

WELWYN HATFIELD

28 NOV 2017

PLANNING

70 Woodhall Lane
Welwyn Garden City
Hertfordshire
AL7 3TF

cc. Reflexelite

23rd November 2017

Your reference: 6/2017/1696/EM

RE: Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council , in pursuance of powers under the Leasehold Reform Act 1967, REFUSAL to permit.

Dear Sirs

We would like to appeal against your original decision in relation to the above reference relating to the Estate Management Scheme and politely request that the Council would consider the following in response.

Firstly, which I understand will probably fall outside the Councils consideration, but is of significant importance to us, was that at the time we placed our order (with a local company for the replacement door) we were unaware of the Estate Management Scheme and what it entails. This decision has unfortunately meant we have spent £600 to date with a further £600 outstanding as the vendor has been unable to fit the door. The vendor understandably is keen that they recover all their costs, as the door has been manufactured. They were not aware of the scheme although they supply to the area. I understand that financial outlay is not a justification, but as we were unaware of the scheme's applicability the result of the decision has ultimately led to this unfortunate position for us.

In your communication on the 17th October it was stated;

'The design of the proposed front door is considered to be inappropriate and would be an incongruous addition to the property failing to respect the visual amenities of the street scene. Accordingly, the proposed development would fail to maintain and enhance the amenities and values of this part of the Garden City and is therefore contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.'

Having now looked at the Estate Management Scheme, as a home owner the stipulations are that we keep and maintain walls, roofs, doors, windows, fences hedges and drains in good repair and condition. We believe the replacement of the current door, as it requires replacing, with the proposed door, we are indeed exercising this responsibility accordingly.

We have been unable to ascertain over and above the statement provided by the Council, specifically why the proposed door was refused.

If in general terms it is related to colour, style and or door furniture, or combinations thereof, when one wanders around areas covered by the Estate Management Scheme, on the Woodhall side of the Garden City, many doors have already been replaced (see example pictures below).



With so many examples of either the colour or style already installed across streets defined within the Estate Management Scheme (many others have not been included as examples above), I believe precedent has been set, therefore our application cannot be considered incongruous, or that they fail to maintain and enhance the amenities and values of this part of the Garden City.

In fact they can be considered an enhancement as the designs are not so atypical of the period when some of the houses themselves were built, and more appropriate than many doors that have been replaced across the subsequent decades.

We therefore sincerely request that you reconsider your initial decision and permit us to fit the door we have paid for but been unable to fit.

Thank you

Yours faithfully

Paul Frake and Helena D'Arcy.

