

# **Birmingham City Council**

## **Birmingham Design Guide Supplementary Planning Documents**

### **Consultation Statement**

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Birmingham City Council consulted on the Birmingham Design Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) between Tuesday 24th November 2020 and 5th February 2021. This statement explains the purpose of the SPD, provides an overview of the comments received, the City Council's response to the comments and details any amendments applied to the final SPD as a result of the comments made. The statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 (a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) and the Birmingham Statement of Community Involvement.

#### **2. Purpose**

- 2.2 The SPD have been prepared to provide detailed guidance to support the implementation of policies in the DMB and BDP. This will assist prospective planning applicants, property developers and landowners, as well as decision makers and local residents to understand how the design of proposal will be assessed by the City Council.
- 2.3 The Design Guide is made up of a suite of documents, all of which carry equal weight in the planning process. The primary document is the Design Principles Document which contains design principles covering a wide range of issues and considerations that development must effectively align with and/or respond to. This document and its principles are structured around five themes:
- The Birmingham ID
  - Streets & Spaces
  - Landscape & GI
  - Healthy Living & Working Places
  - Efficient & Future-ready
- 3.5 Supplementing the Design Principles Document are five City Manuals, which provide more detailed guidance for applicants, developers and Planning Officers on how to achieve the criteria and requirements in the design principles. These City Manual follow the structure of the Design Principles Documents, with a City Manual for each of the five themes. The additional

guidance in the City Manuals is contained in a number of City Notes, which correlate back the relevant Design Principle

### **3. Engagement approach**

- 3.1 The draft SPD and supporting documents were uploaded onto the City Council's consultation website BeHeard. [Birmingham Design Guide](#)
- 3.2 Emails/ letters were sent to all contacts on the Planning Policy Consultation Database including:

- Prescribed Specific Consultation Organisations
- Neighbouring local authorities
- Parish/ town councils
- Ward Councillors
- Local Members of Parliament
- Residents associations
- Community groups
- Neighbourhood forums
- Community trusts
- Voluntary groups
- Interest groups
- Disability groups
- Religious groups
- Business groups
- Environmental groups
- Landowners
- Developers and agents
- Housing associations

- 3.3 An email was sent to all Councillors and a briefing was held for Planning Committee.
- 3.4 An email signature was added to all planning officer's email address during the consultation period (as below).



- 3.5 10 webinars here held via Teams over 6 weeks, providing an overview of the different aspects of the document and an opportunity for members of the public to ask Officers questions about the document.
- 3.6 A press release informing the public about the consultation was release by the Leader of the Council's Office.

- 3.7 The policies within the BDP and DMB on which the drafts SPDs are based were themselves subject to extensive consultation over a number of years. The Consultation Statements related to these documents can be viewed here:

[https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/16783/csd7\\_consultation\\_statement\\_regulation\\_22](https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/16783/csd7_consultation_statement_regulation_22)

- 3.8 The consultation generated 54 individual comments on the Design Guide SPD. These have been summarised below, together with a City Council response and details of revisions made to the SPD.

**Birmingham Design Guide SPD: summary of consultation responses** Key to proposed amendments:

- Text in *italics* and highlighted has been added to the Design Guide SPD.
- Text ~~striketrough~~ and highlighted has been removed from the Design Guide SPD.

Summary of representation	BCC Response	Proposed revision to the SPD
<b>Consultee: Birmingham Airport Limited</b>		
<p><u>Aerodrome Safeguarding</u></p> <p>As a statutory consultee, BAL is consulted on developments that are likely to impact on aerodrome safeguarding.</p> <p>Whilst BAL support local and regional growth, this must be balanced against the need to safeguard the Airport aerodrome and airspace. This is done through the aerodrome safeguarding process. This process should be referenced within the Design Guide with a separate planning policy.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that a new policy is added to the Design Guide, under or within the tall buildings section, which deals specifically with Aerodrome Safeguarding and encourages pre consultation with Birmingham Airport. Prior</p>	<p>The City Council welcome comments from BAL and supports the recommendation to provide further information on the aerodrome safeguarding process; and encouraging early developer engagement with BAL.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 20: Creating Tall Buildings</u></b></p> <p>Designs must be informed by appropriate microclimate studies, ensuring any adverse impacts are effectively mitigated against.</p> <p><i>Applicants must undertake early engage with Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) to identify any potential hazards to airport operation and establish whether an Aerodrome Safeguarding Assessment is needed to support an application.</i></p> <p>The development of well-designed tall building may be supported in the locations outlined in City Note LW-45 in the Living and Working Manual.</p>

consultation will benefit Birmingham City Council in meeting its statutory determination periods for planning applications.

Whilst it is reassuring to see the mention of aviation within the document, it is considered that more detail needs to be provided in order to enable developers to fully understand what it is they need to consider.

When BAL is consulted on a planning application, a safeguarding assessment is undertaken to identify potential hazards to the Airport operation, as follows:

- Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS)
- Construction
- Communications, Navigation and Surveillance (CNS) Technical Safeguarding
- Wildlife Hazards
- Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP's)
- Lighting
- Drones

In order to protect the Airport aerodrome and airspace, Birmingham Airport recommend that a new safeguarding policy is included within the Design Guide, which can be informed by the text provided above.

**City Note LW-37 Complying with Civil Aviation Authority Limits**

Due to the city's ~~centre's~~ proximity to Birmingham Airport and its associated flight path, tall building proposals must engage *effectively* with *Birmingham Airport Ltd (BAL) / Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)* to understand any concerns they may have *related relating* to the height of the building, *its form, the design and/or the ~~or the~~* construction methods to be employed.

As key consultees on tall building proposals, it is important applicants understood and effectively respond to any concerns or objections *BAL / the CAA* may have. *BAL and the City Council encourage applicants to engage with CAA early in their design process and before a formal planning application is submitted. This will benefit the applicant in helping to inform the design and highlight any objections early in the design process. In turn it may reduce the potential for BAL objections when formally submitted as an application. ~~Early engagement with them is encouraged.~~*

*In response to initial engagement, the CAA may request a Aerodrome Safeguarding Assessment be submitted with a planning application for their consideration.*

<b>Consultee: Bruntwood</b>		
<p><u>Introduction &amp; Summary</u></p> <p>We believe that overall the guidance, if agreed, would make a very positive contribution to the city's future development and there is a great deal in the document that we support.</p> <p>While we strongly support the principle of there being clear guidance set out, there will often be cases where there are exceptional circumstances that make the achievement of all the required objectives difficult, or where some trade offs will be required to ensure a specific project's viability. We are therefore pleased to see that there is acknowledgement throughout the document of the need for balance and that there will still be a place for expert opinion to argue for the best overall balance to be struck</p>	<p>The City Council welcomes these comments.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><u>Birmingham ID</u></p> <p>We believe that the design principles strike a sensible balance between protecting the best of the existing built and natural environment while also</p>	<p>The City Council welcomes the comment.</p> <p>The City Council recognises the need for guidance related</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>recognising that there is an important place for innovation and diversity and for the contributions from “creative professionals” to be made and valued.</p> <p>As the guide sets out, it is also important to recognise that new development, if well designed and executed, can add to rather than detract from existing heritage and the opportunity for this new development mustn't be ruled out by overly prescriptive guidance. The role of appropriate technical assessment is important here, enabling the design process to be fully informed and for relevant material considerations to be balanced.</p>	<p>to the protection of heritage assets to effectively balance prescriptive requirements with a considered and balanced design process being undertaken. Supported by the guidance, this balanced should be productively explored between developers and the local planning authority during pre-application process.</p> <p>The City Council believes the guidance provides sufficient prescription to guide development, whilst allowing productive negotiations to take place to deliver the best outcome for the asset.</p>	
<p><u>Streets &amp; Spaces</u></p> <p>We agree strongly with the aims of the guidance to create active and vibrant streets and, over time, to move towards many more streets being places for pedestrians and cyclists rather than vehicles.</p>	<p>The City Council welcomes the initial comment.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledges that each site</p>	<p>Amendment proposed:</p> <p>City Note SS-16:</p> <p><i>Our transport network is rapidly changing and advancements in mobility mean that travel habits may significantly change in future. Designs should seek to be</i></p>

<p>While the key principles are important and we support these, each site should nevertheless be considered on its own merits, and each will have its own circumstances that affect the design process. These then need to be balanced with other material considerations. Currently the public transport offer in some places away from the city centre is restricted and in these locations, certainly in the short term, there is a continued need to provide for car access. There may therefore still be cases where new parking provision can be justified, if part of an overall sustainable development, particularly while a transition to a 'car-free' city centre core is undertaken.</p> <p>The guidance and linked documents setting out the Council's approach to parking could perhaps stress the point more that designs should seek to be sufficiently flexible to allow for the re-purposing of parking as and when demand reduces</p>	<p>should be considered on its own merits and its context.</p> <p>Whilst the Design Guide seeks to provide guidance on the design of car parking; the policy requirements related to the amount and mix of parking provision to be provided by development is managed by the emerging Birmingham Parking SPD.</p> <p>The City Council support this suggestion and will revise the text accordingly. The parking design section SS16 also references the need to consider future repurposing for MSCPs.</p>	<p><i>sufficiently flexible to allow for the re-purposing of parking as and when demand reduces.</i></p> <p>See BCC response and proposed revisions to City Note SS-11 below.</p>
<p><u>Landscape &amp; GI</u></p> <p>The principles to ensure that good landscaping of new developments is provided to ensure they fit in well with their surroundings and the need to protect existing important trees and to support the planting of additional ones are both supported.</p> <p>As with the other themes the unique context of each development needs to be considered in determining</p>	<p>The City Council welcomes the comments.</p> <p>The City Council agrees that the requirements and details related to the delivery of public open space must be undertaken in partnership. The existing <b>Open Space in</b></p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>



<p>what the correct green infrastructure solution is. The guidance strikes a sensible compromise here by setting out clear overall objectives without being overly prescriptive.</p> <p>The delivery of appropriate public open space will need to be carried out as a partnership between a developer and the Council with expert input from specialists. The guidance needs to provide a framework for this cooperation without being overly prescriptive</p>	<p><b>New Residential Developments SPD</b> provides the current guidance on this subject. S106 agreements informed by the document is the primary means of negotiating and securing public open space outcomes.</p>	
<p><u>Healthy, Living &amp; Working Places</u></p> <p>Fully support the objectives of this section to promote high quality residential development and, as an organisation, Bruntwood would fully support the Council's ambition to make Central Birmingham, and the City Centre a more attractive place to live for families.</p> <p>There is a significant amount of complementary guidance related to this section contained in the design notes that accompany the guide. There would perhaps be some merit, from the perspective of transparency, of some of this being in the main document. An example would be the policy on tall buildings where City Note LW45 sets out the</p>	<p>The City Council welcomes the comments.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledges the comment related to the siting of guidance within the Design Principles Document and the relevant City Manual. But the guidance in each document carries equal weight, collectively comprising the SPD. Design Principle 20 clearly signposts readers to City Note LW-45.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>circumstances where these would not normally be supported.</p> <p>While we would agree that there is a need to carefully manage new tall buildings, the blanket policy preventing their construction in conservation areas is questioned. It might be more appropriate for the relevant clause to say that such buildings would not normally be accepted in such locations, particularly as there is a subsequent clause which states:</p> <p><i>“Where a proposal is seeking support for a tall building that does not align with these locations or criteria, applicants must clearly demonstrate how their proposal will positively enhance its surroundings and contribute to the wider placemaking agenda of Birmingham.”</i></p> <p>There will always be circumstances where the characteristics of a site require the balancing of a set of objectives and we would suggest that it’s important to recognise that building height may often be one of those matters. The design of tall buildings critically has to be informed by relevant technical assessments (e.g. sunlight/daylight, visual impact, heritage appraisal etc). The design process needs to balance a series of different material considerations in these terms.</p>	<p>In response to comment received from HE, the proposed guidance related to the location of tall buildings have been revised.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledges the design of a tall building requires a range of technical and site specific considerations that will influence the form, height and location of a building.</p>	
--	---	--

<p><u>Efficient and Future-ready</u></p> <p>Given the current climate crisis there is an urgency to ensuring the highest possible environmental performance of new (and indeed existing) buildings. We would be keen to share our expertise in this area as we work to both retrofit our estate and build new buildings which incorporate the highest environmental standards.</p> <p>The challenge that the delivery of zero carbon buildings presents is significant but we believe it is essential that guidance to developers prioritises this essential objective and that local authorities and Government adopt standards that require the transition to zero carbon as rapidly as is feasible. It's also important to ensure that buildings are designed in a way that seeks to future proof them and allows for change in the future and we welcome the acknowledgement of this as set out in the complementary City Note EF4.</p>	<p>The City Council welcomes and supports the comments made. The City Council is committed to transitioning to a zero carbon city and development will play an important role in helping achieve this. Within the confines of existing national policy, the City Council will continue to pursue this objective, the replacement of the BDP playing an important future role.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>We have identified above some matters where we think the guidance needs to appreciate that the Council will have to recognise the importance of the particular context of a development and come to a balanced view as to which are the most important objectives to be delivered. Ultimately development appraisals and viability will need to be factors that</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges the concluding comment related to the planning balance, and does not seek to deter this via the application of the Design Guide.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p>will need to be taken into account in determining what wider contributions to the public realm and broader societal objectives any given development can provide.</p>		
<p><b>Consultee: Calthorpe Estates via CBRE Ltd</b></p>		

<p>will need to be taken into account in determining what wider contributions to the public realm and broader societal objectives any given development can provide.</p>		
<p><b><u>Cross-cutting issues</u></b></p> <p>'Align or Explain' – this is supported.</p> <p>There will also be other circumstances where, due to site-specific or other considerations, it may not be practical to meet all aspects of the Guide.</p> <p><u>Use of images and precedent examples</u></p> <p>In order to further articulate and demonstrate some of the key principles set out in the Guide, Calthorpe Estates recommends the inclusion of images and precedent examples.</p> <p><u>Issues covered by Building Regulations</u></p> <p>The Design Guide should not seek to duplicate these, particularly where it is possible that Building Regulations could change, and the Design Guide then be out of step.</p> <p><u>City Notes relating to Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets</u></p>	<p>The City Council welcomes the comments submitted.</p> <p>The DG will seek to provide images and precedents to help demonstrate elements of the guidance; and welcomes to offer from Calthorpe Estates related to this.</p> <p>The DG does not seek to duplicate building regulations, but there are instances where the DG encourages development to go beyond the regulations.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledges the error</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>It is considered that some of the City Notes which provide guidance relating to designated and nondesignated heritage assets, and heritage statement requirements, contradict with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and overarching legislative framework governing Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.</p>	<p>related to the Heritage Assets and relevant amendments will be applied</p> <p>The Council is currently drafting a Historic Environment SPD that will be the primary source of guidance related to the historic environment. As such, the majority of guidance in the draft Design Guide will be removed.</p>	
<p><b><u>Fulfilling design quality</u></b></p> <p>Understanding the details of a development is important to ensuring design quality. However, for major schemes, it is often necessary to submit outline planning applications to secure the main parameters of a development. Calthorpe Estates recommend that the need and appropriateness of such approaches should also be recognised in the Guide, alongside the mechanisms available to the Council to secure the level of detailed design quality needed.</p>	<p>The City Council recognises the important role outline applications, masterplans, design codes, development briefs etc play in helping to support investment and inform future reserved matters application or full planning application.</p> <p>The role of the Fulfilling Design Quality is to ensure the proposals supported by the City Council via reserved matters or full planning</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>Design Principle 28: Fulfilling Design Quality</b> Development proposals submitted for <b>full</b> planning permission must be appropriately detailed and financially assessed to ensure the architecture and landscape design presented is realised. To help support this, applicants will be required to provide <b>on submission or via condition (subject to the type of application submitted):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of detailed drawings / <b>bay studies</b>.</li> <li>• A quality, robust panel of materials and detailing, with relevant written specifications.</li> <li>• Sample panels of materials and detailing, created by the appointed contractors, as requested.</li> </ul>
	<p>applications are deliverable and delivered as approved.</p>	<p><b>Reflect the building quality proposed in any financial appraisal that reflect the quality of building proposed.</b></p> <p><b>Detailing of the Clerk of Works appointed.</b></p> <p>ere an applicant is seeking to amend their proposal for approval, this must not lead to a reduction in quality.</p>

