

## Planning Committee

Report of Head of Planning and Building Control on 25 July 2024

Plans List Item Number: 4

### Reason for bringing to committee

Called in by Councillor S Nasreen on the grounds that the proposal is considered would have no significant harm to the amenities of the surrounding area from parking, traffic, noise, disturbance, odour, loss of TPO trees.

The Councillor considers that development will meet a vital need and will not have a detrimental impact on the area. The issues for refusal of a previous application have been dealt with, in the main and the reason for refusal is considered insufficient to refuse this application.

### Application Details

**Location:** 89, BELVIDERE ROAD, WALSALL, WS1 3AU

**Proposal:** FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF ONE, 2.5 STOREY, SIX BEDROOM DWELLING (USE CLASS C3 - DWELLINGHOUSE) WITH DETACHED TRIPLE GARAGE AND FRONT BOUNDARY WALL AND RAILINGS. THE PROPOSAL ALSO INCLUDES VEHICLE ACCESS OFF BELVIDERE ROAD. (RESUBMISSION OF PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE NO. 23/1097)

**Application Number:** 24/0337

**Case Officer:** Helen Smith

**Applicant:** Aneet Khambay

**Ward:** St Matthews

**Agent:** Khalil Aslam

**Expired Date:** 23-May-2024

**Application Type:** Full Application: Minor Use Class C3 (Dwellinghouses)

**Time Extension Expiry:** 26-Jul-2024



Crown Copyright and database rights 2022 Ordnance Survey 100019529

### Recommendation

1. Refuse

## Proposal

This is a resubmission planning application following an earlier refusal of planning application no.23/1097 by planning committee on 15/01/24.

The current proposal is for a proposed 6 no. bedroom detached dwelling with loft rooms and a detached triple car/storage garage to the front. The proposal includes 1.8 metres high brick pillars with 1-metre-high wall topped with 0.9 metres high railings. The proposal also includes new driveway and new dropped kerb along Belvidere Road and an extended existing dropped kerb along Highgate Avenue by 1 metre on each side.

The proposed new dwelling would be:

- 8.8 metres high
- 2.5 storeys high
- Ground floor area of 179.8m<sup>2</sup>.
- Includes 3 no. 2.5 storeys front gable features with a large area of glazing installed in the centre gable.
- Includes 2 no. 2.5 storeys rear gable features.
- Part gable, part hipped and part flat main roof design.
- Red colour facing brick with smooth grey plain roof tiles.
- Side gaps of 0.4 metres and 0.6 metres wide between the new dwelling and the side elevations of 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue respectively.
- Proposed front elevations would be set back from Belvidere Road by 9.9 metres and 12.2 metres from Highgate Avenue

The proposed new dwelling would be 1.8 metres further forward than the neighbouring dwellings at 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue, and existing building line in both streets. It would also be 2.3 metres higher than the ridgeline of 88 Belvidere Road.

The proposed detached 3 vehicle garage would sit on the front corner of the application site fronting Highgate Avenue and Belvidere Road, and this has been moved approximately 0.4 metres further into the site. No elevation drawings of the garages have been provided with the submission.

No chimneys are proposed.

An in-out driveway from each of these two roads is proposed and a new dropped kerb would be required at the proposed access off Belvidere Road. The garage building would be 3.9 metres high with an angled and hipped roof design. The floor area of the garages would be 68m<sup>2</sup>.

The appearance and size of the dwelling remains the same as the previous approval. The height of the proposed new dwelling would match the height of the existing dwelling however the scale of the proposed new dwelling would increase at this height.

This revised proposal amends the previous front boundary wall to a 1 metre high boundary wall with 0.9 metres high railings on top. The site plan indicates that gates across the two access points are proposed although they are not shown on the proposed elevation drawings.

The private amenity space for the new dwelling would be a 24 sq. metres paved patio area at the rear. The landscaping and planting on the existing front garden area has already mostly been cleared and the current proposal includes a small front lawn area of 44 sq. metres enclosed by a picket fence (no height details provided) and an area of planting in the gap between the proposed front boundary wall and garages.

The planning application is supported by the following:

- Bat survey.
- Design and Access Statement
- Heritage and Impact Assessment
- Supporting statement on the building height

## Site and Surroundings

The existing house would be replaced by a new 2.5 storey detached dwelling and the existing house was built in the 1930s and occupies a corner position at the road junction with Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue. The existing dwelling has 2 storeys.

The front garden sits parallel with both Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue. The front boundary of the site is defined by a low red brick wall with blue coping bricks along the site perimeter along both Highgate Avenue and Belvidere Road with hedge behind. The

side garden included several non-protected trees, both evergreen and deciduous, most of which have been removed and a laurel hedge adjacent the vehicular driveway on Highgate Avenue. Pedestrian access to the property is from Belvidere Road. The existing private rear amenity space serving the existing house is 22 sq. metres.

The current dwelling sits within a row of other 1930s two storey dwellings along both Highgate Avenue and Belvidere Road with common building lines on the two frontages. The dwellings along southern side of Belvidere Road vary in design and character and are set back within plots and have soft landscaped large front gardens. The application site is in close proximity to the Highgate Conservation Area which has an Article 4 Direction restricting development.

There are Locally Listed Buildings at 6 and 8 Belvidere Road. The application site is located within a Coal Development Low Risk Area and is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3. The application site does not fall within the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation 15km Zone of Influence. There are no protected trees (TPO's) on the site.

Access to the site is currently available via Highgate Avenue, on the west boundary of the site, and benefits from an existing dropped kerb. The existing access provides access to a driveway and off-street parking area to the front of the dwelling. There is currently a low brick wall along the front boundary and a set of inset vehicle access gates leading off Highgate Avenue. A new dropped kerb is proposed for the second vehicle access off Belvidere Road.

No. 88 Belvidere Road sits to the east of the application plot and has front and rear facing habitable room windows. 22 Highgate Avenue sits to the south of the application plot and has front and rear facing habitable room windows.

Houses on the opposite side of Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue would have habitable room window to window separation distances of 35 metres.

