/03/2007).
CCON 17.04.2007

12/01829/1LB - Alterations to first floor landing window.
CCON 26.09.2012

17/01061/1HH - Erection of outbuilding to provide workshop and garden store.
CP 11.07.2017

18/02039/LBC - Installation of external flue on rear roof slope to facilitate relocation of boiler from cellar to loft space.
CCON 13.09.2018

25/01631/LDCLB - Repairs and restoration to chimney base in lower ground floor area.
GTD 20.08.2025

3.0 **Policies**

3.1 Policy HE1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 – 2031 is relevant as are the following paragraphs of Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024):

- **135 c)** (*sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment*),
- **207** (*local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting*)
- **210** (*desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness*),
- **212** (*great weight should be given to the asset's conservation*),
- **213** (*clear and convincing justification*), and
- **215** (*harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use*).

4.0 **Representations**

4.1 **Ashwell Parish Council** – Resolves to accept the proposed.

Historic England – No comment as non-intervention letter received.

Press & site notices – No comments received.

5.0 **Planning Considerations**

5.1 **Site and Surroundings**

5.1.1 Nos. 57, 59 and 61 (Day's Bakery), High Street are grade II* listed and located within the Ashwell Conservation Area. The building and the area are designated heritage assets for the purpose of applying the aims of the NPPF. The list entry is provided at the following link.

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1347311?section=official-list-entry>

5.2 **Proposal**

5.2.1 The application is described as: ***Replace existing front door.***

5.3 **Key Issues**

5.3.1 With reference to Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the following should be noted: "In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special interest or historic interest which it possesses". The key issue is to assess the impact of the proposal on the listed building's special character.

5.3.2 The submitted Design & Access Statement says:

*Six panel Georgian style front door which is only 30mm thick
A number of scars from previous location of handle etc
Filler panel to accommodate locks*

Multiple attempts have been made to restore the existing door have been made, filling, sanding, painting etc.

The existing door has dropped and 'sticks' making it very difficult to open and having to slam to close as the timber expands and contracts in different weather conditions – on occasion it has been virtually impossible to open the front door.

Following consultation with building and carpentry company, due to the age and thin construction of the door it can no longer be repaired to be correctly functioning and secure.

Due to the construction of the current door, it provides only poor thermal insulation and the lack of any windows means artificial lighting is almost constantly needed in the small entrance hallway.

5.3.3 DAS goes on to say:

To address the lack of natural lighting in the entrance hall, the proposal is to replace the top two panels with opaque glass. This is aligned to the front door style of number 59 (next door) which has two glass top panels in a six-panel door and it should also be noted that Day's the Bakers door (No 61) has glass panels.

5.3.4 The existing 6no. flush-panel door type compliments the front elevation of this high value heritage asset. Whilst there are some examples of similar doors nearby, for instance at Plait Hall (grade II), there are several variations on the panel door type in the High Street. I have been unable to establish the precise provenance of the door but at my site visit on 14 July I noted the 'defective' elements and that the door does not sit flush within the opening provided. Interestingly, the internal doors to the lobby entrance are thicker than the front door being 40mm and they have glazed top panels. Although the originally submitted George Barnsdale specification refers to '4no. 12mm Painted Flush Panel', the section drawing no.1 indicates that the panels appear slightly recessed which, together, with glazing the upper panels, means that the new door will have different characteristics when compared with the existing.

5.3.5 On 21 July I emailed the applicant stating:

..... I was hoping that the replacement door will match as closely as possible the flush panels to the existing door which is considered a positive detail. Initially I thought that was the case but on closer inspection of the application I noted that the specification accompanying the application refers to '4 No. 12mm Painted Flush Panel' and the drawing provided also shows slightly recessed thinner panels with a quadrant bead type detail to the outer face (see red arrows below). This is unlike the existing door in the photo below left where the 6no. flush panels have a routed/routed bead detail. Externally, the panels are flush with the Head Rail / Locking Rail / Bottom Rail / Stiles / Mullion. Internally, the panels are squared off and recessed.

Considering the wording in the specification I decided to contact George Barnsdale direct to seek clarification. I have been informed that the recess from rail to panel for the new door is 16mm. With the panel thickness itself being 12mm. The panels are recessed not flush. GB confirmed that the panels can be made thicker, if need be, to reduce the gap from rail to panel which may alleviate concerns that I may have regarding the flush panel detail, but they cannot replicate the flush panel detail as existing

5.3.6 On 24 July I emailed the applicant stating:

.... What I should say is that I am prepared to accept the replacement of your front door but considering what I regard to be an existing door type that positively contributes to the external appearance of your property and considering its grade II* listed status, **I would normally anticipate a custom-made solid timber door ideally with routed/routed panel finish** and I appreciate that the cost may be higher but I do not know what the differential is.

I am concerned by the potential installation of a door with a factory paint finish and where the infill panels are (so far as I understand) a composite material with maybe a foam 'inner' (not confirmed). I appreciate that may be considered 'only' a door replacement but I am uneasy with the exceptionally 'clean/smooth' external finish and the composite panel infills and I will need to be convinced that the proposed door type is acceptable

5.3.7 On 28 July the applicant responded as follows enclosing an amended drawing and amended specification:

.... I have now received an updated specification from the supplier, this has addressed, I hope, your initial request to consider thicker infill panels, which I actioned on receipt of your first email. Again, you have raised further points on Friday (24/07) which were not covered in the initial email following your site visit. I hope I can address these.

With regard to the material of the infill panels raised in the second email, I have been advised by the manufacturer these are timber.

With regard to the paint finish, the factory finish does, as per the notes in the quotation '.... providing an excellent finish and long life with low maintenance.'... we are keen the replacement door has a long life and, while at the moment in the (very) dry weather this may not be something you are able to witness, there is, in the High Street a significant number of dips and undulations in the road surface, one of these is deep enough to create puddles which are in the exact track of cars right outside my house. On days when we do get heavy rain the spray caused by these pot holes splashes over our front door

I trust you will appreciate, as a look through your records will attest, we have always endeavoured to maintain the historic fabric of our house using sympathetic materials and technique as I understand you agreed with Simon at the site visit, the current door is not repairable. We have researched the market to find the best quality door we can from a source which has experience in historic and listed buildings. This new door is a significant investment and one we hope will add to the longevity of the property, while also providing us with greater insulation (both heat and noise), some light to prevent having to use artificial lighting 24 hours a day in winter and greater security.

5.3.8 On 29 July I stated:

I note that in the alternative option, the panels are thicker and you have confirmed that these are timber, but the consequence is that the glazing is more conventional double-glazing (4:20:4) as opposed to the narrower glazing of the 'Historic' option. I assume that you would like me to proceed based on the second option.

Whilst I remain convinced that an alternative joinery firm could reproduce the routed, flush-panel finish I have been seeking I have to assess the proposal as submitted and I conclude that I find the replacement door type on balance unobjectionable.

5.4 **Alternative Options**

5.4.1 Nonapplicable.

5.5 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

5.5.1 Nonapplicable.

5.6 Conclusion

5.6.1 The replacement door will not occasion harm to the listed building's special character or harm the appearance of the Ashwell Conservation Area, thereby, satisfying the provisions of Sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the aims of Section 16 of the NPPF and the aims of Policy HE1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 I recommend that listed building consent be **GRANTED** subject to the following condition.

1. The work to which this consent relates shall be begun by not later than the expiration of the period of 3 years from the date of this notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Signed  Anne McDonald	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Determining Officer Date: 30 July 2026	