<p><b><u>Design Principle 20: Creating tall buildings</u></b></p> <p>Calthorpe Estates is supportive of the overarching design principles required of tall buildings.</p> <p>But, it would be useful if the supporting text acknowledged that designs should seek to mitigate potential adverse effects on the surrounding environment.</p>	<p>The supporting text to Design Principle 20, includes the following:</p> <p><u>Designs must also mitigate and prevent any potential adverse effect on the surrounding environment</u> and uses in terms of wind turbulence, overshadowing, noise, reflected glare; or aviation, navigation and telecommunication interference.</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 20: Creating tall buildings</u></b></p> <p>Designs must be informed by appropriate microclimate studies, ensuring any adverse impacts <b>on the surrounding environment</b> are effectively mitigated against.</p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 23: Lighting of buildings</u></b></p> <p><u>Illumination of buildings and space</u></p> <p>The Lighting Places SPD (June 2008) identifies that enhanced lighting schemes will be expected in places or buildings that contribute to the regeneration of Birmingham city centre or local</p>	<p><u>Illumination of buildings and space</u></p> <p>The City Council recognises the role considered lighting systems can have in enhancing buildings during</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendments:</u></p> <p><u>Lighting of Buildings</u></p> <p><u>Illumination of buildings and spaces</u></p> <p>The effective lighting of public spaces and buildings are an important element of their design, ensuring places remain</p>

<p>centres, because of their location, use, heritage or design, and recognises the role lighting could play in reinforcing local distinctiveness and heritage.</p> <p>Design Principle 23 should explicitly acknowledge how well-designed lighting can enhance built heritage, including listed buildings and within conservation areas, as well as contribute to placemaking in local centres outside of Birmingham city centre.</p> <p><u>Floodlighting</u></p> <p>As the Guide is intended to supersede the adopted Guidelines for Floodlighting of Sports Facilities, Car Parks and Secure Areas, it is recommended that Design Principle 23 also includes a criteria-based approach to guiding the design and scope of floodlighting proposals. This will be important to seek to minimise impacts from flood lighting on nearby residential occupiers.</p> <p>It is particularly useful that City Notes LW-59 and LW-60 provide appropriate criteria to guide lighting design, including the application of guidance produced by the Institute of Light Professionals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The height and size of floodlighting columns and equipment should be kept to the minimum needed for operational purposes;</li> </ul>	<p>night-time hours, including heritage assets.</p> <p><u>Floodlighting</u></p> <p>As acknowledged by the comments, City Note LW-60 outlines the criteria to guide the siting and design of flood lighting. As such, it is not considered necessary to duplicate this in the design principle.</p>	<p>safe and usable beyond day-light hours. Appropriately considered and designed, lighting strategies can create dynamic and exciting night-time environments, providing spaces and buildings with an evening persona to help support safe, evening activity. <b>They can also enhance the night-time appearance of buildings, using light and shadow to punctuate architectural features and create focal points within their context.</b></p> <p><b>DESIGN PRINCIPLE 23: Lighting of buildings and spaces</b></p> <p><u>Illumination of buildings and space</u></p> <p>Façade lighting of buildings should seek to enhance the night-time presence of appropriate buildings, considering their <b>architectural style, heritage value, stature, location</b> and role within the city.</p> <p><u>Floodlighting</u></p> <p>No amendment proposed.</p>
--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated obtrusive light limitation standards for exterior lighting installation to supersede Guidelines for Floodlighting of Sports Facilities, Car Park and Secure Areas Appendix Two; and</li> <li>• The hours and number of occasions that the floodlights will be used should be stated in any application and will normally be a material consideration in determining an application or potential imposition of planning conditions.</li> </ul>		
<p><b><u>City Note LW-6: Strong Concept</u></b></p> <p>Calthorpe Estates supports the Guide’s encouragement of architecture that is both considered and innovative, including emphasis on using design to help buildings knit into their surrounding context. It would be useful to clarify the need to strike a balance between innovative landmark buildings and high quality buildings that form the majority of the cityscape ‘backdrop’, which are key to making landmark buildings and their architecture legible.</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges the comment made; and agrees that all building should deliver good quality design. Landmarks are important elements of the urban landscape, but by definition are not the dominant element.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><u>CITY NOTE LW-6: Strong concept</u>  The concept behind a building should be drawn from the creativity of the architect, whilst pulling and utilising appropriate elements of the surrounding character area to help the building knit into <i>and positively add to</i> its surroundings. <del>The City Council welcomes considered architecture that seeks to challenge and innovate.</del></p> <p><i>In presenting the concept behind a design, designers and applicants are encouraged to explain the ‘story’ of what informed and inspired the design submitted; and how it will add to the surrounding context.</i></p> <p>The City Council welcomes considered architecture that seeks to challenge and innovate. <i>But this does not mean every proposal must strive to be a landmark</i></p>



		<p>or bold statement. Whilst there is a place for such statements in appropriate locations, on the majority of sites it is unlikely to be the desired approach.</p> <p>The 'challenge or innovation' may merely be a contemporary interpretation of an existing character or architectural style. The importance is to ensure the design has a strong context / rationale that delivers good, cohesive architecture.</p>
<p><b><u>City Note LW-8: Façade composition and detailing</u></b></p> <p>The principle of considering the balance of features that comprise façade detailing is useful in as far as it challenges monolithic façade treatment, and sets out how applicants should explain their design by making reference to concepts such as rhythm, symmetry and balance.</p> <p>However, the statement that “<i>Well composed facades are likely to contain a degree of projecting and recessed features to aid interest and articulation...</i>” is a wide-ranging and prescriptive statement that may not be valid in every architectural design and context. It is recommended that City Notes provide a framework for challenging poor quality architecture and justifying design choices, but avoids being overly prescriptive in a way that limits architectural freedom.</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledge the comment made. Is it not the intention to limit architectural freedom via this City Note. As detailed within the quoted statement (<i>‘facades are <b>likely</b> to .....</i>’), the use of the word ‘likely’ does not mean every or must do. It merely highlighted that it is often a common detailing within façades. The City Council does not believe this statement is prescriptive.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p><b><u>City Note LW-44: Minimise and mitigate impacts on the local environment and microclimate</u></b></p> <p>Microclimate impacts are an important consideration in relation to proposals for tall buildings. In terms of wind impacts, in addition to planting it would be helpful to also outline in the Guide the other potential types of mitigation measures that can be provided to satisfactorily address wind impacts, such as the erection of screens, the use of podiums, and the provision of fins or similar on building facades.</p> <p>In relation to Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing (DSO) impacts, we support the approach advocated in the Design Guide in relation to BRE Guidance.</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledge the comment made in relation to wind mitigation measures and will revise the guidance to include the potential mitigation measures detailed.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>In order to assess any climatic or environmental impacts of a proposal, initial designs <b>should must</b> test and model different forms, heights, layouts, <b>orientations</b> and block arrangements <b>(considering prevailing winds and proximity to existing tall buildings)</b> to help ensure any climatic impacts are reduced and managed. Evidence of this testing should be submitted with a proposal; together with detailed wind, sunlight and shadow studies.</p> <p><b>Wind Impact</b>  <b>Increase in wind speeds at street level is a primary environment challenge that designers must effectively mitigate against, with tall buildings redirecting wind down their facades into the street environment.</b></p> <p><b>The measures needed to alignment with the City (of London) Lawson Criteria will be site and building specific, but the City Council believes there is a tier of mitigation measures (allied with the above) that is likely to reflect the scale of discrepancy between a proposal and the City (of London) Lawson Criteria).</b></p> <p><b>The first tier relates to the form and façade design of the building; and has the potential to create a more cohesive response (through their manipulation) and a greater reduction in wind impact in street and on the building</b></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>greater reduction in wind impact at street and on the building.</i></p> <p><i>These primary design considerations include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>- Softening of corners / edges – creating a more aerodynamic form or apply considered cut outs in the form and/or façade will help reduce loads and aid dispersion</i></li><li><i>- Tapering, profile changing or setting back the building as it rises – removes the uniformity that causes wind shedding</i></li><li><i>- Creating permeability – having open floors will enable wind to move through the structure as well as around it (see 432 Park Avenue, New York).</i></li><li><i>- Podium – can help redirect wind away from the street, subject to surrounding context, its design and siting of the tower.</i></li></ul> <p><i>The second tier of mitigation may not influence the form of the building as directly, but if utilised they must be a considered element of the design (not an afterthought) and their effectiveness demonstrated. These secondary measures include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>- the siting of fins on facades</i></li><li><i>- canopies at lower levels</i></li><li><i>- colonnade base element</i></li></ul>
--	--	---

		<p>Screens within the public realm can also be used as a mitigation measure, but these are unlikely to be acceptable due to their impact on the street environment. Applicants must demonstrate no other mitigate is possible before the City Council will consider this mitigation methods. If this mitigation method is supported in principle by the City Council, they must integrate into the surrounding public realm; not obstruct movement; and be artist-led in their design.</p> <p>The use of trees will not normally be accepted as means to mitigate wind impact. Their effectiveness varies with the seasons (evergreen species are not typically supported) and age, they are not considered permanent mitigation and climatic changes can limit their ability to grow and mature.</p> <p>The City Council does not seek to prescribe the mitigation measures a proposal must apply, but the response must deliver good architecture and wind speeds in the surrounding external environment (public and private) that meet the City (of London) Lawson Criteria.</p>
<p><b><u>City Note LW-45: Location of tall buildings</u></b></p>	<p>The City Council welcomes to comments related to the proposed location of tall</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p>

<p>Considering the existing prevalence of tall buildings along the A456 Hagley Road and functional proximity of the Five Ways area to the city centre core, it is recommended that LW-45 also supports tall buildings in areas adjoining the A4540 Ring Road and on key routes into the A4540, such as the A456 and A38. This would reflect the city's ambitions to integrate the city centre with its surroundings, as highlighted in the recent consultation on Our Future City Plan – Central Birmingham 2040.</p> <p><u>Where tall buildings 'not' supported:</u></p> <p>The approach is considered to be overly restrictive, compromising the ability for the Council to reach a balanced conclusion on the impact of a tall building on a designated heritage asset. In particular, it suggests that a draft or adopted SPD that references height limits is absolute; however, many of the City's adopted SPDs are dated and do not reflect current planning policy priorities or built environment context. Calthorpe Estates does not support a blanket approach to restricting tall buildings using a narrow approach that does not consider the site-specific heritage context or building design.</p> <p><u>Key views:</u></p>	<p>buildings and is proposing an amendment to this element of the guidance.</p> <p>Further work related to the siting of tall building may be undertaken to support the updated BDP.</p>	<p>Please see proposed revisions to the location of tall building below (see Historic England comments &amp; response).</p>
--	--	---

<p>It would be useful if the Design Guide included a diagram of key view corridors which the Council consider to be important when assessing proposals, albeit acknowledging that impacts on these view corridors will be considered on a site-by-site basis.</p>		
<p><b><u>City Note GI-7: Landscape components and features</u></b></p> <p>The encouragement of including green elements into building design, including green roofs, is supported. Given the competing demands of design requirements, such as the need to incorporate onsite photovoltaic panels or blue roofs, it would be useful to recognise that the total area of roofscape that may be given over to green roofs will need to be balanced with the competing demands for limited roofspace.</p> <p>When determining planning applications for developments within the Estate which generate green infrastructure demands, the extent of proposed on-site green infrastructure should be assessed in the context of the uniquely extensive publicly accessible open green spaces and tree cover within the Estate.</p>	<p>The City Council recognises there maybe completing demands for the productive use of roofs cape and recognises site specific discussions will be needed to confirm the most appropriate solution / use for the site and surroundings.</p> <p>As with any development, site specific consideration and context will be considered when seeking on site GI gains. The DG seeks to outline parameters and consideration that will informed the most appropriate solutions for a site.</p>	<p><u>Amendment proposed:</u> None</p>

<p><b><u>Design Principle 4: Creating great streets</u></b></p> <p>Calthorpe Estates is supportive of the requirement for all development to positively acknowledge, enhance and interact with their surrounding street environments; adding to their vibrancy, safety and use, including prioritising active travel. It is recommended that there is explicit reference to designing relevant streets for low vehicle speeds and prioritising the pedestrian.</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges the need to create low vehicle speed environments and pedestrian priority. The City Council believes this requirement is supported by Design Principle 4 &amp; 5 (as in the draft document) and within the City Manual, include the reference of 20mph neighbourhood in City Note SS-1.</p>	<p><u>Amendment proposed:</u> None</p>
<p><b><u>City Note SS-1: Create safe and inviting, inclusive places for people</u></b></p> <p>The overall principle of creating streets that prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport over cars is supported.</p> <p>The role of smaller public spaces should be recognised. In particular, the prescription for 'active spaces' to be appropriately sized and receive a minimum of 5 hours sunlight at Autumn Equinox needs to be clarified, as not all public spaces can feasibly achieve this, but nevertheless be a comfortable space to walk through or dwell.</p>	<p>Yes, the City Council recognises on reflection the statement related to the 5 hrs of sunlight is onerous and not always achievable in an urban environment. As such, the text will be revised.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>CITY NOTE SS-1</b></p> <p><u>Create safe and inviting, inclusive spaces for people</u></p> <p>From conception, how people interact and move within and around a space should be a foundation of a development's design.</p> <p>The design of streets and public spaces should be tailored to respond to their location and function; position in the street hierarchy; and the buildings enclosing them. They should be safe and pleasant places for people to walk or linger, considering how sun, shade, wind, noise and air quality affect the local</p>