## Relevant Planning History

22/1651 - Proposed 6-bedroom detached dwelling with loft rooms and a detached triple car/storage garage to front. Railings to be added to existing brick boundary wall, a new driveway and new dropped kerb along Belvidere Road and extended existing dropped kerb along Highgate Avenue by 1m on each side – refused permission on 27/4/23 on the following grounds:

1. *The proposed scheme fails to reflect, enhance, and respect the local historic character and townscape quality of the area and would fail to provide an attractive quality-built development that would be reflective of the existing dwellings along Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue. The proposal would fail to reflect the existing character of the area where pockets of open space are retained between dwellings. Furthermore, the proposal would have an element of harm to the immediate setting of Highgate Conservation Area. The proposal would be contrary to Paras. 130, 134 [now para 135] of the NPPF, Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD*
2. *No Statement of Heritage Significance has been submitted, therefore the proposal would fail to meet Unitary Development Plan Policies ENV27, ENV28, ENV32, together with Chapter 16 of the NPPF Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.*
3. *Insufficient information has been submitted which accurately describes the overall appearance and design of the proposal and specifically the appearance of the boundary treatment which do not have their own set of plans. The application form relates to a Design and Access statement to describe the materials schedule, but this has not been submitted. The lack of clarity and information therefore renders the LPA unable to make an accurate and judgement over the materials and finish of the proposal and appearance of the boundary treatment and its visual impact on the character and appearance of the locality. The proposal would be contrary to Paras. 130, 134 [now para 135] of the NPPF, Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.*
4. *Insufficient information has been submitted that demonstrates that vehicles can manoeuvre on site and leave the site in a forward gear, and that the proposed garage will not cause detrimental harm to other road users, given its location and bulk/scale causing potential visibility issue and highway safety impacts. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy T7 Car Parking and Policy T13: Parking Provision for Cars, Cycles and Taxis of the UDP.*
5. *The significant height, scale and bulk of the proposed new dwelling would result in significant shading and loss of light to 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue. This is considered to be detrimental to their residential amenity over and above the existing situation and would create a living environment that would be harmful to occupants and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment, and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policy GP2 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.*
6. *The proposal would introduce three side facing windows which would directly overlook the habitable rooms and private amenity area of 88 Belvidere Road. The proposal would result in direct overlooking and loss of privacy that would be*

*detrimental to the residential amenity of occupiers of 88 Belvidere Road and would be contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policy GP2 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.*

7. *The proposal would only offer 24sqm of private amenity space for future occupiers. For a property of such scale, this is considered significantly inadequate and would be well below the LPA's 68sqm requirement. The proposal would therefore lead to inadequate levels of private amenity for any future occupants creating a constrained living environment that would be harmful and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policy GP2 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.*
8. *The complete removal of all trees and vegetation from the front curtilage is to the detriment of the local environment and has removed mature and semi-mature trees which provided a significant contribution to the overall appearance of the street scene, setting of the Conservation Area, offered significant amenity value to local residents whilst contributing to the mitigation of the impacts of climate change. Any plans would have sought their retention and the proposal in its current form is therefore contrary to Paras. 130, 134 [now para 135] of the NPPF, Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.*
9. *The applicant has not submitted a bat survey to support the application. The demolition of the existing building has the potential to detrimentally harm roosting bats which is contrary to SPD; Conserving Walsall's Natural Environment, and Section 15 of the NPPF.*

23/1097 - Proposed 6 no. bedroom detached dwelling with loft rooms and a detached triple car/storage garage to front. Railings, 1.8 metres high gates and a 1.5 metres high front brick boundary wall, a new driveway and new dropped kerb along Belvidere Road and extended existing dropped kerb along Highgate Avenue by 1m on each side (re-submission of planning application reference no. 22/1651). – refused permission by planning committee on 15/01/24 on the following grounds:

1. *The proposed scheme fails to reflect, enhance, and respect the local character and townscape quality of the area and would fail to provide an attractive quality-built development that would be reflective of the existing dwellings along Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue. The excessive height when combined with the increased bulk and mass of the proposal along with its position forwards of the building lines on Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue would introduce an incongruous house of poor design and detached garages to the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area. The proposal would be contrary to*

*Paras. 135 of the NPPF (December 2023), Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.*

- 2. The proposed front 1.5 metres high boundary wall with 0.3 metres high railings above and 1.8 metres high gates are considered would appear incongruous in a street scene which consists largely of low brick walls and planting. The character of the area is one of openness where fronts of plots are open or secured with low level walls or soft landscaping. The proposed boundary treatment would be visually detrimental and would fail to reflect, respect, and enhance the existing character of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Paras. 135 of the NPPF (December 2023), Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.*
- 3. The significant height, scale and bulk of the proposed new dwelling would result in significant shading and loss of light to 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue. This is considered to be detrimental to their residential amenity over and above the existing situation and would create a living environment that would be harmful to occupants and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policy GP2 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.*
- 4. The proposal would introduce three large obscurely glazed, first floor side facing windows which would directly overlook the habitable rooms and private amenity area of 88 Belvidere Road. The proposal would result in overlooking and a sense of loss of privacy that would be detrimental to the residential amenity of occupiers of 88 Belvidere Road and would be contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.*
- 5. The proposed new dwelling would only offer 24sqm of private amenity space for future occupiers. For a property of such scale, this is considered significantly inadequate and would be well below the LPA's 68sqm requirement. The original dwelling appears to have been laid out with a compensatory large front garden which was screened by mature trees and a hedgerow which have recently been mostly removed, exposing the garden area. The proposed three garages would reduce the size of this amenity area further and it is considered that the proposal would therefore lead to inadequate levels of private amenity for any future occupants creating a constrained living environment that would be harmful and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.*

