

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: DC/26/71425 – Additional Written Representation for Planning Committee (1 April 2026)
Date: 26 March 2026 06:57:10
Attachments: RE URGENT Structural Integrity Record Statutory Non-Compliance - 3 Ethel Street B67 5AL.mxd

H [REDACTED]

Please see email and attachments received from objector.

[REDACTED] has submitted 'Additional Written Representation for Planning Committee (1 April 2026)'.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Sent: 25 March 2026 21:06
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: DC/26/71425 – Additional Written Representation for Planning Committee (1 April 2026)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council / Children's Trust. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Good evening,

Further to the officer report and in advance of the Planning Committee meeting on **1 April 2026**, I am submitting the following additional written representation and supporting evidence for Members' consideration, in accordance with the Committee guidance requiring submission no later than 48 hours before the meeting. This submission responds directly to matters raised in the officer report and to works undertaken since the application was validated, and is therefore provided to assist Members in reaching a fully informed decision.

This submission relates specifically to **DC/26/71425 – 3 Ethel Street, Smethwick** and should be read alongside my earlier objections.

Summary of additional material considerations:

- While the revised drawings present the proposal as a standard domestic kitchen extension, the works already undertaken on site (as observed and documented by the adjoining resident) are not consistent with that description, including full internal strip-out works and the removal of chimney breasts and ceilings.
- A surveyor has halted the works pending a structural engineer's inspection, indicating that the scope of works goes beyond minor domestic alterations.
- No Party Wall notice has been served on adjoining owners.
- A Building Control application has been submitted and approved for internal reconfiguration to create a **six-bedroom HMO**, which provides important context as to the functional role of the extension.
- The planning application contains **no first-floor plans**, despite the scale of internal alterations already undertaken.
- The property is registered to **Roselyn Property**, while the planning application has been submitted in the director's personal name. The same director has followed a similar sequence on at least two other local properties which were subsequently converted to high-intensity HMOs.

Taken together, this information raises a legitimate planning question as to whether the extension can properly be regarded as a standalone domestic kitchen extension, or whether it forms part of a wider **enabling scheme for intensified occupation**, the cumulative impact of which the Committee is entitled to consider in the planning balance.

I recognise that a six-bed HMO may be lawful under permitted development in this area; however, the planning issue before Members is whether the proposed extension materially facilitates and entrenches that intensified occupation and whether the resulting impact on residential amenity should be given weight in determining this application.

Documents attached:

- Site photographs
- Surveyor correspondence confirming works halted pending structural engineer review (see email)
- Building Control documentation relating to six-bedroom HMO reconfiguration (see email)
- Companies House extract for Roselyn Property

I would be grateful if you could confirm that this additional representation is **appended to, or clearly summarised within, the Committee update** so that Members are aware of this context when determining the application.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]