<p>Precedent images of 'great streets' should be provided to illustrate the art of the possible</p>		<p>microclimate. These climatic factors are particularly important where schemes propose use spillage and active engagement with the public realm. <del>In these scenarios, it is recommended active spaces are appropriately sized and received a minimum of 5 hours sunlight at the Autumn Equinox.</del></p>
<p><b><u>City Note SS-10: Creating safe, attractive, efficient walking and cycling environments</u></b></p> <p>For ease of reference, it would be useful if this section were combined with City Note SS-1, to promote a 'total' approach to street design.</p> <p>It would be encouraging if City Notes SS-1 and SS10 could provide in-principle support for the reconfiguration of existing vehicular routes to redistribute road space from the car to the pedestrian and cycle, subject to safety and traffic considerations.</p>	<p>The City Council believes all the City Notes within the Streets &amp; Space Manual provide a 'total' approach to street design.</p> <p>City Note SS-2 has been deleted as the City Council believes this duplicates the content of other City Notes within the Manual.</p> <p>Revised text to reflect inprinciple support for the reconfiguration of existing vehicle routes.</p>	<p><b><u>CITY NOTE SS-10</u></b></p> <p><u>Creating safe, attractive, efficient walking and cycling</u></p> <p>Where new streets and routes are to be created, these must prioritise safe, efficient pedestrian and cycle movement over motor vehicles through <del>the redistribution</del> <i>reallocation of road space away from private car (in consultation with the Highways Authority). Design should apply parking management tools, the application of pedestrian and cycle</i> priority, low speed road layouts, 20mph speed limits, crossing facilities and/or segregated routes that invite use.</p>



<p><b><u>City Note SS-11: Deliver a clear hierarchy of connected streets</u></b></p> <p>Principle of requiring a seamless network of pedestrian and cycle connectivity is strongly supported.</p> <p>It would be useful for City Note SS-11 to recognise the positive role of well-design bollard systems in permitting limited service access within developments as necessary.</p> <p>The inclusion of precedent images to express Birmingham examples of the street hierarchy would be useful.</p>	<p>The City Council recognises that bollards can be an effective method of helping to segregate uses and in some scenario aid safety within the public realm. Whilst the City Council will not dismiss these systems, other landscape led solutions must be explored and tested first. If bollard systems are accepted, they must effectively integrate into a landscape proposal.</p> <p>Request for local street images noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>City Note SS-11: Minimise and manage car parking, ensuring it does not dominate</u></b></p> <p>It would be encouraging if <b>City Note SS-16</b> also set out in-principle support for consolidation of existing off-street car parking and repurposing of such areas for creation of new public spaces or development.</p> <p>Ensure no duplication or contradiction with Car Parking SPD and City Notes SS-16 &amp; SS-17.</p>	<p>The City Council supports Calthorpe Estate's desire to help deliver the city's sustainable transport ambitions. The repurposing of underutilised land such as car parking can deliver a number of benefits to the surrounding environment, but the wider impact of displaced car parking must also be</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE SS-16</u></b></p> <p><b>Minimise and manage car parking, ensuring it does not dominate</b></p> <p>.....</p> <p>The City Council supports the application of Manual for Streets and the Space to Park guidance, which allied with guidance within this document, proposals <b>should must</b> align with.</p>

	<p>considered. Whilst the city wants to encourage citizens to become less depended on daily car use, there may remain scenarios where vehicle parking and storage is needed. As such, changes to current provision must be considered on a case by case basis via the planning system.</p> <p>Comment regards Design Guide and the Car Parking SPD is noted.</p>	<p><i>As reflected in the Birmingham Parking SPD, the City Council may support the removal of existing on-street parking provision within the city centre where it would aid and support the enhancements to the public realm, public transport provision, walking and cycling and delivery, taxis, car clubs and electric vehicle charging. The City Council may also support the consolidation of existing off-street parking provision to help achieve similar gains to the public realm and/or non-private vehicle based travel. But suggest developments will be assessed on a case by case basis, considering the public realm and/or transport gains achieved and the impact of parking loss on the surrounding environment.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 9: Design of public open space</u></b></p> <p>Calthorpe Estates encourages the inclusion of explicit support in DP9 for the creation of public open space through the delivery of pocket parks and re-assignment of existing road space to pedestrians. DP9 should acknowledge role smaller public spaces play in wellbeing.</p> <p>Images that reflect spaces of smaller scales should be included.</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges that public open spaces of different sizes can help support the health and wellbeing of surrounding residents and users.</p>	<p><b><u>Design Principle 9</u></b></p> <p><b>Public open space</b></p> <p>Multifunctional public open spaces <i>(of all sizes, from pocket parks to neighbourhood parks)</i> play an important role in the creation of sustainable developments, providing spaces that can encourage healthy, social and cultural activity; whilst also delivering biodiversity gains and contributing to the city's green infrastructure network.</p>

<p><b><u>Design Principle 12: Increasing densities</u></b></p> <p>The requirement for the density of a proposal to not impact on the quality of place is supported.</p> <p>It would be useful for the statement '<i>where a change in character is supported or promoted by the City Council.</i>' to make reference to situations in which change is supported. E.g city centre or within walking distances of high quality public transport.</p> <p>Request definition of '<i>enhance the surrounding area</i>'. E.g:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enable redevelopment of underused or derelict land</li> <li>- Bring more residents to aid viability of local services etc</li> <li>- Existing scale of surrounding area does not make effective use of land in a sustainable location and low density is not a primary component of an area's character.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>What constitutes 'enhances the surrounding area' is a site by site consideration, taking into account the character of the surrounding area and the design proposed within this context. Catch-all scenarios cannot be applied. The applicant must demonstrate how their proposal does not negatively impact on its surroundings.</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 16: High Quality Homes</u></b></p> <p>Outdoor amenity space – the wording should be clarified to allow this provision to be provided as either private or communal amenity space. This maybe be particularly relevant in high density schemes where there maybe limited opportunities to</p>	<p>The supporting text to Design Principle 16 allows for individual or communal spaces to be provided by the developer:</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> none proposed.</p>

<p>accommodate outdoor space as part of the development.</p> <p>52-72m<sup>2</sup> for houses – flexibility must be shown for high density homes where no capacity or desire to have gardens this size. Focus should be given to quality and functionality of spaces provided.</p> <p>Images of family homes in urban setting with large balconies, terraces etc should be shown to illustrate the possible.</p>	<p><u>These spaces, whether integrated or external, individual or communal, must create private, functional areas</u> where residents can relax and connect to the outdoor environment and nature (helping create biophilic led design).</p> <p>City Note LW-13 in the Healthy, Living &amp; Working Manual details potential exceptions to the numerical standards:</p> <p>If proposals are seeking to gain support for amenity space below the City Council's minimum standards, designs must clearly demonstrate how this reduction will not impact on the delivery of quality amenity space. This may form part of an innovative architectural design that creates a number of smaller spaces (garden, roof terraces, balconies and/or courtyards) that</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>provide variety; benefit from sunlight at different hours of the day; and enable different residents to have private space. Will the design and content of the smaller space create a more useable, engaging space that residents and wildlife can interact with? Is the reduction a result of providing a greater proportion of private space over communal?</p>	
<p><b><u>City Note LW-10: Modern Architecture</u></b></p> <p>Supported. Would also be useful to make reference to potential value of modern, innovative design response to heritage assets.</p> <p>Images of modern residential architecture in different setting would be useful.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The emerging Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of draft guidance related to the historic environment. This separate SPD will provide guidance on the relation with heritage assets and modern architecture.</p> <p>City Note LW-10 is not prescriptive in its application, as such enables the potential</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendments:</u> none proposed.</p>

	for modern residential responses to heritage assets.	
<p><b><u>City Note LW-10: Internal Space</u></b></p> <p>Details of internal space design requirements in the DG is considered to be too prescriptive to enable architects to create efficient, adaptable and wellfunctioning layouts. E.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Internal space free of boilers and other infrastructure and consideration of sports equipment can be stored;</li> <li>- Kitchens should incorporate washing machines without compromising the kitchen function</li> <li>- Location of children’s bedrooms away from other habitable rooms.</li> </ul>	<p>The City Council does not support the statement that the guidance related to internal space design is too prescriptive. The considerations referenced should be base requirement of an design, ensuring there is sufficient storage, kitchens function effectively and the needs of all occupants effectively considered in the design and arrangement of space.</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>
<p><b><u>City Note LW-25: Accessible buildings</u></b></p> <p>Support. But ensure the content does not duplicate, contradict or conflict with building regulations, especially in the context of Govts Accessible Homes Consultation.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>
<p><b><u>City Note LW-30: Extensions to non-residential buildings</u></b></p> <p>Full appreciate need for non-residential extensions to enhance the host building and contribute to surrounding character. But, imperative to ensure</p>	<p>Comments noted. As will all development a ‘planning balance’ needs to be made by the City Council in</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>

<p>continued viability of uses in the context of listed buildings and CAs should be acknowledged in City Note LW-30.</p>	<p>determining development proposals. The City Council acknowledges the need to consider viability within this balance, allied with the design, heritage and other policy considerations.</p>	
<p><b><u>Design Principle 14: protecting residential amenity</u></b></p> <p>Support exceptions being considered. But request that in-principle support for densification and maximising well-designed residential delivery is reiterated. For example, it should be acknowledged that a reduced degree of privacy is anticipated in HD settings, whilst the existing high degree of privacy of the city's mature suburbs means there's an expectation that minimum privacy distances are maintained.</p>	<p>The City Council supports the premise of the comments and believes the current guidance allows proposal to demonstrate a high level of amenity is provided and retained, whilst being below the amenity standards (45 degree &amp; separation distances). But given every site has specific challenges and considerations, it is not appropriate to give in-principle support in general locations or scenarios.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>
<p><b><u>City Note LW-3: Residential privacy and overlooking</u></b></p> <p>Potential for exceptions supported. To assist the reader, it would be useful to specify examples if the</p>	<p>As reflected in the NPPF this City Note seeks to ensure high levels of residential amenity for existing and new</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>

<p>types if situations when this may most likely be appropriate. This could also include where a narrower separation distances than 21m is acceptable, such as were an interface between residential and office (with amenity concerns alleviated by the 9-5 nature of offices). Where minimum standards cannot be met in other situations, it would also be beneficial for DG to give examples of measures that could be used – angled windows or reducing facing habitable rooms.</p>	<p> dwellings. The City Council believes separation distances and the 45 degree code are well established mechanisms for helping to achieve this; and it views these as an important base reference.</p> <p>As acknowledged by the comment, the City Council will consider exceptions to these numerical standards, where an applicant can demonstrate high levels of amenity are achieved and/or retained by their design. But the onus must be on the applicant to demonstrate this. The City Council does not want to present a second tier of standards that applicant can apply to achieve such an exception. Every response to a site must be bespoke.</p>	
<p><b><u>City Note LW-4: 45 Degree Code</u></b></p> <p>Inclusion of code is supported. Recommend including 3D visuals to aid explanation.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>



<p><b><u>Design Principle 17: Residential extensions</u></b></p> <p>It would be useful to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Include visual examples of what constitutes 'good' and 'bad' practice</li> <li>b) Reflect the 3<sup>1st</sup> principles set out in Extending Your Home SPD 1. Respect appearance 2. Ensure no adverse affect on neighbours 3. minimise impact on env.</li> <li>c) Replicate minimum standards set out at section 7 of extending your home spd.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Noted, but the approach taken across the DG is to present good practice only.</li> <li>b. City Note LW-16 provides guidance related to these considerations.</li> <li>c. The City Council is to adopt the Nationally Described Space Standards in the Development Management in Birmingham DPD. Separation distances (for all residential developments and those adjacent to them) are detailed in City Note LW-3 and 4 and Design Principle 14. References to the City Notes are provide within the guidance related to household extensions.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>
---	---	--

<p><b><u>Design Principle 18: Rooftop extensions</u></b></p> <p>Given the extension of PDR to allow for upward extensions on existing residential and nonresidential building it would be useful for the text to provide context on where PDR allow for upward extension without planning permission.</p>	<p>Comment Noted.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment:</p> <p><u>Rooftop extension</u></p> <p><i>Note: Permitted Development Rights (PDR) allow certain existing residential and non-residential building to extend upward without requiring planning permission. Applicants are encouraged to check their PDR or contact the City Council to confirm whether planning permission need to be obtained.</i></p>
<p><b><u>City Notes LW-16 – LW-24: Design of residential extensions</u></b></p> <p>It would be beneficial to make reference to the particular contribution landscaping and garden space play in Mature Suburbs.</p> <p>Would be useful to reflect on PDR and where applicants may not benefit from these.</p> <p>Introduction of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ images would be useful.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment:</p> <p><b><u>Do I need planning permission and/or building regulations?</u></b></p> <p><i>We recommend you check with the City Council to confirm whether you need planning permission. Not all household extensions require planning permission, but it is important to check before designing a scheme.</i></p> <p>Information on what extensions require planning permission is available on the Planning Portal. But, is it recommended you contact the Council to clarify this.</p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE LW-16</u></b></p> <p><b>Respect the appearance of your home and local area</b></p> <p>As with any new development the design of an extension must consider the architectural style of the</p>

		<p>house being extended and character of the surrounding area; leading to a design that complements the scale and style of the house and its surroundings.</p> <p>To successfully achieve this, designers must consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The key characteristics and styles of the host building and the surrounding area, ensuring the roof design aligns with the existing style (unless there is an architectural rationale for not); and using similar shapes, sizes and designs for windows, doors and other external details.</li> <li>- <i>The landscape character; the role gardens, hedges and trees play in characterising the surrounding area.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>City Notes LW-49 to LW-54</b></p> <p>Requirements exceed the requirements of the NPPF. Overall the City Notes are being too prescriptive about the content of the Heritage Statement.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting process of this Historic Environment SPD.</p>	<p>These city notes will be deleted.</p>

<p><b><u>City Note LW-49: Extensions and alterations to historic assets</u></b></p> <p>There are a number of areas where the content of City Note LW-49 deviates from the NPPF and BDP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requirement for extensions &amp; alterations to give appropriate consideration to the significance of the building</li> <li>- Heritage statement to demonstrate justification for the location based around historic fabric and public views.</li> <li>- Requirement for the least amount of fabric to be lost</li> <li>- Requirement to preserve and enhance exceed that of the relevant case law, which established that it was sufficient to simply preserve.</li> <li>- Requirement for small extensions to be in keeping. This contradicts other elements of DG related to extensions.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting process of this Historic Environment SPD.</p>	<p>This city note will be deleted.</p>
<p><b><u>LW-50: Windows in listed buildings</u></b></p> <p>Would be useful to clarify / define what would constitute a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Sequential approach detailed exceeds the requirements of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting</p>	<p>This city note will be deleted.</p>
	<p>process of this Historic Environment SPD.</p>	
<p><b><u>LW-53: demolition of non-designated heritage assets</u></b></p> <p>Comments continue to relate to the sequential approach to the replacement of windows in listed buildings.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting process of this Historic Environment SPD.</p>	<p>This city note will be deleted.</p>

	process of this Historic Environment SPD.	
<p><b><u>LW-54: New buildings in conservation areas</u></b></p> <p>Believes the guidance related to the content of the Heritage Statement crosses over into the realm of what should be covered in the D&amp;A Statement.</p> <p>City Note suggests that 'pastiche' is a potential architectural approach. This conflicts with other elements of the design guide. Suggested revision:</p> <p>...'seek and architectural response that represents 'high quality contextual design'; fundamentally, the design process should be the same whether or not sited in a conservation area.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting process of this Historic Environment SPD.</p>	<p>This city note will be deleted.</p>