6. *The complete removal of all trees and vegetation from the front curtilage is to the detriment of the local environment and has removed mature and semi-mature trees which provided a significant contribution to the overall appearance of the street scene, offered significant amenity value to local residents whilst contributing to the mitigation of the impacts of climate change. The limited space between the proposed garages and boundary wall is insufficient space for planting. The proposed replacement planting on the western boundary is unlikely to be viable and remaining small areas of planting adjacent to the two driveways, dominated by short ornamental planting are inadequate to compensate for the loss of mature and semi-mature trees, the proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 135 of the NPPF (December 2023), Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.*
  
7. *The proposed wall along the front boundary of the site exceeds 600mm in height above footway level and adequate pedestrian/vehicle inter-visibility must be maintained at the access points in the interests of highway safety. The proposed access gates are not set back 5 metres from the carriageway kerb edge to allow a vehicle to wait for the gates to open without blocking the highway and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate the proposed garages would not impact visibility at the Highgate Avenue / Belvidere Road priority-controlled junction. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved UDP policies GP2, ENV32, BCCS policy TRAN2 and paragraph 115 and 116 of the NPPF (December 2023).*

## Relevant Policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

[www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework)

The NPPF sets out the Government's position on the role of the planning system in both plan-making and decision-taking. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, in economic, social, and environmental terms, and it emphasises a "presumption in favour of sustainable development".

**Key provisions** of the NPPF relevant in this case:

- **NPPF 2 – Achieving sustainable development.**
- **NPPF 4 – Decision Making**
- **NPPF 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes.**
- **NPPF 12 – Achieving well-designed places.**
- **NPPF 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.**
- **NPPF 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.**

On **planning conditions**, the NPPF (para 56) says:



Planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects. Agreeing conditions early is beneficial to all parties involved in the process and can speed up decision making. Conditions that are required to be discharged before development commences should be avoided unless there is a clear justification.

On **decision-making** the NPPF sets out the view that local planning authorities should approach decisions in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available and work proactively with applications to secure developments that will improve the economic, social, and environmental conditions of the area. Pre-application engagement is encouraged.

### **National Planning Policy Guidance**

On **material planning consideration** the NPPG confirms- planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests could not be material considerations.

### **Reducing Inequalities**

The Equality Act 2010 (the '2010 Act') sets out 9 protected characteristics which should be taken into account in all decision making.

In addition, the 2010 Act imposes a Public Sector Equality Duty "PSED" on public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, and victimisation, to advance equality and to foster good relations. This includes removing or minimising disadvantages, taking steps to meet needs, and encouraging participation in public life.

Section 149(6) of the 2010 Act confirms that compliance with the duties may involve treating some people more favourably than others. The word favourably does not mean 'preferentially'. For example, where a difference in ground levels exists, it may be perfectly sensible to install some steps. However, this would discriminate against those unable to climb steps due to a protected characteristic. We therefore look upon those with a disability more favourably, in that we take into account their circumstances more than those of a person without such a protected characteristic and we think about a ramp instead. They are not treated preferentially, because the ramp does not give them an advantage; it merely puts them on a level playing field with someone without the protected characteristic. As such the decision makers should consider the needs of

those with protected characteristics in each circumstance in order to ensure they are not disadvantaged by a scheme or proposal.

## **Development Plan**

[www.go.walsall.gov.uk/planning\\_policy](http://www.go.walsall.gov.uk/planning_policy)

## **Saved Policies of Walsall Unitary Development Plan**

- GP2: Environmental Protection
- ENV14: Development of Derelict and Previously Developed Sites
- ENV17: New Planting
- ENV18: Existing Woodlands, Trees, and Hedgerows
- ENV23: Nature Conservation and New Development
- ENV28: The 'Local List' of Buildings of Historic or Architectural Interest
- ENV32: Design and Development Proposals
- ENV33: Landscape Design
- T7: Car Parking
- T13: Parking Provision for Cars, Cycles and Taxis

## **Black Country Core Strategy**

- HOU2: Housing Density, Type and Accessibility
- TRAN2: Managing Transport Impacts of New Development
- ENV1: Nature Conservation
- ENV2: Historic Character and Local Distinctiveness
- ENV3: Design Quality

## **Walsall Site Allocation Document 2019**

HC2: Development of Other Land for Housing

EN1: Natural Environment Protection, Management and Enhancement

EN5: Development in Conservation Areas

T4: The Highway Network

## **Supplementary Planning Document**

### **Conserving Walsall's Natural Environment**

Development with the potential to affect species, habitats, or earth heritage features.

- NE1 – Impact Assessment
- NE2 – Protected and Important Species
- NE3 – Long Term Management of Mitigation and Compensatory Measures

Survey standards.

- NE4 – Survey Standards

The natural environment and new development

- NE5 – Habitat Creation and Enhancement Measures
- NE6 – Compensatory Provision

Development with the potential to affect trees, woodlands, and hedgerows.

- NE7 - Impact Assessment
- NE8 – Retained Trees, Woodlands, or Hedgerows
- NE9 – Replacement Planting

## Designing Walsall

- DW1 Sustainability
- DW3 Character
- DW4 Continuity
- DW9 High Quality Public Realm
- DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings
- Appendix D

## Air Quality SPD

- **Section 5 – Mitigation and Compensation:**
- Type 1 – Electric Vehicle Charging Points

## Consultation Replies

**Conservation Officer** – No objection.

**Environmental Protection** – No objections subject to the inclusion of conditions requiring the submission of a construction environmental management plan and asbestos identification and removal.

**Local Highway Authority** – Objection on the grounds of the proposed second vehicle access off Belvidere Road, concerns over pedestrian/vehicle inter visibility due to the boundary treatment, insufficient information for visibility in relation to the garage and gates.

**Fire Officer** – No objections subject to compliance with Approved Document B and an informative note can be included for the applicant, if approved.

**RSPB** – No objections subject to the installation of a minimum of 2 x swift nesting bricks which could be conditioned if approved.

