

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
ESTATE MANAGEMENT APPEAL PANEL – 8 APRIL 2019
REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR (PUBLIC PROTECTION, PLANNING
AND GOVERNANCE)

6/2018/2849/EM

202 KNIGHTSFIELD, WELWYN GARDEN CITY, AL8 7RQ

REPLACEMENT FRONT DOOR

APPLICANT: MR & MRS G BRIANT

(Sherrards)

1 Background

- 1.1 This is an appeal against the refusal of Estate Management Consent for the replacement of a front door. The application was refused for the following reason:

The proposed front door, by virtue of its uncharacteristic colour, would constitute a change that would be significantly out of character with the area to the detriment of the character and appearance of the property and the immediate street scene. Accordingly the proposal would fail to maintain the values and amenities of the Estate Management Scheme and is contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

2 Site Description

- 2.1 The appeal property is a two storey end terrace dwelling located on a corner plot with Knightsfield and a non through road. The front door is on the side of the property, facing this non through road. The existing door is white upvc with the top half in one glazed panel of six panes.
- 2.2 The street scene comprises semi- detached and terraced dwellings with a relatively consistent design and appearance.

3 The Proposal

- 3.1 The appeal seeks consent to change the front door from white to a composite red. Its style and design would alter with two glazed panels in the upper half.

4 Relevant Estate Management History

- 4.1 None

5 Policy

5.1 Estate Management Scheme Policies (October 2008):

5.2 EM1 – Extensions and Alterations

6 Representations

6.1 Two letters of support have been received as a result of the appeal from Nos. 200 and 203 Knightsfield. They can be summarised as;

- Mixed colours doors and style brings character and life to the area;
- No conformity of style or colour of front doors in roads or rows of houses;
- The doors is to the side of the road and is not clearly visible;
- The door match the boundary fence; and
- The colour and style of door is an enhancement to the area.

7 Discussion

7.1 This is an appeal against the refusal of Estate Management consent. The appellant's letter of appeal is attached at Appendix 1 and the delegated officer's report for application 6/2019/2849/EM, is attached at Appendix 2.

7.2 The key issue in the determination of this appeal is the impact of the proposed development on the values and amenities of the property and the surrounding area. The impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers is considered to be acceptable.

7.3. In recognition of the importance of Welwyn Garden City as a unique town and in order to protect the amenities and values of the Garden City, the Estate Management Scheme was set up. The purpose of the Management Scheme and its importance to homeowners is to ensure that homes and street scenes are kept in harmony with the original design and concept of the town.

7.4 Policy EM1 aims for alterations to be in keeping with the existing property and not harm the values and amenities of the area. Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme (EMS) refers to extensions and alterations, and states that extensions and alterations will only be allowed where the works are in keeping with the design, appearance, materials and architectural detail used in the existing building, and would not harm the amenities and values of the area.

7.5 This part of Knightsfield is characterised with terrace properties. A common architectural design of those properties is that front doors and fenestration are predominantly white. Mid terrace dwellings have the front door facing the road, whereas the end terraces have the door positioned to the side. Whilst the design of the door may vary, the colour remains relatively consistent. Given the visibility of doors and their overall style and design they contribute to the values and amenities of the area.

- 7.6 The existing door is white upvc and sited to the side of the property and consistent with the surrounding area. The proposed front door, would be a different design and would constitute a change of colour to red. Whilst there is no concern raised with regard to the design of the door given the existing door's design together with those within the area, the proposed colour would contrast with the surrounding properties in the area and introduce an incongruous addition to the property and street scene. As a result it would cause harm to the amenities and values of the area, which would be readily viewable within the street scene.
- 7.7 Accordingly the proposal would not preserve the unique architectural heritage of the town and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the building and street scene, resulting in a detrimental harm upon the amenities and values of the Garden City contrary to Policy EM1.
- 7.8 A case has been advanced by the appellant in support of the appeal. The appellant outlines that doors on this street and within the area have a variety of colours including red, blue, black, yellow and white amongst many others and in a variety of door styles. The white doors are in the majority the remnants of the upvc revolution of the 1990s where white was the only colour available. The appellant does note that some of the references within the case officer's report are not within the Estate Management Scheme which include Nos. 203 and 205 Knightsfield.
- 7.9 The applicant has submitted that none of the original doors in this area were white with them being generally the same style but in many different colours including red and blue, which was the only choice as a tenant during the regular maintenance cycles. The appellant outlines that over time as properties were bought from the Authority owners have painted the doors in different colours but always strong primary colours and never white, with the one exception at 185 Knightsfield. Whilst officers have no reason to dispute this, and the colour of the original door may have been red, however the design and style of the doors were consistent, as can be seen from the appellant's attached photographs, with a proportion of the frame being white. As a result the effect would have been a consistent architectural appearance which contributed to the values and amenities of the properties and the area.
- 7.10 The appellant outlines that the statement in the officer's report that outlines that; '*doors in Knightsfield were replaced as one project in recent years and were all white at one time*' is untrue and shows a lack of understanding and knowledge of the area. The appellant states that the doors replaced as one project were only the remaining Council owned properties.
- 7.11 The appellant also outlines that the door is not visible from public vantage points and the only significant view is from Nos. 1 and 2 Malmsdale and 201 to 213 Knightsfield. The site is a corner plot and the door is sited on the side elevation visible from Knightsfield and Malmsdale.
- 7.12 Additionally a number of letters of support have been included within this statement. It is considered that only those letters of support submitted directly to the council provide any material representation.
- 7.13. Overall, it is considered that a compelling case has not been made by the appellant to demonstrate why the circumstances advanced by the occupants of this particular property, when considered in its context, should override the wider values and amenities of the area. Accordingly, the proposal fails to reflect the character and appearance of the terrace properties to which it is located and the streetscene of Knightsfield. The proposed development therefore fails to maintain the amenities and values of the Estate Management Area.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 No additional evidence or information has been put forward by the appellant which adds to or would alter officer's recommendation. The proposed colour of the new front door, design, and appearance in a prominent location of Knightsfield, would be unacceptable and have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the row of terrace properties in which it is located and the surrounding street scene. Therefore the proposed colour and design of the door would cause harm to the values and amenities of the area and the proposal fails to accord with Policy EM1 of the Welwyn Garden City Estate Management Scheme

9 Recommendation

- 9.1 That Members uphold the delegated decision and dismiss the appeal.

Name of author: *Sarah Smith 01707 357512*
Title: *Principal Development Management Officer*
Date: *20 March 2019*

Background Information

Appendix 1: Appellant's Statement (and attachments)
Appendix 2: Officer Report



 <p>WELWYN HATFIELD</p> <p>Council Offices, The Campus Welwyn Garden City, Herts, AL8 6AE</p>	Title: 202 Knightsfield Welwyn Garden City		Scale: DNS
			Date: 2019
	Project: EMAP Committee	Drawing Number: 6/2018/2849/EM	Drawn: Emma Small
© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council LA100019547 2019			