<p><b><u>Efficient &amp; Future-ready</u></b></p> <p>In some instance there will be conflicts between meeting a move towards zero carbon development and addressing other design principles. This should be acknowledged in the DG, advocating the adoption of a balanced approach to ensure the best overall outcomes. Particularly related to heritage assets.</p>	<p>Comments noted. As will all development a 'planning balance' needs to be made by the City Council in determining development proposals. The City Council acknowledges the need to consider viability within this balance, allied with the design, heritage and other policy considerations.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>
<p><b><u>EF-1: Energy Efficiency</u></b></p> <p>Building orientation and solar gain – supported in principle, but should be applied pragmatically to sitespecific circumstances. Balanced with the need to optimise land and deliver good quality homes.</p> <p>Guidance provided in insulation and draft proofing and using materials with a high thermal mass. The Guidance must avoid duplication of Building Regs.</p> <p>Guidance provides guidance on external materials capability of storing heat. We would advise the wording is rationalised to be clear on the scope of advice and acknowledge competing demands of a</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The guidance is not seeking to duplication or imping on Building Regulations. It is merely a suggestion of how thermal mass could be utilised.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	<p><b><u>City Note EF-1</u></b>  <b>Orientation and passive solar gain</b></p> <p>To help maximise the benefits of solar gain, internal layouts should be influenced by the buildings orientation and the associated solar gain (balanced with <b>key urban site specific characteristics and constrains and other</b> design principles).</p> <p><b>Insulation and thermal mass</b>  .....  .....  <i>Whilst consideration must be given to the surrounding character area and potential contribute to surrounding heath island effect, dense materials, such as stone, brick and ceramic tiles have a high thermal mass, as do green roofs which provide a greater thermal mass than slate.</i></p>
<p>design and site; and the need to reduce heat island effect.</p>		
<p><b><u>EF-2: Conserving water resources &amp; maximising water efficiency</u></b></p> <p>Installation of parallel grey and potable water pipe network is usually unfeasible in residential building, adding to expense and maintenance. The efficiency of rainwater capture is dependent on the scale of roof area.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>

design and site; and the need to reduce heat island effect.		
<p><b><u>EF-4: Flexible &amp; adaptable design</u></b></p> <p>Recommend more specific references are made to how an applicant should demonstrate the adaptability of layouts at planning stage (clarifying the Lifetime Homes is no longer required). The wording should acknowledge the predominant role of Building Regs (particularly in context of Future Homes Standards consultation) in guiding adaptable homes.</p>	Comments noted	<p>However, whilst the use may remain consistent, these buildings need to be able to adapt with their occupants. As lifestyles, personal circumstances and ways of living change, units need to be able respond to this; enabling internal layouts to be adjusted, supportive infrastructure to be installed and extensions to be added.</p> <p><i>Beyond the accessible and adaptable homes requirement outlined in Policy DM10 of the Development Management in Birmingham DPD, the City Council encourages designers to consider wider enhancement to flexibility, that may enable adaption by a future resident. Building Regulations Part M4 (2 &amp; 3) contains a number of useful design considerations that would enable a resident who has reduced mobility to move around and use the dwelling effectively. Whilst not a requirement, the City Council encourages</i></p>

		<p>proposals to integrate all or elements of these standards.  Beyond this standard, consideration could also be given to the internal layout; the future installation or removal of internal walls; or whether a downstairs room could be converted into a bedroom without impacting on wider circulation.</p> <p>Homes built to Lifetime Homes Standards have flexibility built into their design, enabling easy adaptation to suit different requirements over time. <del>All these considerations could</del> This gives the building a longer lifespan, and may enable residents to remain in their home and community throughout their life; in turn potentially reducing a future burden on health and care services.</p>
<p><b><u>EF-5: building re-use &amp; sustainable materials</u></b></p> <p>Note should acknowledge that there are circumstances in which building re-use is inappropriate or unfeasible.</p> <p>Request note is clearer on what is required at planning submission stage, as generally, the source and specification of materials is not known in full or cannot be committed to prior to designed design.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE EF-5</u></b>  <b>Building re-use</b>  Where a site contains an existing building, the <b>feasibility (considering viability and site constraint) of potential for this to be</b> retained <b>it</b> (in whole or part) should be appropriately considered by any development proposal. Scenarios must consider how the building could be refurbished and/or modified to successfully accommodate the new use sought.</p> <p><b>Use of low carbon materials</b></p>



		<p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p><i>Where an applicant is proposing to utilise low carbon materials, their intent should be detailed in the design and assess statement, with confirmation of the materials origin or source provided as part of the material condition attached to a permission.</i></p>
<p><b><u>EF-6: Climate resilience</u></b></p> <p>Request wording is clearer, so that it requires architectural detailing and justification for choice of rainwater goods and roofing finishes to deal with heavy rainfall events and does not confuse the requirements for surface water drainage strategies.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>This may include <i>architectural</i> detailing and infrastructure such as: gutters and other rainwater goods of a size that can account increased and heavier rainfall; robust roof designs that incorporate detailing such as over-hanging eaves to cope with increased rainfall; and external walls protected from increased rain by large eaves and splash zones at their base.</p>
<p><b><u>EF-7: BREEAM requirement</u></b></p> <p>We recommend that wording is inserted to allow applicants to demonstrate how their development works toward Net Zero and acknowledge the role of building regs.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The duplication of BDP Policy TP3 by City Note EF-7 will be removed from the DG.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE EF-7</u></b></p> <p><b><u>BREEAM requirement</u></b></p> <p><i>In line with Policy TP3 of the BDP (and the associated guidance note), all new non-residential built developments in excess of 1,000sq.m (gross permitted floorspace) or being developed on a site area of 0.5ha or more, must aim to meet BREEAM standard excellent (or any future national equivalent)</i></p>

		<p>unless it can be demonstrated that the cost of achieving this would make the development unviable. The standard applies to a range of non-residential development types including offices, schools, industrial, retail, but also applies to non-C3 Residential Uses such as multi-residential and supported living developments. Requiring BREEAM certification helps to ensure that all new non-residential buildings incorporate a minimum standard of energy efficiency measures, energy generation and sustainable design characteristics into their development.</p> <p>The Council's Guidance Note on Sustainable Construction and Energy Statements provides further guidance on the requirements of BDP Policy TP3 Sustainable Construction.</p>
<p><b>City Note: LW-5: Biophilic design principles</b></p> <p>Noted that Note encourage accreditation of WELL Building Standards. Note should be clear that formal accreditation is not a requirement for applicants.</p>	<p>As acknowledged by the respondent, the City Council 'encourages' accreditation. As such, it does not 'require' it.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment: none proposed</p>
<p><b>City Note SS-7: Advertisements</b></p> <p>The 'location and land use guidelines' section of SS7 is currently unclear on how these principles apply to different types of advertisements. Would be useful to have guidelines to cover the broad range of items falling under advertisement consents:</p>	<p>This element of the guidance primarily relates to hoardings, large format and free standing units. Guidance related to shop front and business signage is provided</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>CITY NOTE SS-7 Advertisements</b></p> <p>- Create obstacles to pedestrian movement or sightlines</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shopfront signage</li> <li>- Adverts related to businesses (totems, hoardings and banners)</li> <li>- Wayfinding signage</li> </ul> <p>Images of good and bad would be useful.</p>	<p>in the Healthy, Living and Working Manual.</p>	<p><i>* guidance on the design of shop front and totem signage is provided at City Note LW-32 in the Healthy, Living and Working Manual.</i></p>
<p><b><u>City Note SS-7: Advertisements</u></b></p> <p>Listed building section of SS-7 highlighted that advertisements hoardings would not normally be acceptable. But as currently written, this section does not provide a framework to guide the design of sensitive and appropriate scaled signage proposals. Calthorpe Estates have worked with BCC to create a number of well-design signage proposals for a number of their developments.</p> <p>Section should be expanded to incorporate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requiring signage on Listed Buildings, within their curtilage or within a conservation area to not detract from the significance of the designated heritage asset nor detract from the character of the conservation area; and</li> <li>- Requiring applicants to explain the rationale for proposing signage in such circumstances.</li> </ul>	<p>The City Council believes the initial guidance proposed by City Note SS-7 is sufficient to allow sensitive signage to be sited on buildings, with the onus on the applicant to demonstrate this.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>CITY NOTE SS-7 Advertisements</b></p> <p>Where allowed, their scale, position and overall design should be sympathetic to their location, ensuring through individual or cumulative impact, they do not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cause visual clutter within public spaces or streets.</li> <li>• Block or impact on important views.</li> <li>• <del>Detract</del> <b>Detract</b> from the character or significance of a heritage asset. driving hazard</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>City Note SS-12: Make legible places that are easy to navigate</u></b></p>	<p>Comments noted and supported. Amendments to</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><u>CITY NOTES SS-12</u></p>

<p>It would be encouraging if there was explicit support for rationalisation and consolidation of signage, in addition to the current statement that this should take place where possible.</p> <p>Cross referencing between SS-12 and SS-7 would be useful given signposting / wayfinding tends to fall under advertisement consent regime.</p>	<p>SS-12 will be applied to reflect the comments made (as adjacent).</p>	<p>Where required, signposting and waymarking should <b>(in line with SS-7)</b> be sensitive to the local environment, simple, consistent, clearly legible, and well maintained. Rationalisation and consolidation of signage <b>should take place where possible</b>, to avoid <b>and reduce creating</b> street clutter <b>will be supported</b>.</p>
<p><b><u>City Note LW-32: Shopfront Design</u></b></p> <p>Cross-referencing to City Notes SS-7, SS-10 &amp; SS12 should be provided. Ideally guidance on building signage and freestanding business related signage should be coordinated and one place for ease of reference. In particular, the totem signage guidance relating to shop fronts should be consistent with guidance on general wayfinding totem signage.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The City Council acknowledges there maybe cross referencing between LW-32 and SS-7. Unfortunately, there will always be a degree of cross reference needed.</p> <p>The City Council does not consider totem signage and wayfinding equally comparable.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE LW-32</u></b></p> <p><b>Key components</b></p> <p>The below key components should work together to create a well proportioned, balanced shop façade, that positively adds to the surrounding street environment. <b>Align with the guidance provided by City Notes SS-7, SS-10 &amp; SS-12 must also be achieved.</b></p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 26: Design of telecommunications infrastructure</u></b></p> <p>The guidance in City Notes LW-61, 62 &amp; 63 is strongly supported.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No Proposed Amendment.</p>

## CANAL & RIVER TRUST

### The Birmingham ID

The city manual does less for identifying what makes the city unique and seeking to protect this when new development is proposed. Therefore, it risks losing the importance of the elements of the city that are special to Birmingham and we suggest that this manual is the place where these things should be identified and protected.

The City Council acknowledges the comment, but given the size of Birmingham and the number of physical, cultural and social elements that collectively give the city its unique identity, it is not considered possible to distil this into a functional element of the DG. By emphasising the importance of undertaking character assessments, if undertaken effectively, development proposal should identity, acknowledge and effectively respond to the unique characteristics.

There is also scope for area specific SPDs, neighbourhood plans, design codes, etc to provide this focused / place specific detail.

No amendments proposed.

<p><b><u>Wayfinding &amp; signage</u></b></p> <p>There is a tension between providing sufficient wayfinding and signage that is informative whilst at the same time not resulting in inappropriate clutter. Whilst the Trust acknowledge that these can result in conflicts, there is often a need for wayfinding and signage, and that a thorough consideration of how best this should be approached might be more helpful than several references to keeping it to a minimum.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Guidance is provided on signage, advertising and wayfinding in the Streets &amp; Spaces Manual.</p>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed glossary</u></b></p> <p>We suggest that some of the terms used throughout the document would benefit from explanation or clarification,</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>A glossary will be added.</p>
<p><b><u>Birmingham ID</u></b></p> <p>DP1: Trust considers '<i>heritage &amp; historic qualities of a location</i>' should be included here, as it is referred to in the supporting text.</p> <p>DP2: suggest the inclusion of a glossary, and that within it, heritage asset, or non-designated heritage asset be included, to clarify where these exist.</p> <p>DP3 / CITY NOTE ID-2: it is important to recognise that the canal network is a heritage asset, and that it should be identified and considered as such in relation to proposed developments close to it. It is</p>	<p>DP-1 – comment noted.</p> <p>DP-2 – comment noted.</p> <p><u>DP-3 &amp; CITY NOTES ID-2 &amp; ID-3</u> The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 1</u></b></p> <p>Development must positively add to Birmingham's diverse identity, through the creation of designs that respond to the physical, cultural, <b>historic</b> and social characteristics of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Design Principle ID-3 is be deleted.</p>

<p>particularly important that all four of the values apply to the canal network (evidence, historic, aesthetic &amp; communal).</p> <p>CITY NOTE ID-3: The Trust welcomes the positive approach of design principle 3 and the supporting detail in City Note ID-3 in relation to heritage matters. It is helpful that it requires not just the identification of significance, but also an assessment of the impact of the proposed development upon the heritage asset(s), as this second element is often overlooked or is not sufficiently robust and evidenced.</p>	<p>majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting process of this SPD.</p>	
<p><b><u>Streets &amp; Spaces City Manual</u></b></p> <p>Should be clearer in the document the canal should be included as a dedicated, usable route.</p> <p>Welcome the requirement for development to create great streets with strong frontages, the Trust is concerned that in doing so, some developments might turn their back on the canal network in preference to the street. The canal network should also be considered, and developments should recognise that waterside design is not the same as for streets. The design should be drawn out from beyond the immediate waterside through the connecting streets, providing activity and engagement with the waterspace.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The City Council supports the need to activate canal side environment and does want development to turn its back on them.</p> <p>CITY NOTES SS-1 &amp; SS-3 – comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Design Principles Document</b></p> <p><b><u>Birmingham’s Great Streets</u></b></p> <p>In designing new buildings, <b>architects designers</b> should ensure their proposals successfully engage and interact with their surroundings; with primary entrances and internal space, sited at <b>street key</b> frontage (<b>roads, canal-sides, public spaces</b>); and users and uses encouraged to spill into spaces (where appropriate). This should lead to buildings that overlook, activate and physically and visually connect with their surrounding public realm.</p>

<p><b>City Note SS-1</b> Trust is concerned that using the word 'streets' might draw development users away from the canal network by seeking to have pedestrians and cyclists passing in front of buildings. The canal and towpath network has some similarities with streets in terms of being linear transport corridors used by pedestrians and cyclists, and it seems appropriate that these might be used as alternatives to streets for travel in some locations.</p> <p><b>City Note SS-3</b> has intentions for active streets and public realm/spaces which again appear appropriate to canals too. Delivering active frontages and/or residential uses at ground level in most locations where it is feasible is very important. Active ground floor uses already noted should also include frequent doors and windows, with few blank walls; and the articulation of facades providing a welcoming feeling; and, where appropriate, lively internal uses visible from the outside. We ask that these concepts be captured within this text and that public realm, streets and spaces be clear that this can include the canal network.</p>		<p><del>Places and streets</del> <i>The public realm</i> should be shaped by the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users; <del>with and</del> road traffic and parking should be carefully integrated to produce a liveable environment which minimises the negative impacts of vehicles such as excessive volumes, fumes and noise.</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> <b>DESIGN PRINCIPLE 4</b> All development must positively acknowledge, enhance and interact with their surrounding <del>street environments</del> <i>public realm</i>; adding to their vibrancy, safety and use.</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>CITY NOTE SS-1</b></p> <p><b>Create safe and inviting, inclusive spaces for people</b> The design of streets, <i>canal-sides</i> and public spaces should be tailored to respond to their location and function; position in the street hierarchy; and the buildings enclosing them.</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> <b>CITY NOTE SS-3</b></p> <p>.</p>
--	--	--