**Severn Trent Water** – No objections subject to the inclusion of a drainage condition.

**Strategic Planning Policy** – Objection as it does not address the previous reasons for refusal.

## Representations

### *(Local Planning Authority comments in italics and brackets)*

The Local Planning Authority has received a 33-signature public petition against the development over the following reasons:

*Concerns over street scene dominance and out of character with locality, extension beyond building lines and dangers to school children due to the 2 exit points.*

Objections have been received from 14 neighbours on the following grounds:

- Out of keeping with area and conservation area
- Loss of trees and garden
- No change other than driveway from previous application
- Forward of building lines.
- Garage will impact on visibility on the corner.
- Loss of light
- New access could be dangerous for pedestrians due to boundary and lack of visibility, especially due to the nearby school.
- No plans to replace trees and plants that have been removed.
- Boundary wall out of character and will impact visibility for cars and pedestrians.
- Objects to 6 bedrooms, why do they need this? *(not a material planning consideration in this instance as the application is assessed as submitted)*
- Design and Access statement does not refer to the amended boundary wall.
- Supporting statement on height shows huge increase in additional mass and fails to show relationship with adjacent houses.
- Overdevelopment
- Noise due to closer proximity to adjacent houses.
- Shared boundary impinges on neighbour *(the proposed new dwelling would sit 0.4 and 0.6 metres from the shared boundaries with immediate neighbours).*

- Concerned the decision may be unduly influenced to get it over the line (*the Local Planning Authority remains neutral in its assessment of planning applications*).
- 45-degree code breached.
- Loss of privacy
- Terracing effect.
- Sets a precedent to rebuild traditional houses with modern houses (*there is no precedence in planning and each planning application is assessed on its own merits*).
- Parking.
- Not enough room to use the garage which raises questions if it will be used as one.
- Not clear on potential impact to street lighting column and whether this will be moved or simply removed.
- Building work disruption (*construction works would have some local disruption for neighbours however as this is for a single dwelling house the impacts would be for a relatively short period*)

## Determining Issues

### Whether the application has addressed the reasons for refusal:

- Reason no. 1: Design
- Reason no. 2: Boundary treatment
- Reason no. 3: Light and outlook
- Reason no. 4: Amenity
- Reason no. 5: Amenity space
- Reason no. 6: Landscaping
- Reason no. 7: Highways

### Additional considerations:

- Principle of Development
- Ground conditions and Environment.
- Parking and Access
- Neighbour Comments

## Assessment of the Proposal

### Whether the application has addressed the reasons for refusal of the previous application

## Reason for Refusal No. 1

The proposed scheme fails to reflect, enhance, and respect the local character and townscape quality of the area and would fail to provide an attractive quality-built development that would be reflective of the existing dwellings along Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue. The excessive height when combined with the increased bulk and mass of the proposal along with its position forwards of the building lines on Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue would introduce an incongruous house of poor design and detached garages to the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Paras. 135 of the NPPF (December 2023), Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.

The appearance and size of the dwelling remains the same as the previous approval.

This revised proposal only amends the previous front boundary wall to a 1 metres high boundary wall with 0.9 metres high railings on top. The site plan indicates that gates across the two access points are proposed although they are not shown on the proposed elevation drawings. Saved Policy ENV32 of the UDP states that poorly designed development or proposals which fail to properly take account of the context or surroundings will not be permitted.

The introduction of three competing front gable features on one elevation and two wider but further spaced gable features is considered would introduce 5 no. competing gables to a single dwelling house which would have a jarring impact in the street scene.

The excessive height of the proposed dwelling house when combined with the increased bulk and mass considerably over and above that of the original dwelling is considered would be an over dominant and incongruous addition to the existing street scenes fronting both Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue and alongside existing two storey dwellings at 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue.

The design of the proposed new dwelling fails to include characteristic design features along both Belvidere Road and Highgate Road. Chimneys add character to a dwelling, evidenced along both Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue and the proposal fails to include chimneys in the proposed design. Additionally, the proposed large windows and the solid to void ratio is considered to be poor design and fails to consider the character of the local area.

The proposal fails to respect the existing building lines fronting both Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue on this prominent corner. The new dwelling would be 1.8 metres further forward than the dwellings at 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue which fails to respect the character of the area resulting in an oversized and incongruous dwelling house for the plot.

The proposal seeks to squeeze in as much built development within the plot as possible, to the point where the plot is dominated by built form and two large areas of hard surfacing with very little soft landscaping. Trees have already been removed from the site and the proposal includes limited soft landscaping. Policy ENV33 of the UDP states landscaping is integral to urban design and requires developments to include planting schemes and Policy ENV17 seeks new planting. The amended scheme indicates that hedgerow planting is proposed or would be retained along the front garden boundary and UDP saved policy ENV18, seeks to retain hedgerows.

No elevation plans of the proposed garage structure have been submitted with this planning application establish the height and appearance of this part of the proposal. Garages that sit forward of dwellings are not a characteristic of the surrounding area. Existing single storey garages along both Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue are set back from the main elevation, as subservient features. This proposed triple garage structure is considered would be visually prominent and visually detrimental when viewed from the public realm and street scene along both Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue.

The proposal is considered fails to enhance and respect the local character of the area. The applicant has advised that the proposed three garages are store residents mobility scooters and wheelchairs and whilst these reasons are noted, the Local Planning Authority is unable to take into account personal circumstances when assessing planning applications as the development would remain after such needs have ended.

Policy DW3 of the designing Walsall SPD states that new development to [should] be informed by the surrounding character and respond in a positive way to it by reflecting local urban design characteristics. The revised proposal is considered to have an over-complicated design and with three garages in the street scene at a prominent and visually important corner is considered fails to reflect or include architectural features from the existing dwellings along Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue.

The applicant has confirmed that the proposed new dwelling is the same height as the existing dwelling and the plans include a blue dashed outline of the existing dwelling

house. This is at the highest point of the existing dwelling however the proposal would increase the scale, bulk, and mass of the dwelling at this height which is considered unacceptable. The applicant has previously advised that they have revised the design to a more contemporary design however this design is considered fails to take any design cues from neighbouring properties.

With regards to the design concerns referred to in refusal reason no. 1 it is considered that the proposal continues to fail to reflect and respect the local character of the area and townscape quality. The development would fail to provide an attractive quality-built development that would be reflective of the existing dwellings along Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue. The proposal would be contrary to Para. 135 of the NPPF, Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policy DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.

The current planning application is supported by a Heritage and Impact Assessment dated March 2024. This has been reviewed by the council's conservation (Heritage) officer who is of the opinion that whilst the application site does not sit within Highgate Conservation Area it is in close proximity to it and therefore assessment of the proposal's impact on the conservation area it is warranted. The conservation (Heritage) officer is of the opinion that the proposed development would have no harm on heritage grounds to the setting of the Highgate Conservation Area.

To the north of the site beyond numbers 4 to 15a Belvidere Road is Highgate Brewery, a Grade II listed building, which is also a designated heritage asset, as defined in the NPPF. The proposed development would no harm to the setting of Highgate Brewery.

Near the site are numbers 6 and 8 Belvidere Road are locally listed buildings of local importance. The proposal is considered would have no harm to the significance of these locally listed buildings. The Council's Conservation Officer has no objections on heritage grounds.

Considering the above assessment of the area, as there have been no changes to the design, scale, or footprint of the house itself reason for refusal no. 1 has therefore not been overcome.

Therefore, reason for refusal no. 1 remains.



## **Reason for Refusal No. 2**

The proposed front 1.5 metres high boundary wall with 0.3 metres high railings above and 1.8 metres high gates are considered would appear incongruous in a street scene which consists largely of low brick walls and planting. The character of the area is one of openness where fronts of plots are open or secured with low level walls or soft landscaping. The proposed boundary treatment would be visually detrimental and would fail to reflect, respect, and enhance the existing character of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Paras. 135 of the NPPF (December 2023), Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.

The resubmission has amended the boundary treatment following this refusal. The gates at the two access points are shown on the site plan but not on the elevation drawings and details of these would be required but could be conditioned. The proposed brick front boundary wall has been reduced in height to 1 metre, with 0.9 metres high railings on top. The reduction in height of this solid wall and topped with open railings is considered would be visually acceptable at this location. Whilst most houses have low walls there is a neighbouring house with a similar front boundary treatment and the visual openness would be maintained by the proposed railings particularly if painted black in colour. It is considered that the revised proposal has satisfactorily addressed refusal reason no. 2 and would no longer support a refusal reason for this proposed development.

Therefore, reason for refusal no.2 is considered has been overcome subject to details of the proposed gates to the application site being provided and the provision of adequate inter-visibility splays at the vehicular entrance points as referred to below by the Local Highway Authority under the Parking and Access heading.

## **Reason for Refusal No. 3**

The significant height, scale and bulk of the proposed new dwelling would result in significant shading and loss of light to 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue. This is considered to be detrimental to their residential amenity over and above the existing situation and would create a living environment that would be harmful to occupants and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policy GP2 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.

The proposed design which would occupy the same footprint as the previous proposal is considered to be similar in bulk and mass to the initial proposal. The excessive scale, height, and mass in relation to the neighbouring houses 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue is considered would be detrimental to their residential amenity over and above the existing situation and would create a living environment that would be harmful to occupants and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment.

The increased height and scale of the property would result in significant shading to 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue in the late afternoon as the sun moves West. This would be over and above that which is already experienced and would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue.

The first-floor eaves height of the proposed new dwelling would be higher than those of both neighbouring houses and the proposed roof 2.3 metres higher than the ridgeline of 88 Belvidere Road.

As mentioned above, the house itself has not changed since the last refusal. The height, scale and bulk remain as previously refused and therefore the previous assessment on shading and loss of light should be retained.

Therefore, reason for refusal no. 3 remains.

#### **Reason for Refusal No. 4**

The proposal would introduce three large obscurely glazed, first floor side facing windows which would directly overlook the habitable rooms and private amenity area of 88 Belvidere Road. The proposal would result in overlooking and a sense of loss of privacy that would be detrimental to the residential amenity of occupiers of 88 Belvidere Road and would be contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.

The proposal still includes three first floor side facing windows overlooking the private rear garden of 88 Belvidere Road however these windows would serve a landing, ensuite and walk in wardrobe, all of which are non-habitable room windows. Whilst these could be conditioned to be obscurely glazed it is considered that the addition of three large windows would create a feeling of being overlooked by neighbours and are considered to be excessive in number and size. High-level narrow, obscurely glazed windows are considered may be more acceptable.

As above, no changes have been made and thus the previous assessment on impact to neighbour amenity should be retained.

Therefore, reason for refusal no. 4 remains.

### **Reason for Refusal No. 5**

The proposed new dwelling would only offer 24 sq. metres of private amenity space for future occupiers. For a property of such scale, this is considered significantly inadequate and would be well below the LPA's 68 sq. metres requirement. The original dwelling appears to have been laid out with a compensatory large front garden which was screened by mature trees and a hedgerow which have recently been mostly removed, exposing the garden area. The proposed three garages would reduce the size of this amenity area further and it is considered that the proposal would therefore lead to inadequate levels of private amenity for any future occupants creating a constrained living environment that would be harmful and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed places.

The existing private rear amenity space at the dwelling currently measures 24 sq. metres and the proposal being considered is for the same area of 24 sq. metres because of the constraints of the existing site with the house set well back into the application site. To compensate the original dwelling appears to have been laid out with a compensatory large front garden which was screened by mature trees and a hedgerow and provided the previous owners with a degree of privacy.

However, the front gardens have been recently cleared, exposing the garden area. The proposed triple garage would reduce the size of this amenity area further and it is

considered that the proposal would therefore lead to inadequate levels of private amenity for any future occupants creating a constrained living environment that would be harmful and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment. It is considered that refusal reason no. 5 has not been satisfactorily addressed.

As above, no changes have been made to the provision of amenity space since the previous application and the assessment on private amenity should be retained.

Therefore, reason for refusal no. 5 remains.