<p><b>City Notes SS-4 &amp; SS-5</b></p> <p>identify important design principles for minimising the impact of and harm from servicing and street clutter, however this needs to extend beyond streets to other publicly accessible areas, and especially the canal network as there are added potential risks from pollution and contamination in the case of waterways.</p>	<p>CITY NOTES SS-4 comments noted.</p> <p>CITY NOTE SS-5 – the next makes reference to the ‘city’s street and spaces’. The City Council consider canal environments fall within ‘spaces’.</p>	<p><b>Active streets and spaces</b></p> <p>The characteristics of streets and spaces are heavily influenced by how buildings and uses relate and enclose them. Development should create proposals that effectively enhance <b>street- public</b> environments, with buildings that interact, activate and engage with the <b>public realm (streets, spaces, watersides, routes) street</b>; creating activity and vibrancy.</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE SS-4</u></b></p> <p>The servicing requirements of a building should not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding street <b>or canal-side</b> environment, either through the location and design of associated building elements; or dedicated areas within the public realm.</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p>
<p><b>City Note SS-6</b></p> <p>It is important that if these are identified as required near the canal network, the historic setting and the ability for the public to access and use the network for a variety of functions is maintained. We ask that where these are proposed near the canals, early dialogue with the Trust is pursued.</p>	<p>CITY NOTES SS-6</p> <p>The City Council believes the bullet points are self explanatory.</p> <p>The bullet point states <i>‘produce unacceptable light pollution’</i>. This is not a prescriptive statement, as such could be applied any</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE SS-6</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Currently infrastructure must be Publicly Available Specification (PAS) 68 or International Workshop Agreement (IWA) 14-1 rated.</u></b></p> <p>Site specific requirements will be advised by the West Midland’s Counter-Terror Unit.</p>

<p><b>City Note SS-7 Advertisements</b></p> <p>The bullet points at the beginning of this section do not appear to have any explanation with them.</p> <p>The point around unacceptable glare from light pollution of adverts needs wider consideration for example, waterside lighting can lead to unnecessary glare, reflection and light pollution of the waterway corridor if it is not carefully designed. Any illumination of adverts should not result in any glare or reflection over the waterspace of the canal corridor to show consideration for bats and other nocturnal species.</p> <p>(We note that driving hazards appears in 2 bullet points, possibly in error)</p> <p>At p10 of document 3, under the heading advertising hoardings, reference is made to the impact on the surrounding environment. We consider that due to the small, historic and linear nature of the canal network, advertising of this size is often overbearing and inappropriate in scale, and we therefore suggest that this be included as a situation where hoardings will be considered inappropriate and not accepted.</p> <p>P11 'green belt &amp; open space' sets out broad definition of open space, but lacks clarity on whether the waterway network would be included in considerations here. We seek clearer wording to</p>	<p>surrounding environment, including canals.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Green belt &amp; Open space – canals will be included within definition.</p> <p>The City Council agrees that canals are transport corridors. As are other nonroad routes. The text does not seek to define a transport corridor, enabling the guidance to be applied to any transport corridor.</p>	<p><i>Proposals close to the canal network, must engage with the Canal &amp; River Trust.</i></p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>City Note SS-7 Advertisements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detract from the character or significance of a heritage asset. driving hazard.</li> <li>• Cause a driving hazard.</li> </ul> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Green belt and open spaces</b></p> <p>These areas will not normally be acceptable locations for the display of advertisement hoardings as they are likely to negatively impact on the openness and appearance of the green belt, landscape or open space. (Open space includes public open space used for recreational and community purposes, private playing fields, <i>canals</i> and linear walkways; central reservations and land adjacent to traffic islands and areas of Nature Conservation).</p> <p><b>Digital and Full-motion advertisements</b></p> <p>Proposals must also demonstrate that the safety of public spaces is not compromised during non-daylight</p>
--	--	---

<p>address this. We therefore seek the addition of the consideration of canal infrastructure, and some clarity around where this is to be applied.</p> <p>We consider that canals are transport corridors and should fall under that heading on p11, in order that the safety of its users is included in for consideration, following from the requirements set out in the Advertisement Regulations.</p> <p>Digital and motion hoardings, as covered on p12, should be located so that their backs are not visible from the canal network, as these can attract ASB and form overbearing or inappropriate visual impacts on users of the canal corridors. They can also cause some light spill which should be avoided.</p> <p>The Trust welcome some clear guidance on the installation of advertisements. However, there is no reference to the requirements of the Town &amp; Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), or recognition that these policies will only apply to those adverts which require consent from the LPA.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>hours, creating periods of over illumination, shade and movement, which could impact on the ability of pedestrians to navigate safely through the city's streets and spaces.</p> <p><i>Proposal must not be sited with their backs visible or overshadowing adjacent public realm, including the canal network; overbearing these spaces and negatively impacting on their amenity and function.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 5: Transport needs of development</u></b></p> <p><b>City Notes SS-11 &amp; SS-12</b></p>	<p>CITY NOTE SS-11 states that <i>New streets and public routes should be linked up and connect seamlessly to the existing network to provide a choice of</i></p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>could provide more detail of the possibility of using tree-lined and well-surfaced towpaths as readily available connections between key areas.</p> <p><b>City Note SS-12</b></p> <p>It suggests interconnect discussions with BIDs and TfWM should happen early. The Trust ask that where signage and routes include elements of the canal and towpath network, the Canal &amp; River Trust also be included in early conversations and that our network is included in the holistic promotion of routes in the city.</p> <p><b>City Note SS-14</b></p> <p>Trust is seeking to make our network as inclusive as possible. In places where we have not yet provided good access, we ask that where appropriate this be included in developers assessments of their sites and ways to improve accessibility to our network included in development schemes or contributions towards access improvements sought via the development management process. As part of this, we may ask for assistance in providing appropriate wayfinding and signage to assist the public in identifying alternative ways to access our network.</p>	<p><i>convenient routes</i>. The City Council recognise the towpaths form part this existing network.</p> <p>SS-12: Comments noted. The City Council recognises the canals and towpaths as a key element of the city’s route network. The Interconnect Wayfinding signage is managed by TfWM.</p> <p>SS-14: comment noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments</u>: none proposed</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments</u>:</p> <p><b>CITY NOTE SS-14</b></p> <p><i>Proposal should seek to enhance accessibility between their site and the surrounding public realm and route network.</i></p>
---	--	---

<p><b>City Note SS-16</b></p> <p>should add some detail of using vegetation to screen canalside areas from parking facilities to minimise intrusive visual impacts where these facilities cannot be located elsewhere. <b>City Note SS-18</b></p> <p>might also specify that any increase in waterborne freight should not result in any detriment of the water and habitat quality of the canals.</p>	<p>SS-16: comment noted.</p> <p>SS-18: comment noted.</p>	<p><b><u>CITY NOTE SS-16</u></b></p> <p><b>Parking typologies</b></p> <p><b>Gates, screens and barriers</b> must be of a design that aligns with its surroundings, limiting their impact on the surrounding environment. When integrated into a building (including an MSCP), gates and screens must align and/or complement the building's material palette or have a justified design rationale for an alternative.</p> <p><i>Parking sited next to a canal must be effectively screened (including planting) to reduce the visual, noise and light impact on the canal.</i></p> <p>SS-18: Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Landscape &amp; Green Infrastructure City Manual</u></b></p> <p><b>Design principle: 6 Landscaping new developments</b></p> <p>The bullet point list includes creating spaces to support health &amp; wellbeing, but the text of the DP and the supporting text does not appear to give much guidance on how this might be achieved or direct the reader to other existing guidance. We note that the Landscape Institute has defined five principles of healthy places and suggest that these be acknowledged or referenced here. They are:</p>	<p><u>DP6:</u></p> <p>The accompanying City Notes to Design Principle 6, provide further guidance on the criteria within the principle.</p> <p>The City Council believes City Notes provide sufficient guidance to help designers</p>	<p><u>DP6:</u> Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>

<p>1. Healthy places improve air, water and soil quality, incorporating measures that help us adapt to, and where possible mitigate, climate change</p> <p>2. Healthy places help overcome health inequalities and can promote healthy lifestyles</p> <p>3. Healthy places make people feel comfortable and at ease, increasing social interaction and reducing anti-social behaviour, isolation and stress</p> <p>4. Healthy places optimise opportunities for working, learning and development</p> <p>5. Healthy places are restorative, uplifting and healing for both physical and mental health condition.</p> <p>Whilst these might go a little beyond what can be delivered by landscape design alone, they appear to support the direction of the draft guidance being proposed, and therefore we suggest that these are relevant and helpful. These principles are also relevant to City Note GI-4. <b><u>City Note GI-1</u></b></p> <p>should also recognise that many existing landscape features exist on site boundaries; whilst they often contribute positively to a site, they can also be more difficult to control through planning and</p>	<p>create landscapes that aid health and wellbeing.</p> <p>City Note GI-1 Comment noted.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendments:</p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE GI-1</u></b></p> <p><b>Protect <i>and use</i> existing landscape assets</b> <i>Development sites and their immediate surrounding</i></p> <p><i>often contain existing landscape features and assets that contribute positively to the landscape character, appearance of the site and surrounding area. These can include existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows,</i></p> <p><i>ponds, streams and grassland; and where</i></p> <p><i>appropriate, these features must be retained and</i></p>
--	--	---

<p>landownership matters. They are important to the context of the site and any new development upon it.</p> <p><b>City Note GI-3</b></p> <p>Would benefit from an indication of what an 'appropriate species mix' might include or how to identify what that is.</p>	<p><u>City Note GI-3</u></p> <p>The City Council does not want to give a definitive species mix as location, site characteristics and landscape design will influence this.</p>	<p>integrated into the development. This will help retain an element of the existing landscape character and local distinctiveness, bring a sense of maturity to the scheme and inform the wider design for the site.</p> <p><b>CITY NOTE GI-3</b> <b>Giving space to landscape</b> In order to help achieve this, proposals must consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>applying an appropriate species mix; whether the mix of species is appropriate, considering biodiversity benefits, local climate, soil composition and site characteristics;</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>City Note GI-6</b></p> <p>makes no reference to designing out crime near waterways. The aim should be to create local space that is safe, welcoming and accessible, and it is important to emphasise that orientation and design can be used to optimise views and surveillance of waterways and improve security. Development of public realm that integrates with and opens up access to the waterway aids reducing fear of and potential for crime.</p>	<p><u>City Note GI-6</u></p> <p>Guidance is provided on ensuring public landscapes are safe. The City Council includes canals as part of the public landscape. The guidance highlights that spaces must be overlooked. Spelling error noted.</p>	<p><u>City Note GI-6 Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Public landscapes</b> Public areas of landscaping should be designed and sited to help support safe use and activity. The nature, role and location of a space or route may dictate specific measures or features that need to be incorporated into a landscape design. But all spaces should ensure they are effectively overlooked and have clear lines of <b>site sight</b> through them.</p>

<p>Text in the public landscapes para should refer to lines of 'sight' not 'site'. <b><u>City Note GI-7</u></b></p> <p>should encourage new development to relate to the waterside and promote the human scale of the waterways, as well as ensuring pedestrian comfort and easy access between the development and the waterway.</p>	<p><b><u>City Note GI-7</u></b></p> <p>The city note relates to the hard and soft elements of a landscape design. The City Council does not believe this is a relevant City Note to include this comment.</p>	<p>City Note GI-7 Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 7 Integrating existing trees into development</u></b></p> <p><b><u>City Note GI-11</u></b></p> <p>gives no mention of the fact that a greater profusion of hard surfaces is likely to lead to more surface runoff and (without effective and adequate drainage) more pollution incidents. Wherever possible, surfaces that allow surface water infiltration should be promoted and included, whilst ensuring this does not result in below ground transfer to waterways.</p> <p><b><u>City Note GI-13</u></b></p> <p>should provide more detail of species recommendations for tree planting, with a particular</p>	<p><b><u>City Note GI-11</u></b></p> <p>Comment noted. The City Council believes a revision to GI-7 to be more appropriate.</p> <p><b><u>City Note GI-13</u></b> – relates to the pruning of trees.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendments: <b><u>City Note GI-7</u></b> <b>Hard landscape features</b> <b>Materials –</b> <i>Materials and their bonding should generally be permeable, to help manage surface water run-off and drainage, whilst considering any wider implications to drainage systems and waterways.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Note GI-13</u></b> Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>



<p>encouragement towards native species, habitat improvement and maximising biodiversity. <b><u>City Note GI-14</u></b></p> <p>provides useful recommendations on use of species to provide transition from forest to woodland edge. The Trust suggest you consider extending this to provide recommendations on transition from woodland to a green towpath verge. <b><u>City Note GI-15</u></b></p> <p>gives clear directions for mitigating hedgerow loss, and the Trust recommend that there be consideration of linking this to the emerging 10% biodiversity net gain requirements as this type of mitigation could assist with such improvements. <b><u>City Note GI-16</u></b></p> <p>would further assist if it included a definite recommendation of tree species to plant, ensuring that they are appropriate to the given environment, with further considerations to maximising biodiversity and improving aesthetics (in that order).</p>	<p>City Note GI-7 provides some broad guidance on species selection.</p> <p><u>City Note G-14</u> – comment noted</p> <p><u>City Note GI-16</u> City Note GI-7 provides some broad guidance on species selection.</p>	<p><u>City Notes GI-14, 15 &amp; 16</u> Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 8 Tree planting in new development</u></b></p> <p>The Trust recommend that native species, pollinators and edible varieties should be selected,</p>	<p><b><u>Design Principle 8</u></b> Comments noted.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>

<p>where possible to increase biodiversity, habitat provision and human interest /engagement as well as being possible to achieve from a more local source and suggest that these be added into this design principle.</p> <p><b><u>City Note GI-22</u></b></p> <p>We welcome the principles set out in this note and ask that it be extended to consider how existing and proposed elements of GI might link together better to form wildlife corridors through the city, as well as linking in with and enhancing the GI corridor formed by the canal network where relevant.</p> <p>The picture of a canal that appears on <u>p25 of the LGI city manual</u> document appears not to be of a location within the City of Birmingham and has no explanation for its inclusion.</p>	<p><b><u>City Note GI-22</u></b></p> <p>The introductory text of City Note GI-22 highlights that <i>‘development should deliver enhancements which add to existing Core Ecological Areas, Ecological Linking Areas and create new habitat resources ....’</i> This address this point. But additional reference to mapping will be added.</p> <p>The picture on p25 is of Kings Cross in London. As with other areas of the DG, non-Birmingham images are utilised.</p>	<p><b><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></b></p> <p><b>City Note GI-22 –</b> Development should deliver enhancements which add to existing Core Ecological Areas, Ecological Linking Areas or create new habitat resources in Ecological Opportunity Areas <i>(as identified on BCC Local Nature Recovery Network mapping)</i>.</p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 9 Design of public open space</u></b></p> <p>The Trust suggest that blue infrastructure is often included within GI and that it should also be referenced here. Opportunities for enhancement could be secured here and the blue infrastructure would gain from being mentioned.</p>	<p>The City Council recognises the importance and role of blue infrastructure as a GI asset. If designers wish to include blue elements in the design of public open space, this is something the City</p>	<p>Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>