### **Reason for refusal 6**

The complete removal of all trees and vegetation from the front curtilage is to the detriment of the local environment and has removed mature and semi-mature trees which provided a significant contribution to the overall appearance of the street scene, offered significant amenity value to local residents whilst contributing to the mitigation of the impacts of climate change. The limited space between the proposed garages and boundary wall is insufficient space for planting. The proposed replacement planting on the western boundary is unlikely to be viable and remaining small areas of planting adjacent to the two driveways, dominated by short ornamental planting are inadequate to compensate for the loss of mature and semi-mature trees, the proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 135 of the NPPF (December 2023), Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.

The submitted site plan demonstrates that there have been some changes to the provision of planting. The current plans remove some planting to the right of the access on Belvidere Road but add planting to the right of the access on Highgate Avenue. In addition, the garage has been moved 0.4m away from the boundary treatment at the narrowest points which would offer a slight increase in room for planting.

Despite this, the amended planting provision falls significantly short from the biodiversity value of the site prior to its clearance. Saved Policy ENV33 of the UDP states that landscape design is an integral part of good design, and the Council will ensure that development proposals take account of opportunities to create and enhance environmental quality.

Despite the minor changes, it can be deemed that the compensation for the loss of the mature and semi-mature trees will be the small areas of planting adjacent to the two driveways, dominated by short ornamental planting. This is deemed inadequate to compensate for the loss of mature and semi-mature trees and shrubbery that existed prior to the applicant's occupation.

Refusal reason no .6 has therefore not been overcome and remains contrary to paragraph 135 of the NPPF, Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.

### **Reason for Refusal No. 7**

The proposed wall along the front boundary of the site exceeds 600mm in height above footway level and adequate pedestrian/vehicle inter-visibility must be maintained at the access points in the interests of highway safety. The proposed access gates are not set back 5 metres from the carriageway kerb edge to allow a vehicle to wait for the gates to open without blocking the highway and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate the proposed garages would not impact visibility at the Highgate Avenue / Belvidere Road priority-controlled junction. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved UDP policies GP2, ENV32, BCCS policy TRAN2 and paragraph 115 and 116 of the NPPF (December 2023).

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF confirms that applications for development should create places that are safe, secure, and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards.

The Local Highway Authority has objected to the revised proposal on highway safety grounds. The proposed fencing along the boundary exceeds 600mm in height above footway level and adequate pedestrian/vehicle inter-visibility must be maintained at the access points in the interests of highway safety, especially given the potential conflict with children due to the site's proximity to St Mary's Primary School.

The Highway Officer has noted that there are conflicting drawings. The floor plans and elevations suggest that the gates have been removed (*or shown in the open position*) however the submitted floor plan shows gates opening into the site. It is therefore not

clear whether this aspect has been fully overcome and no details to confirm the access gates are set back 5 metres from the carriageway have been received, should they be installed.

No evidence has been supplied which demonstrates the proposed garages would not impact visibility at the Highgate Avenue / Belvidere Road priority-controlled junction or forward visibility from Belvidere Road onto Highgate Avenue.

Reason for refusal no.7 has not been fully overcome and should be retained.

## **Principle of Development**

As this application is for a replacement dwelling, it does not raise strategic planning policy issues.

Strategic Planning Policy have commented that there was a previous planning application that was refused in April 2023 (reference: 22/1651) for the same proposal, however, from reviewing the supporting plans, there does appear to be some minor amendments to the proposed elevations, in particular, the proposed front and rear elevations.

Whilst this is for a replacement dwelling and the proposal in principle raises no strategic planning policy issues, the design would still appear to over dominate the adjacent houses and the large triple garage in the front garden would be out of character in the street. It also appears that several mature and semi-mature trees and shrubs have been felled in the garden to compensate for the proposal, however, the removal of these trees would still not allow adequate garden amenity space for future occupiers.

As such, the current application would not appear to address the reasons for refusal as outlined above.

## **Ground Conditions and Environment**

Environmental Protection advise that the existing property may have been built and used at a time when asbestos containing materials were commonly used within structures and

products. Consequently, the applicant will need to undertake an asbestos identification and removal survey prior to any works commencing and if any asbestos containing material is identified, it will require removal under the appropriate national legislation and in accordance with relevant health and safety requirements. This can be conditioned.

A condition requiring the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan if approved has also been recommended to safeguard owner and neighbour amenity during construction if approved.

## **Parking and Access**

The Local Highway Authority have commented that access to the application site is currently available via Highgate Avenue, on the west boundary of the site, and which benefits from existing dropped kerbs which are proposed to be extended as part of the development. The existing access provides access to a driveway and off-street parking area to the front of the dwelling.

The development proposals seek to introduce a secondary vehicle access into the site and introduce an additional dropped kerb crossover via Belvidere Road. The Highway Authority object to a new access being introduced onto the public highway as the site benefits from an existing access on Highgate Avenue. St Mary's Primary School is located circa.120m east of the site on Belvidere Road and introducing a secondary access at this location is considered would increase the potential for conflict between vehicles, pedestrians, and children.

The Local Highway Authority have commented that Site\_Plan\_13-03-24 drawing demonstrates gate opening lines from the back of the footpath. If gates are proposed information is required to demonstrate the proposed gates at the Highgate Avenue access are set back 5 metres from the carriageway kerb edge to allow a vehicle to wait for the gates to open without blocking the highway.

In addition, a 2.4m x 3.4m pedestrian visibility splay should be maintained at the access points to the site where no structure or planting exceeding 600mm in height above footway level will be permitted. The proposed fencing would obstruct visibility at the site access and no evidence has been submitted to demonstrate a 2.4m x 3.4m visibility is achievable. The Highway Authority will not accept any boundary structure over 600mm, especially in vicinity of a school.

The proposals include a detached triple garage, which is located on the northwest boundary of the site. The developer has failed to provide evidence that the proposed garages would not restrict vehicle visibility at the Highgate Avenue and Belvidere Road priority-controlled junction or forward visibility from Belvidere Road onto Highgate Avenue.

Walsall UPD saved policy T13 requires the provision of 3 no. car parking spaces for a four bedroom and above dwelling. The proposed car parking provision proposes a significant car parking provision over and above that required by policy T13.

The Local Highway Authority have commented that the proposed development is not considered would create any material impact on the surrounding network.

Considering the comments above, the Local Highway Authority have advised that they cannot support the proposal in its current form until the issues raised are addressed. These are included below for clarity:

- Removal of the proposed secondary access via Belvidere Road.
- The proposed fencing along the boundary of the site exceeds 600mm in height above footway level. Adequate pedestrian/vehicle inter-visibility must be maintained at the access points in the interests of highway safety. A 2.4 metres x 3.4 metres pedestrian visibility splay is required.
- Site\_Plan\_13-03-24 drawing demonstrates gate opening lines. If gates are proposed information to demonstrate the proposed gates are 5m from the carriageway kerb edge to allow a vehicle to wait for the gates to open without blocking the highway.
- Evidence has not been provided to demonstrate the proposed garages would not impact visibility at the Highgate Avenue and Belvidere Road priority-controlled junction or forward visibility from Belvidere Road onto Highgate Avenue.

### **Neighbour Comments**

The proposed new dwelling would have gaps to the side of 0.4 and 0.6 metres to the neighbouring houses, which is less than the 0.9 metres recommended by Appendix D of Designing Walsall SPD to avoid terracing.

However, as the existing gaps between houses in the immediate area vary in width, including the existing narrow gap between 88 and 89 Belvidere Road, and the existing terraced dwellings between 15 to 19 Belvidere Road (odds) and it is considered that the proposed width of the gaps in this location are acceptable.



The Council's 45-degree code is met in relation to the habitable room windows in the neighbouring house no. 22 Highgate Avenue. The 45-degree code would be marginally breached in relation to front habitable room windows in 88 Belvidere Road due to the location of the proposal forward of the building line on Highgate Road, however this is considered not to be detrimental to neighbouring amenity above and beyond 45-degree code compliance.

## **Conclusions and Reasons for Decision**

The scale, height, positioning, and discordant design of the proposed new dwelling house is considered would be an incongruous and detrimental addition to the existing street scene. The impacts on adjoining neighbours have been considered and in this instance the impacts are considered would be detrimental to neighbours' outlook, light, and amenity. Consequently, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

This proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable and contrary to the local and national planning policies and guidance set out in this report.

The material planning considerations weigh against the proposal such that it is recommended for refusal.

## **Positive and Proactive Working with the Applicant**

### **Refuse**

Following a previous refusal of planning permission, it is considered that the previous concerns raised have not been fully overcome and additional concerns have been raised as outlined in the committee report.

## **Recommendation**

Refuse permission.

## Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed scheme fails to reflect, enhance, and respect the local character and townscape quality of the area and would fail to provide an attractive quality-built development that would be reflective of the existing dwellings along Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue. The excessive height when combined with the increased bulk and mass of the proposal along with its position forwards of the building lines on Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue would introduce an incongruous house of poor design and detached garages to the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Paras. 135 of the NPPF (December 2023), Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.
2. The significant height, scale and bulk of the proposed new dwelling would result in significant shading and loss of light to 88 Belvidere Road and 22 Highgate Avenue. This is considered to be detrimental to their residential amenity over and above the existing situation and would create a living environment that would be harmful to occupants and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policy GP2 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed and beautiful places.
3. The proposal would introduce three large obscurely glazed, first floor side facing windows which would directly overlook the habitable rooms and private amenity area of 88 Belvidere Road. The proposal would result in overlooking and a sense of loss of privacy that would be detrimental to the residential amenity of occupiers of 88 Belvidere Road and would be contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed and beautiful places.
4. The proposed new dwelling would only offer 24sqm of private amenity space for future occupiers. For a property of such scale, this is considered significantly inadequate and would be well below the LPA's 68sqm requirement. The original dwelling appears to have been laid out with a compensatory large front garden which was screened by mature trees and a hedgerow which have recently been mostly removed, exposing the garden area. The proposed three garages would reduce the size of this amenity area further and it is considered that the proposal would therefore lead to inadequate levels of private amenity for any future occupants creating a constrained living environment that would be harmful and fail to provide a healthy and optimal living environment. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of DW10 Well Designed Sustainable Buildings and Appendix D of the Designing Walsall SPD Saved Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Unitary Development Plan, ENV3 of the BCCS, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in Achieving well designed and beautiful places.
5. The complete removal of all trees and vegetation from the front curtilage is to the detriment of the local environment and has removed mature and semi-mature trees which provided a significant contribution to the overall appearance of the street

scene, offered significant amenity value to residents whilst contributing to the mitigation of the impacts of climate change. The proposed replacement planting on the western boundary is unlikely to be viable and remaining small areas of planting adjacent to the two driveways, dominated by short ornamental planting are inadequate to compensate for the loss of mature and semi-mature trees, the proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 135 of the NPPF (December 2023), Saved Policies GP2, ENV18, ENV17, ENV32 and ENV33 of the UDP, policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the BCCS and Policies DW1 to DW3 of Designing Walsall SPD.

6. The proposed wall along the front boundary of the site exceeds 600mm in height above footway level and adequate pedestrian/vehicle inter-visibility must be maintained at the access points in the interests of highway safety. It is not clear whether the proposed access gates are being retained nor whether they will be set back 5 metres from the carriageway kerb edge to allow a vehicle to wait for the gates to open without blocking the highway and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate the proposed garages would not impact visibility at the Highgate Avenue / Belvidere Road priority-controlled junction along with the introduction of an unacceptable secondary vehicle access of Belvidere Road to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved UDP policies GP2, ENV32, BCCS policy TRAN2 and paragraph 115 and 116 of the NPPF (December 2023).

### **Notes for Applicant**

None.

# APPENDICES

Petition Received 29<sup>th</sup> April 2024

POST ROOM  
29 APR 2024  
RECEIVED

The residents of Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue object to the planning application 24/0337 for the following reasons

- The new dwelling would still be 1.8 metres further forward than the property at 88 Belvidere road and will be over 2.3 metres higher than the adjacent properties. The proposed development would be very dominant in the street scene and out of character with adjacent properties
- The junction at Belvidere road and Highgate Avenue is a very busy one, especially at times when nearby school discharges the children and having 2 exit points at this junction will make an increased risk of accidents.