	<p>Council would consider. The principle's role is to support the Public Open Space in New Residential Development SPD, which has more prescriptive guidance on the specifics of POS.</p>	
<p><b><u>Healthy Living &amp; Working Places City Manual</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 11 Creating sustainable neighbourhoods</u></b></p> <p>The supporting text about neighbourhoods includes information around walking routes and connections as important elements of neighbourhoods. However, the design principle text should also include links/connections as part of the design principle. links are very important if they are to be successful places and accessible to all.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 12 Increasing densities</u></b></p> <p>The Trust is concerned that this policy suggests that in some cases, which are not altogether clearly identified, it might be acceptable to depart from other policies and elements of the (draft) design guide. Whilst the need for accommodation of a satisfactory standard and the need for increasing quantities is a difficult conflict to address, the requirements for</p>	<p>Design Principle 11 states: <i>'Development shall help support and contribute to the creation of sustainable, <u>accessible neighbourhoods</u> .....</i></p> <p>The inclusion of 'accessible', allied with the supporting text is considered sufficient to cover this comment.</p> <p>Comment noted. Similar comments have been raised by HE and revisions have been proposed to the</p>	<p>Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendment</u>: as detailed within the response to the HE comments below.</p>

<p>good design that responds to local distinctiveness is also a requirement, flowing from the NPPF.</p> <p>The suggestion that larger buildings than would positively represent the character of the surrounding area appears to contradict other elements of this document, and also raises concerns that poor quality might be acceptable if it provided quantity, which also does not sit comfortably with the operation of the planning system.</p> <p><u>It might be best removed, given that it does not appear to follow other advice and guidance in this emerging document.</u></p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 13 Building layout &amp; orientation</u></b></p> <p>Trust ask that it be confirmed and/or clarified that it includes consideration of our network.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 14 Protecting residential amenity</u></b></p> <p>Additional clarity on why departure from the policy might be acceptable would be beneficial here. We ask that this policy also be reviewed in light of the outcome of the examination of the DM in Birmingham DPD and any impacts on the drafting of Policy DM10 which is referred to here.</p>	<p>design principle, as outlined below.</p> <p><u>Design Principle 13</u>  Comment noted. It is the City Council's intension that canals are acknowledged and utilised in this context. The City Council has enabled an exception to be considered in relation Design principle 14, but the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate why an exception should be considered.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u>  <b>Design Principle 13  Layout and Orientation</b>  .....  It is important proposals successfully engage with streets, <b>canals</b> and public spaces, and .....</p> <p><u>Design Principle 14:</u> Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p> <p><u>Design Principle 15:</u>  Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>
--	--	--

<p><b><u>Design Principle 15 Architectural cohesion &amp; quality</u></b></p> <p>There is some concern that the sentence relating to stock book building types might not sit well with the emerging planning system as set out in the recent white paper.</p> <p><b><u>City Notes LW-5 - LW-8</u></b></p> <p>We suggest that the matters set out in notes 5-8 should be reflected in planning application submissions, and therefore ask that this be required, or at least encouraged, to be included in either the DAS or other supporting information as appropriate to the size/scale of the development.</p> <p>The Trust seek some clarification on whether biophilic design represents the local architectural language of Birmingham and whether its requirement will result in contextual, sensitive design.</p>	<p>Comment noted, but house builders are unlikely to move away from this model. But as outlined, these forms to evolve and be flexible in relation to their external appearance.</p> <p>The submitted scheme, via plans, elevation drawings, D&amp;A Statement, perspectives, etc should demonstrate alignment with the DG and all its Design Principles and City Notes.</p> <p>Proposal must consider all design principles in creating a response to a site, with established character being a key consideration. Apply biophilic design principles does not need to result in a proposal being out of context with its surroundings. It just requires an enhanced</p>	<p><b><u>City Notes LW-5 - 8:</u></b> Proposed Amendments: none proposed</p>
---	---	--

	connect to the natural environment, which can be achieved or simulated by a range of means.	
<p><b><u>Design Principle 17 Residential extensions &amp; Design Principle 18 Rooftop extensions City</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Note LW-18</u></b></p> <p>there is no mention of views from the rear or side (or front, if relevant) over open spaces such as the canal network, and therefore these criteria appear not to apply to canalside extensions. Given that there are many rear private gardens that back onto the waterway network in the city, and some areas where houses front onto canals, it would be appropriate to include an indication of what would make extensions towards canals acceptable in design terms. These considerations are relevant throughout this section of the document, including City Notes LW-16-24.</p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-19</u></b></p> <p>It might aid clarity to identify that not all upward extensions require permission and therefore that this guidance cannot apply in all cases as well as adding consideration of the impact of rooftop extensions on the canal network.</p>	<p><b><u>City Note LW-18</u></b></p> <p>The guidance relates to the siting of extensions on a dwelling, whatever their location. But for clarity, amendment will be applied.</p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-19</u></b> Comment noted.</p>	<p><u>City Notes LW-8: Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Side extensions</b> Side extensions, particularly 2 storeys, can have a significant effect on the street scene <b>(or adjacent public space or canal-side)</b> .....</p> <p><b>Rear extensions</b> Extensions at the back do not usually affect the appearance of the street. But where <b>they will be visible from the street or other public space (including canals) it would be visible</b>, greater consideration must be given to the design and its potential effect on the street.</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> <b>City Note LW-19 Rooftop extension apply following as final paragraph:</b></p> <p><b>Note: Permitted Development Rights (PDR) allow certain existing residential and non-residential building to extend upward without requiring planning permission. Applicants are encouraged to check their PDR or contact the City Council to confirm whether planning permission needs to be obtained.</b></p>

<p><b><u>City Note LW-20</u></b></p> <p>Where these would be in close proximity to the waterway network it is important that information is included in their design and consideration that relates to the impact of their construction and ongoing existence on the adjacent waterway infrastructure. The waterway network is a heritage asset and is not always a watertight system; therefore, when planning and proposing a basement extension, this should include that excavations can lead to water ingress which can cause problems for the site and for construction, and also for the drainage system for the site. It is therefore important that additional information is provided when basements are proposed in close proximity to the canal network to demonstrate that they can and will be constructed, drained and retained appropriately. This is important in protecting the structural integrity of the historic waterway network.</p>	<p><u>City Note LW-20</u> Comment noted.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment: <b>CITY NOTE LW-20 Basement extensions</b> <i>apply following as final paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>Basement extension in close proximity to a canal must give specific consideration to the potential impact on this network during construction and by its permanent presence. Early engage with the Canal &amp; River Trust must be undertaken.</i></p> <p><i>As heritage assets, the canal system is not always water tight and proposal must successful account for and manage potential water ingress. In consultation with the Canal &amp; River Trust, appropriate information must be submitted with an application to demonstrate that structural integrity and function of the canal will be retain during and post construction.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 19 Designing non-residential buildings</u></b></p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-28</u></b></p> <p>Whilst much of the guidance contained here seems appropriate, we wish to note that consideration of proposals on sites and at locations near the waterway network have some specific issues and features that we consider worthy of identification and</p>	<p><u>City Note LW-28</u> Comments noted.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment: <b>CITY NOTE LW-28</b></p> <p>Beyond the requirement to locate reception, office functions and staff facilities at property frontage, designs should seek to introduce glazing that provides a visual link to the industrial function of the building. Traditionally these elements are hidden from public view, but as with modern office buildings, having a visual connection/ awareness of industrial activity can</p>

<p>inclusion here. For example, locating service areas away from road frontages often results in vehicle areas at the rear adjacent to the canal network, and this should always be well screened, both visually and for safety reasons to prevent vehicles entering the waterspace unintentionally. This screening should include soft landscaping where possible, as this will also reduce any air pollution reaching the canal corridor. Similarly, glass facades onto the canal can result in engagement, activity, increased surveillance and overlooking, but might also result in increased noise or light spill, which might cause more concern. As mentioned in relation to DP23, light spill should not reach the water surface wherever possible to protect nocturnal species.</p> <p>We seek to encourage staff external spaces in locations such as these, and canalside open/green spaces with picnic tables are a good design feature that promote healthy work patterns, as well as opportunities for improved mental &amp; physical health &amp; wellbeing. Where these sites are towpath side of the waterway, the potential for connections for sustainable travel and commuting should also be investigated and this should be required/encouraged in this guidance.</p>		<p>positively add to the street; and support employee health and wellbeing with increased levels of natural light in their working spaces. <i>Adjacent to a canal, proposals should seek to provide surveillance over the area (balanced with noise or light spill) and use it as an amenity resources for employees, with outdoor space adjacent to it.</i></p> <p>Service areas should be positioned behind buildings, screened from the public realm. Where it can be clearly demonstrated that this cannot be achieved, service areas must be designed to minimise their visual impact on the building and surrounding area. <i>If sites adjacent to a canal, screens must include an element of soft landscape where possible.</i></p>
--	--	---



<p><b><u>City Note LW-32</u></b></p> <p>raises similar potential concerns in relation to light spill from shop frontages (both through large glazed areas and from illuminated signage) this should also be precluded from reaching waterspace in order to prevent glare and protect nocturnal species see comments relating to DP23 for further information.</p>	<p><u>City Note LW-32</u> Comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> <b>CITY NOTE LW-28</b> <i>Units adjacent to a canal, must ensure external lighting or lighting from internal environments prevent glare over the canal.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 20 Creating tall buildings</u></b></p> <p>The Trust seek clarity around the Council definition of tall buildings as being more than 15 storeys. Whilst we recognise that this has previously been used, it is unclear of the evidence to suggest that this is a robust choice. Work following the Grenfell fire has resulted in fresh advice on what defines tall buildings and we seek clarification on this matter.</p> <p>We suggest that applications for tall buildings should be accompanied by assessments of their likely shading impacts, visual impacts and impacts on the wind conditions around the buildings and in public spaces nearby. These public spaces should include the canal network and the impact on towpath users where they are in close proximity.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Phase 1 Report of the Grenfell Enquiry highlighted the discrepancies between what is defined a high-rise building in relation to fire safety between Scotland (11m+) and England &amp; Wales (18m+). It is understood this has or will be considered during Phase 2 of the inquiry. However, this relates to fire safety. It does not relate to a planning definition in relation to Birmingham.</p> <p>City Note LW-44 provides guidance on minimising and mitigating against the impact of tall building on the</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>The emphasis on accepting tall buildings because it makes development viable rather than for their appropriate design, location and physical impacts raises concern over the likelihood of poor decision making and a poor-quality built environment that might result.</p> <p>The orientation of tall buildings relative to the waterway network is important located on the northern side and set back sufficiently with good engaging design they can be positive, whereas where they lie on the southern side and immediately adjacent waterspace they can result in overshadowing of the canal and towpath to an extent that makes it much less attractive for use for any of its many functions and leads to boaters passing through without stopping. It can also result in harm to heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>We therefore suggest that the orientation of tall buildings should be considered and included in the city notes that consider the features that they should incorporate and the design principles that they</p>	<p>surrounding area and climate.</p> <p>It is assumed the comment relates to 'deliverable outcomes'? If so, this is in response to numerous schemes being watereddown in terms of quality postplanning. The City Council would rather work productively with a developer to deliver a high quality, viable scheme from the outset.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledge the comment. These issues will be assessed and considered as part of the requirements of City Note LW-44.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
---	--	---

<p>should follow, especially in relation to <b>City Notes LW-39, 40, 42 &amp; 43</b>.</p> <p>Key views taken into consideration in <b>City Note LW39</b> must include views from the waterway network as this is part of the public realm of the city and impacts upon it affect its attractiveness and use.</p> <p>When considering schemes using <b>City Note LW-40</b> we ask that canals be considered as primary frontage.</p> <p>Where tall buildings are proposed close to the waterway network, additional information should be provided with proposals to demonstrate that their foundation design and construction methodology would not result in any damage or harm to the adjacent canal infrastructure and not harm the structural integrity of the canal network. Whilst detailed advice can be provided on a case by case basis, we consider that the principles of considering the heritage asset of the canal network and any</p>	<p><u>City Note LW-39</u> Yes as part of Birmingham's cityscape, proposals may need to consider views from the surrounding canal network. The guidance does not specify locations, as such will be considered on a site by site basis.</p> <p><u>LW-40</u> This is reflected in LW-46.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledges the term 'street' may not be perceived as referring the surrounding public realm as a whole, as such will amend the text.</p> <p><u>Construction &amp; foundation details</u> Comment noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> <b>CITY NOTE LW-40</b> <b>Street</b> In order to effectively integrate with their surroundings and give a human scale to the building at street <b>level</b>; how the building 'hits' the ground is key.</p> <p>Without becoming a stand-alone element, the base must effectively contribute to the activation of the <b>street public realm</b> and where appropriate, have a façade scale/proportion/emphasis that acknowledge its surrounding street scape context. Successfully considered, the base element can help manage any challenging juxtaposition, whilst effectively launching the grand scale of the building above.</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> <b>Detailed drawings (Design Principle 28)</b> ..... .. This package of information should include appropriate construction drawings, which demonstrate how the design presented will be detailed and delivered.</p>
--	--	--

<p>potential impact upon its structural integrity should be captured in this section of the document.</p>		<p><i>Developments sited next to the canal network, in consultation with the Canal &amp; River Trust, may need to submit foundation designs and construction methodology to understand any potential impacts on the network.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Design principle 21 Developing adjacent to water assets</u></b></p> <p>There are some omissions from the bullet point list in DP21 and suggest that inclusion of the following matters be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We note that water quality is not mentioned all new development should seek to protect or enhance the quality of the water environment, and this relates to demolition, construction and the design/operation of drainage systems. All of these should be fully considered when seeking to protect the water quality of adjacent water assets.</li> </ul> <p>There is no reference to developing adjacent to water assets where there is contaminated land on adjacent development sites and how it could interact with the canal. Given that Birmingham has such a significant industrial legacy, this is an important consideration. Developers and decision makers should never assume that the canals are clay lined and therefore, we would always want to see that an assessment has been made on risk to water quality. Where contaminated land is to be remediated</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges that development must effectively protect and manage water quality; and mitigate and manage any contaminated land issues. The City Council's Regulatory Services assess and manage these aspects; but this element of policy is considered to be beyond the scope of the DG.</p>	

<p>adjacent to the waterways, it is important that pollution pathways are not created that link contaminants with the water environment, and that no seepage or above ground spills/run-off are allowed to reach the waterways. There are also many canal basins which have been infilled which are likely to be within the footprint of adjacent developments. Again, adequate assessment on risk to the canal should be provided to demonstrate the protection of the water quality and structural integrity of the waterway network.</p> <p>We also consider that all new development near water assets should be sensitive to heritage assets and their historic interest, where it is applicable. We therefore suggest that this or similar text be added as a further bullet point on the list in DP21:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enhance the character and heritage of designated and non-designated heritage assets with appropriate scale and material palette</li> <li>2. Whilst we note that water-based travel and exercise is included, waterborne freight is not mentioned and we consider that this could be encouraged as part of the climate change agenda.</li> <li>3. Whilst pluvial flooding risks relating to rivers and watercourses are mentioned, the potential for canal flood risk is not mentioned this can occur after heavy rainfall events, and other risks such as potential</li> </ol>	<p><u>Design Principle 21</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enhancing and acknowledging surrounding character is detailed by Design Principle 2.</li> <li>2. Comment noted.</li> <li>3. Comment noted.</li> </ol>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u>  <b>Design Principle 21</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Where appropriate</i>, support and promote appropriate water based travel <i>(including freight)</i> and exercise.</li> </ul> <p>Development adjacent to the city's <i>water assets rivers or other water courses</i> should effectively mitigate against any potential fluvial <i>or canal</i> flood risk resulting from development.</p>
--	---	--