WALSALL COUNCIL  
POST ROOM  
29 APR 2024  
RECEIVED

| Name | address             | signatory |
|------|---------------------|-----------|
|      | 2 Highgate Ave.     |           |
|      | 74 Belvidere Road   |           |
|      | 6 Highgate Ave      |           |
|      | 4 Highgate Ave      |           |
|      | 4 Highgate          |           |
|      | "                   |           |
|      | 14, Highgate Avenue |           |

Printed and published by Ian Robertson 87 Belvidere Road Walsall WS1 3AU tel 01922 634642

The residents of Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue object to the planning application 24/0337 for the following reasons.



- The new dwelling would still be 1.8 metres further forward than the property at 88 Belvidere Road and would be over 2.3 metres higher than the adjacent properties. The proposed development would be very dominant in the street scene and out of character with adjacent properties.
- The junction at Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue is a very busy one, especially at times when nearby school discharges the children and having 2 exit points at this junction will make an increased risk of accidents.

| Name       | Address                      | Signatory  |
|------------|------------------------------|------------|
| [Redacted] | 17 Belvidere Rd              | [Redacted] |
|            | 15 Belvidere Rd              |            |
|            | 18 BELVIDERE RD<br>FLAT ONE. |            |
|            | Flat 4, 18 Belvidere Road    |            |
|            |                              |            |
|            |                              |            |

Printed and published by Ian Robertson 87 Belvidere Road WS1 3AU tel 01922 634642

The residents of Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue object to the planning application 24/0337 for the following reasons.

- The new dwelling would still be 1.8 metres further forward than the property at 88 Belvidere Road and would be over 2.3 metres higher than the adjacent properties. The proposed development would be very dominant in the street scene and out of character with adjacent properties.
- The junction at Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue is a very busy one, especially at times when nearby school discharges the children and having 2 exit points at this junction will make an increased risk of accidents.

| Name   | Address         | Signatory   |
|--|-----------------|---|
|  | 22 Belvidere Rd |  |
|  | "               |   |
|  | "               |   |
|  | "               |   |
|  | "               |   |
|  |                 |   |
|  |                 |   |

Printed and published by Ian Robertson 87 Belvidere Road WS1 3AU tel 01922 634642

The residents of Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue object to the planning application 24/0337 for the following reasons.

- The new dwelling would still be 1.8 metres further forward than the property at 88 Belvidere Road and would be over 2.3 metres higher than the adjacent properties. The proposed development would be very dominant in the street scene and out of character with adjacent properties.
- The junction at Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue is a very busy one, especially at times when nearby school discharges the children and having 2 exit points at this junction will make an increased risk of accidents.

| Name       | Address          | Signatory  |
|------------|------------------|------------|
| [Redacted] | 16 Belvidere Rd  | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 16 Belvidere Rd  | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 18 Belvidere Rd  | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 9 Belvidere Rd.  | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 91 Belvidere Rd  | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 7 Belvidere end. | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 17 Belvidere Rd  | [Redacted] |

Printed and published by Ian Robertson 87 Belvidere Road WS1 3AU tel 01922 634643

The residents of Belvidere Road and Highgate<sup>A</sup> Avenue object to the planning application 24/0337 for the following reasons

- The new dwelling would still be 1.8 metres further forward than the property at 88 Belvidere road and will be over 2.3 metres higher than the adjacent properties. The proposed development would be very dominant in the street scene and out of character with adjacent properties
- The junction at Belvidere road and Highgate<sup>Avenue</sup> ~~close~~ is a very busy one, especially at times when nearby school discharges the children and having 2 exit points at this junction will make an increased risk of accidents.

| Name       | address                       | signatory  |
|------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| [Redacted] | 20 HIGHGATE ROAD<br>WALSALL   | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 22 Highgate Avenue<br>Walsall | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 22, Highgate Ave,<br>Walsall  | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 1 HIGHGATE<br>AVE             | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 3 Highgate Ave                | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 3 Highgate Ave                | [Redacted] |
| [Redacted] | 5B Highgate Ave               | [Redacted] |

Printed and published by Ian Robertson #7 Belvidere Road Walsall WS1 3AU tel 01922 634642



The residents of Belvidere Road and Highgate venue object to the planning application 24/0337 for the following reasons

- The new dwelling would still be 1.8 metres further forward than the property at 88 Belvidere road and will be over 2.3 metres higher than the adjacent properties. The proposed development would be very dominant in the street scene and out of character with adjacent properties
- The junction at Belvidere road and Highgate close is a very busy one, especially at times when nearby school discharges the children and having 2 exit points at this junction will make an increased risk of accidents.

| Name | address      | signatory |
|------|--------------|-----------|
|      | 23 BELVIDERE |           |
|      |              |           |
|      |              |           |
|      |              |           |
|      |              |           |
|      |              |           |
|      |              |           |

Printed and published by Ian Robertson 87 Belvidere Road Walsall WB1 3AJ tel 01922 634642

The residents of Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue object to the planning application 24/0337 for the following reasons.

- The new dwelling would still be 1.8 metres further forward than the property at 88 Belvidere Road and would be over 2.3 metres higher than the adjacent properties. The proposed development would be very dominant in the street scene and out of character with adjacent properties.
- The junction at Belvidere Road and Highgate Avenue is a very busy one, especially at times when nearby school discharges the children and having 2 exit points at this junction will make an increased risk of accidents.

| Name       | Address           | Signatory  |
|------------|-------------------|------------|
| [REDACTED] | 20 BELVIDERE ROAD | [REDACTED] |
|            | 21 BELVIDERE RD   |            |
|            | 21 BELVIDERE RD   |            |
|            |                   |            |
|            |                   |            |
|            |                   |            |
|            |                   |            |

Printed and published by Ian Robertson 87 Belvidere Road WS1 3AU tel 01922 634642

# END OF OFFICERS REPORT