<p>canal breaches in situations such as when a canal is on an embankment have not been considered. Similarly, flooding of the canal network can also occur in some limited circumstances.</p> <p>Whilst we are supportive of public spaces near waterways and their active relationships, there should also be care taken in the design of these spaces to preclude conflict between linear users of the towpath passing sites, and those joining the towpath from adjacent areas. Good visibility, sufficient space and appropriate features should be included to prevent any conflict from occurring.</p> <p>We acknowledge the criterion relating to opening up culverts, and ask that where this affects the canal network, such as in relation to headwalls where the two connect, the details of these elements are not overlooked. It is important that the proposed changes to infrastructure do not result in risk to the structural integrity or water management function of the waterway network. Similarly, ongoing management and maintenance of such changed culverts need to be captured in perpetuity, and open water may require additional control measures to ensure that they do not become clogged or cease to function for other reasons. These must be designed and installed from the outset and not retrofitted later.</p>	<p>Commented noted.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledges the importance of this interaction; and believes it is a level of detail that should be discussed between CRT, EA and the developers early in the engagement process. This level of site specific detail is not provided by the DG, but the guidance does express the need to work with CRT and EA.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> none proposed</p>
---	--	--

<p>The Trust welcome the opportunity for early engagement on proposed developments and run a free pre-application enquiry service for developers (see <a href="https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialistteams/planning-and-design/our-statutory-consulteerole/what-were-interested-in/pre-application-advice">https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialistteams/planning-and-design/our-statutory-consulteerole/what-were-interested-in/pre-application-advice</a> ).</p> <p>We would welcome the inclusion of our contact address <a href="mailto:planning@canalrivertrust.org.uk">planning@canalrivertrust.org.uk</a> in any further versions of the document, so that developers or the council can make contact with any further queries.</p> <p>The middle column (p50-51) italic text to explain the * refers to the Trust as the Canals &amp; River Trust.</p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-46</u></b></p> <p>would benefit from the inclusion of some detail on adding appropriate waterside plant and flower species wherever possible and supporting wider visual and biodiversity benefits that this brings.</p> <p>Mention of permeable boundary treatments should be clarified to mean permeable in terms of public access through, rather than water permeability (assuming this is what is meant).</p> <p>The guidance in this city note makes no reference to the scale of new developments near waterspaces</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>LW-46 outlines the principle of creating engaging public spaces. in deigning these spaces, designers should refer back to Design Principle 7 (and its City Notes). The DG should be read as a whole.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Design Principle 2 relates to acknowledging and</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> <b><u>Design Principle 21</u></b></p> <p>* <i>In consultation with the Canal and River Trust and/or Environment Agency.</i> <a href="mailto:planning@canalrivertrust.org.uk">planning@canalrivertrust.org.uk</a></p> <p><u>within supporting text:</u></p> <p>* <i>Rivers are classified as Main River or Ordinary Watercourses, with many other forms of waterbodies, including reservoirs and canals. These features are often managed and/or maintained by multiple parties which include Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, Severn Trent Water, <b>Canals Canal</b> and River Trust and Riparian Owners.</i></p> <p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> <b>City Note: LW-46</b></p> <p>Where a boundary between the waterside and private space is desired, these must be <b>visually</b> permeable and constructed of high quality materials, which acknowledge and enhance the character of the waterside.</p>
<p>development should be informed and influenced by the surrounding scale and character of built form and this should be included explicitly.</p>	<p>responding to established character. The DG should be read as a whole.</p>	
<p><b><u>Design Principle 22 Development and works involving historic assets City Note LW-53</u></b></p> <p>would benefit from clarification on how nondesignated assets are identified. Again, this could be included in a glossary as per our earlier suggestion.</p>	<p>City Note LW-53 will be superseded by the emerging Historic Environment SPD. As such, this City Note will be deleted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>City Note LW-53 to be deleted.</p>

<p>development should be informed and influenced by the surrounding scale and character of built form and this should be included explicitly.</p>	<p>responding to established character. The DG should be read as a whole.</p>	
<p><b><u>Design Principle 23 Lighting of buildings and spaces</u></b></p> <p>The Trust advise that waterside lighting affects how the waterway corridor is perceived, particularly when viewed from the water, the towpath and neighbouring land; for example waterside lighting can lead to unnecessary glare, reflection and light pollution if it is not carefully designed. Any external lighting should not provide flood lighting to the canal corridor to show consideration for bats and other nocturnal species but be directed down and within sites/spaces. However, we appreciate that surfaces such as towpaths and other connections may need to be lit to ensure the safety of users, especially commuters in winter months. This type of lighting</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>City Note LW-59 highlights the need to consider impact on wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> non proposed</p>



<p>should be carefully designed and directed to prevent harm to nocturnal species. <b>City Note LW-60</b></p> <p>should be reviewed to clarify the bullet point relating to the lighting of railways, canals and airports in relation to the matters raised immediately above.</p> <p>This advice and guidance on external lighting near waterspace also relates to other sections of the design guide documents, especially at <b>City Notes SS-3, SS-7, LW-28 and LW-32.</b></p> <p>The Trust notes that on <b>p60</b> of the HLWP city manual, there are two good examples of light being used directionally to provide secure routes for people without spilling beyond the public realm. However, there is also an image of the city at night with extreme light glow pollution. It should be made clear that this type of lighting is not to be encouraged.</p> <p>When considering external lighting, its contribution towards reducing energy consumption should also be noted and required.</p> <p>Innovation in lighting and its use should be encouraged.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> non proposed</p>
--	------------------------	--

<p><b><u>Design principle 24 Safe places anti terror measures</u></b></p> <p>Where potential terrorist targets are adjacent or in close proximity to the canal network, it would be helpful for these to be identified and for the Trust to be engaged in discussions around the type and location of the installation of any necessary measures, in order that solutions can be found with minimal harm to the historic fabric and setting of the waterway network, as well as minimising any inconvenience to users of the towpath and waterspace.</p> <p>We ask that where these are proposed near the canals, early dialogue with the Trust is pursued.</p>	<p>This element of guidance relates to the use of laminated glass within buildings. The response and amendment proposed to City Note SS-6, related to infrastructure within the public realm.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 25 Design of waste storage</u></b></p> <p>'storing waste in a location that does not impact on property frontage or the surrounding'. however, if this results in waste being stored in locations adjacent to the canal this can result in harm to the canal corridor environment.</p> <p>we ask that an additional criterion be added to protect the quality of the waterway environment.</p> <p>p.57 – 'waste CHUTES' not 'waste SHOOTS'</p>	<p>The canal is considered to fall within 'the surrounding environment'.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u>  <b>Design of waste storage</b>  ..... the store should be supported by appropriate infrastructure (such as waste <b>shoots</b> <b>chutes</b> and in flat recycling bins) that enables ease.....</p>

<p><b><u>Design Principle 26 Design of telecommunications infrastructure</u></b></p> <p>Where telecommunications infrastructure is installed near the waterway network, it benefits from soft landscaping to screen installations and especially ground based equipment compounds. This soft landscaping should be a requirement of these developments, and it should be added that wildlife friendly features could be included within this, such as those to encourage nesting of black redstarts, peregrines or other protected species.</p>	<p>City Note LW-63 provides guidance on screening and masking infrastructure.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> non proposed.</p>
<p><b><u>Efficient &amp; Future Ready City Manual</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 27 Creating efficient and futureready buildings</u></b></p> <p>The Trust is disappointed that whilst the installation of LDC decentralised energy infrastructure is mentioned, it omits any mention of the canals, rivers and watercourses as potential sources of LDC energy and we ask that this be reconsidered and added in appropriately. The Trust are happy to provide further advice and expertise on this to aid your discussions. <b><u>City Note EF-2</u></b></p> <p>it misses the opportunity to seek improvements to existing situations, such as when sites are</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>City Note EF-3</b>  As suggested within BDP Policy TP4, the characteristics of the site and its surroundings will inform which methods of generation are viable for the development. <b><i>Whilst on-site generation may be feasible, proposal must also consider utilising the energy and heat &amp; cooling potential of the city's canal network and other water courses; or the potential to connect to Birmingham's District Energy Scheme networks.</i></b>  <del>Having established this early within the design process, proposals must effectively integrate the infrastructure into the architecture of the building/s.</del></p>

<p>redeveloped, or developments are altered/extended. In these situations, misused, misconnected or pipes/drains in poor condition can be identified and rectified as part of the requirements of the planning process.. <b>City Note EF-3</b></p> <p>it makes no reference to the opportunities presented by the extensive canal network in the city of using them as a resource in a range of ways, including using them for heating &amp; cooling and water source heat pumps.</p>		<p><i>Where on-site infrastructure is proposed, on building or within the public realm, the infrastructure must be effectively integrated into the wider design.</i></p> <p><b>Considered</b></p> <p>Applied effectively, the infrastructure can be subsumed into the building's design; or used as an architectural feature.....</p> <p><b>City Note EF-2</b></p> <p><i>During construction, developers are encourage to remedy any water leaks or poor systems on their site to reduce water loss and surface water drainage issues.</i></p>
<p><b>Superseded documents</b></p> <p>city council have not been able to identify the document at no.15 on the list and suggest that this reference be removed.</p> <p>The document at no.8 on the list Lighting places however, is considered to be more comprehensive and contain more thorough details than any of the various references in the city manuals that relate to lighting resulting from various sources or requirements. We therefore suggest that this omission be reviewed and addressed in any changes proposed to the SPD before it progresses to the next stage.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Existing guidance to be superseded</b></p> <p>9. Location of <del>advertisiement</del> <b>advertisement</b> hoardings (N/A).</p> <p><b>15. Canalside development in Birmingham design guidelines.</b></p>
<p>(We also note the typo in the title of the document listed at no.9 on the list and suggest that this be corrected)</p>		
<p><b>ENVIRONMENT AGENCY</b></p>		

<p>(We also note the typo in the title of the document listed at no.9 on the list and suggest that this be corrected)</p>		
<p>In summary, whilst welcoming the acknowledgment of the importance of flood risk mitigation, the Environment Agency would encourage further integration of themes identified in Birmingham's Green Living Spaces Plan which promotes Blue Corridors as part of the city's green infrastructure and a modern approach to SUDs resulting in water permeating to ground as close to source as possible.</p>	<p>The Birmingham Green Living Spaces Plan will be superseded by the work progresses as part of the wider Route to Zero initiative. The City's guidance on the design of SUDs has been created by the lead flood risk authority and should be the primary reference for the design of these elements.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>DESIGN PRINCIPLE 4 - creating great streets</u></b> We would welcome the inclusion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an integrated element of greening flora e.g street trees or wildflowers verges.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Design Principle 4</b> In designing their proposals, architects and landscape architects shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate appropriate anti-terror measures, <b>where required.</b></li> <li>• <b>Provide integrated elements of green infrastructure to provide street-level water management and environmental enhancement.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>DESIGN PRINCIPLE 6 - landscaping new developments</u></b></p> <p>The Design Guide currently states_ <b>Seek to increase bio-diversity through response to the needs of wildlife.</b> To strengthen the wording please amend to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide biodiversity net gain to accommodate the needs of flora, fauna &amp; ecological function</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Design Principle 6</b> In designing proposal, landscape architects should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Seek to increase bio-diversity through response to the needs of wildlife.</b></li> <li>• <b>Provide biodiversity net gain to accommodate the needs of flora, fauna &amp; ecological function</b></li> </ul>

<p><b><u>DESIGN PRINCIPLE 10 - Assessing and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity assets</u></b></p> <p>Please amend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposals likely to affect a protected or priority species or habitat must submit appropriately detailed ecological and/or geological reports</li> <li>• All development must <b>seek to</b> enhance existing biodiversity and geodiversity assets; and create resource that can help increase Birmingham’s ecological network.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Landscape and green infrastructure</u></b></p> <p>We would welcome acknowledgement and integration of Birmingham’s blue infrastructure into this aspect of development consideration as it would</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>       <p>Blue assets are referred to in the opening section of the Theme, but ‘blue’</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Design Principle 10</b> Development proposals likely to affect a protected or priority species <b>or habitat</b> must submit appropriately detailed ecological and/or geological reports .....</p> <p><b>Enhancement</b> All development must <b>seek to</b> enhance existing biodiversity and geodiversity assets; and create resource that can help increase Birmingham’s ecological network.</p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>Landscaping of new development</b> Landscapes can comprise a number of diverse elements and components (hard and soft, <b>blue and</b></p>
--	---	--

<p>ensure that the associated benefits such as placemaking, biodiversity improvements and flood risk management are at the core of future development outcomes.</p>	<p>infrastructure or asset will be added to relevant text.</p>	<p><b>green</b>) that collectively provide an area with its distinct and often unique, landscape character. Birmingham contains a diverse range of landscape character areas, from its hard landscapes in the city centre, to its <b>canal and river corridors; and</b> mature soft landscapes within its suburbs, parks and countryside</p> <p>These different character areas are a product of the relationship between different components, from the urban grain, land-uses and materials palette of the built form, to the topography and land use of open space and its diversity of flora and fauna; <b>and the interaction and role of water (blue) assets.</b></p> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u>  <b>CITY NOTE GI-7</b>  <b>Landscape components and features</b>  Landscape designs should effectively utilise hard and soft elements to create engaging environments that enhance place and positively contribute to the city's green infrastructure network.</p> <p><b>Water assets and features</b> - <i>The integration and use of water in landscape can provide a range of benefits to the space and its users. They can provide a focal point within a design; support the health and wellbeing of users (via interaction, movement, noise); attract wildlife; and contribute to a SuDs system. The canal and river corridors; and mature soft landscapes</i> its suburbs, parks and countryside.</p>
---	--	---

	<p>introduction of new assets that expand the city's blue infrastructure network is supported; but where existing assets lie within a site or adjacent to its proposals must seek to integrate and enhance the asset within the design.</p> <p><b>Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS)</b> primarily these reduce the risk of flooding from both surface water and watercourses in a sustainable and cost effective way. However there are many other benefits to be had, including improved water quality, habitat creation, biodiversity, and the design of more attractive and less engineered environments. SuDS can be retrofitted into streets gardens, parks and open spaces, but in the context of new development, they should be considered at the earliest opportunity, with landscape designers working in tandem with drainage engineers and ecologists. The City Council promotes soft landscape led solutions such as soakaways, filter drains, swales, rain gardens and attenuation ponds rather than more engineered solutions.</p> <p>In designing the SuDs system for a site, applicants must engage with the Lead Flood Risk Authority during the early stages of a design and align with 'The Birmingham Sustainable Drainage: A Guide to Design, Adoption and Maintenance' document. The Design Guide does not supersede or seek to duplicate any element of this document.</p>
--	--



		<p>Further guidance is available in the City Council document 'Sustainable Drainage: Guide to Design, Adoption and Maintenance' <a href="http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/2532/sustainable_drainage_guide_to_design_adoption_and_maintenance">www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/2532/sustainable_drainage_guide_to_design_adoption_and_maintenance</a> and the CIRIA 'Guidance on the construction of SUDS' <a href="https://www.ciria.org/ItemDetail?iProductCode=C768&amp;Category=FREEPUBS">https://www.ciria.org/ItemDetail?iProductCode=C768&amp;Category=FREEPUBS</a> revisions</p> <p><b>Wetlands</b> - these can include features such as Pond- s, reed beds and marshes, which may exist as natural features, or constructed wetlands which are also SuDS. These can be designed on a variety of scales and in dense urban areas can form part of a streetscape with a hard edge. However more often they can form part of a wider landscape and water management scheme on larger development sites. Expert advice from a drainage engineer and an ecologist should be sought when considering the inclusion of these features on a site</p>
<p><b><u>DESIGN PRINCIPLE 21 - Developing adjacent to water assets</u></b></p> <p>We welcome the policies and guidelines outlined within this principle and look forward to supporting risk management authorities in their delivery. Whilst acknowledging that this specific principle refers to development adjacent to water assets when mentioning flood risk, the Environment Agency would encourage consideration that all development.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p><b><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></b></p> <p>Developing adjacent to water assets  Development adjacent to such assets must have an understanding of the potential risks related to the asset and how new development could impact on this.  Directly flow to groundwater is the preferred approach, but further guidance on how development must respond to these potential risks is detailed with the</p>

<p>throughout the city be encouraged to direct flows to groundwater as the cumulative impact of drainage flows to watercourses has significant detrimental impacts in urban environments.</p> <p><b><u>We would suggest the inclusion of the following:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep the water margins as natural as possible free from infrastructure and encourage native flora</li> <li>• Rivers, streams and brooks will require a natural buffer zone free from development or infrastructure to make space for water, biodiversity and associated natural functions</li> <li>• Remove existing structures that may be impeding the natural ecological function of a watercourse and not impose the construction of new structures that could be detrimental to natural functions</li> </ul>		<p>city's 'Sustainable Management of Urban Rivers and Floodplains: Supplementary Planning Document'.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 21</u></b> Proposals should*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Keep the water margins as natural as possible, free from infrastructure and encourage native flora</i></li> <li>• <i>Provide or retain a natural buffer zone free from development of infrastructure adjacent to rivers, streams and brooks to make space for water, biodiversity and associated natural functions</i></li> <li>• <i>Remove existing structures that may be impeding the natural ecological function of a watercourse and not impose the construction of new structures that could be detrimental to natural functions.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Birmingham Design Guide - Healthy Living and Working Places City Manual</u></b></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE LW-2 - Street environment</u></b></p> <p>street width/building heights - Due to the challenging nature of managing water and associated flood risk in urban environments, the EA would suggest and support consideration of accommodating street-level water management. Green verges providing</p>	<p>The City Council supports this comment, but believes a revision would be more appropriately sited within the Streets &amp; Spaces Theme, as</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 4</u></b> In designing their proposals, architects and landscape architects shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate appropriate anti-terror measures, <i>where required.</i></li> </ul>

<p>sustainable draining during rainfall events and development discharge, as well as the consideration of permeable paving and road surfacing. Enabling water to permeate to ground as close to the point of its initial discharge or falling, thereby removing significant pressure during flood events on piped utility systems and the river networks these drain to.</p> <p>Promotion of green roofs, particularly for buildings over a particular size or in a very desirable area?</p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE LW-46 - Overlook, engage and activate water spaces</u></b></p> <p>Naturalisation and developing amenity elements of these water spaces has shown to improve the community and visitor wellbeing as well as increase local biodiversity and flood risk resilience. We would therefore support the daylighting of buried or concealed water assets where possible to provide additional benefit locations throughout the city.</p>	<p>this relates to their design. The proposed revision seeks to address this comments and that made in relation to Deign Principle 4.</p> <p>The use of green roof is promoted by City Note GI-7</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Provide integrated elements of green infrastructure to provide street-level water management and environmental enhancement.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b>HISTORIC ENGLAND</b></p>		
<p><b><u>General wording issues also arise including the following:</u></b></p> <p>1. 'Undesignated' and 'non-designated' assets - it is <u>recommended that non-designated assets are referred to throughout the documents</u> in respect</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 'undesigned' will be changed to 'nondesigned' through the document.</li> <li>2. 'Historic assets' will be changed to 'heritage assets' throughout the document.</li> </ol>

<p>of the historic environment in line with NPPF terminology;</p> <p>2. 'Historic assets' - this term is used throughout the documents comprising the SPD and it is recommended that it is replaced with the term '<u>heritage assets</u>' in line with NPPF terminology for the avoidance of doubt; and,</p> <p>3. <u>Architects</u> - architects are referred to specifically within the SPD material and we would suggest <u>revising those references to read 'developers or their agents'</u> instead to ensure the SPD is applicable to all those working in the built environment.</p>		<p>3. 'Architects' will be changed to 'developers throughout the document.'</p>
<p><b>1) BDG Design Guide Principles document</b></p> <p><b><u>Page 15 - Birmingham's historic environment –</u></b></p> <p>In the bullet point (BP) list the header refers to five recognised national designations but includes nondesignated assets as one of these so will need revising.</p> <p><b><u>Page 15: last paragraph of first text column –</u></b></p> <p>This states that '<b>The City Council does not view the act of conservation as preserving heritage unchanged</b>'. The NPPF Section 16 sets out sustaining, conserving and enhancing the historic environment and helpfully defines 'conserve' in</p>	<p>Page 15 Comment noted.</p> <p>This Design Principle will be superseded by the emerging Historic Environment SPD. As such, this design principle will be deleted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p>Page 15 – Birmingham's historic environment</p> <p>Birmingham's historic assets fall under .....:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listed buildings and structures.</li> <li>• Scheduled ancient monuments.</li> <li>• Registered parks and gardens.</li> <li>• Conservation areas.</li> <li>• <del>Non-designated heritage assets.</del></li> </ul>

<p>relation to the historic environment in its glossary. The Council may wish to consider the current SPD wording in respect of its duties for 'preserving' in relation to The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p><b><u>Page 15 - Design Principle 3: Significance and setting of a heritage asset</u></b> - In terms of the associated text, would it be more relevant to reword the principle to 'Development affecting heritage assets or their setting' or 'Heritage Statements' or a similar alternative? It is not clear what this principle adds to that which is already set out in NPPF para.189 and Planning Practice Guidance Para 009 Ref ID 18a-009-20190723.</p>		
<p><b><u>Page 25 - Design Principle 6: Landscaping new developments –</u></b></p> <p>You may wish to consider including reference to Historic Landscape Characterisation information which can help inform rural and urban development <a href="http://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/historic-landscape-characterisation/">historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/historic-landscape-characterisation/</a></p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u></p> <p><b>CITY NOTE ID-1</b>  <b>Elements of a Character Assessment</b>  Public realm/art/landscape  What role does public realm, art and/or landscape play in characterising the surrounding area? Are there mature landscape features that add to character? Is there a defined materials and/or materials palette? Is the public realm dominated by hard or soft landscape? Are streets framed by hedgerows or trees? Does the site and</p>

		<p>surrounding fall within a distinct or important landscape character?*</p> <p>* It may be appropriate to undertake a wider landscape character assessment <b>or Historic Landscape Characterisation</b> of an area, to understand the quality and potential impact of development.</p> <p><a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/historic-landscapecharacterisation/">https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation/historic-landscapecharacterisation/</a></p>
<p><b><u>Page 39 - Design Principle 12: Increasing densities –</u></b></p> <p>It is unclear how the Council could support or promote a change in character, without prejudice to any future decisions, unless this is already set out in development plan policies and it is recommended that this is clarified within the SPD if the current wording is pursued. At present it could be interpreted as the Council potential supporting/promoting changes in character of areas through the SPD which is not the role of this level of document.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The City Council believes from a design perspective, it may be possible to increase densities to certain locations to help enhance environment. However, it acknowledges the comments linked to the draft text that may be considered to stray beyond the scope of the SPD.</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u></p> <p><b>Building at densities appropriate to good, accessible place making</b></p> <p>Increasing the density of development in the right location can make a significant contribution to place, introducing activity and intensifying primary uses, which in turn can help aid the vibrancy of neighbourhoods. The challenge is to deliver this successfully within the context of established character areas, where scale and mass can be important <b>characteristics</b>. In these scenarios, innovative architectural solutions will need to be developed to increase density, whilst acknowledging character. <b>Not every existing character</b></p>

		<p>area will be able to accommodate increased densities; and the appropriateness of any design response will be considered on a site by site basis.</p> <p><del>The City Council encourages architects and developers to rise to this challenge; creating high quality housing and employment space that uses land and resources efficiently. In order for the city to meet its housing and employment needs, innovative solutions will be needed. Within the city centre high density development is supported; and in the urban centres introducing higher density schemes, in appropriate locations will help sustain these important local centres.</del></p> <p><del>Beyond these established mixed use centres, There may also be scope for density increases where designs can effectively integrate the increased built form of the building into an established character area. Where a change in character is promoted or supported by the City Council, proposals must understand the role of the development site within the wider area of change, and create designs that respond to this.</del></p> <p>In creating architectural solutions, design should ensure the quality of internal and external environments are not compromised as a result of density increase. Architects</p>
--	--	--

		<p>should use these opportunities to apply their skills and creativity to design buildings that respond successfully to these challenges; delivering new forms for living and working. If designs lead to an increased focus on shared amenity space and public realm (with less private space), these must be quality, functional, landscaped spaces</p> <p>that can respond to the competing health and wellbeing needs of users. <i>Any proposed reductions in separation distances will be considered in the context of Design Principle 14.</i></p> <p><i>Where a change in character is promoted or supported by the City Council (within policy or guidance), proposals must understand the role of the development site within the wider area of change, and create designs that respond to this.</i></p> <p><b>DESIGN PRINCIPLE 12</b>  <b>Increasing densities</b></p> <p>Where proposals are seeking to increase the scale and density of buildings, resulting in a scale, height and/or mass above those that positively characterise the surrounding area, designs must demonstrate how a change in scale will enhance the surrounding area. <i>are unlikely to be supported, unless the proposal will not result in a negative impact on the surrounding character area.</i></p> <p>Where a change in character is supported or promoted by the City Council <i>within policy or guidance</i>, designs must deliver coherent outcomes that establish a justified scale and environment that</p>
--	--	---



		<p>can help redefine and enhance the character of a given area; and acknowledge the role of the development site in this wider context.</p> <p>The density of a proposal must not impact on the quality of <i>residential amenity</i> or place. Architects must actively respond to any challenges posed by introducing high density schemes, creating create innovative designs that enhance their surroundings and deliver quality, functional internal and external environments that support health and wellbeing.</p>
<p><b><u>Pages 52-53 - Development and works involving historic assets –</u></b></p> <p>'Historic assets' should be replaced with 'heritage assets' as set out in the general comments section above. In terms of para.3 of the text, would 'conserved' be a more appropriate word than 'preserved'? There are also concerns in relation to para.5 and demolition - is the Council satisfied that the wording is in line with NPPF requirements?</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>This Design Principle will be superseded by the emerging Historic Environment SPD. As such, this design principle will be deleted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>City Notes LW-49 to LW-54 to be deleted.</p>
<p><b><u>Page 53 - Design Principle 22: Development and works involving historic assets –</u></b></p> <p>'It is not clear why assets don't include scheduled monuments or registered parks and gardens since</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>This Design Principle will be superseded by the emerging Historic Environment SPD.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>City Notes LW-49 to LW-54 to be deleted.</p>

<p>development and works can also affect these designated assets. If the principle is referring to built form only it should be made more clear in the overall text of this section. In addition 'detrimental impact' is referred to but not harm. It may be clearer to refer to NPPF requirements for the historic environment as an introduction.</p>	<p>As such, this design principle will be deleted.</p>	
<p><b><u>Pages 74-75 - Works to and consents for historic assets</u></b></p> <p>'Historic assets' should be replaced with 'heritage assets'</p> <p>Preserve is also used here again, would conserve be a more suitable alternative in line with NPPF terminology especially as this part addresses all heritage assets not just those covered by the 1990 Act? There is some duplication of subject matter included at pages 52-53 in this part which doesn't help the document flow. Should a cross reference also be made to Design Principle 3 here?</p> <p>The references to Scheduled Ancient Monuments should be revised to Scheduled Monument and also Scheduled Monument Consent.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Design principle 3 will be deleted and superseded by the Historic Environment SPD.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>Design Principle 3 to be deleted.</p>
<p><b><u>2) BDG ID City Manual</u></b></p> <p>The inclusion of the historic environment as a key part of the city's identity in this manual is welcomed.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>'Birmingham's Historic Assets' section of the City</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>Design Principle 3 to be deleted.</p>

<p>'Historic assets' should be replaced with 'heritage assets' as set out in the general comments section above.</p> <p><b><u>Pages 10 -13 - City Note ID-2 and City Note ID-3</u></b></p> <p>=</p> <p>The content here is not clear in relation to the significance of heritage assets and setting. It is recommended that the content of the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance is revisited to clarify values, in addition to HE's HEAN 12 information:  <a href="http://historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/statements-heritage-significanceadvice-note-12/heag279-statements-heritagesignificance">historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/statements-heritage-significanceadvice-note-12/heag279-statements-heritagesignificance</a></p> <p><b><u>Pages 14-15 - Historic designations –</u></b></p> <p>Should this be 'Heritage Assets' instead of historic designations? Heritage assets are set out here when they have already been referred to in the Design Principles document. If it is considered appropriate to continue to include in this manual, it is recommended that the designations information is set out before the significance information.</p>	<p>Manual will be superseded by the Historic Environment SPD. As such, this element of the City Manual will be deleted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>City Notes ID-2 &amp; ID-3 to be deleted.</p>
<p><b><u>3) BDG Streets and Spaces City Manual</u></b></p> <p>The aspirations for a safe and active environment set out in the manual are welcomed, along with the</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>specific references to historic environment elements. We particularly welcome the supplementary information relating to advertisements which can help appreciate and understand an area or use more, but also have the potential to harm the historic environment as well public realm and streetscape in general.</p>		
<p><b><u>4) BDG Landscape and Green Infrastructure City Manual</u></b></p> <p>Trees and landscaped elements often form part of the character of Conservation Areas and can have a positive effect on the historic environment in the main. We would suggest considering cross referencing historic environment considerations in the last sections where references to Sutton Park are made since landscaping works may also require Scheduled Monument Consent.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Designation attached to any landscape features or assets should be identified by the applicant; and if not will be identified by the LPA.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendments:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>5) BDG Health Living and Working Places City Manual</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Pages 38-42 - Shop Fronts Design</u></b></p> <p>The information relating to shop fronts, signage, services and plant, conversions and upper floor uses is welcomed. It is not clear how the Council intends</p>	<p>Comment noted. Reference to CAA and Management Plans will be added to the guidance.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u>  <b>CITY NOTE LW-31</b>  <b>Key design principles</b>  The architectural period and historic use of a shop front and/or host building will have an influence on the detailing and proportions associated with a specific design; but the key components of a shop front have</p>

<p>to link this information with relevant information contained in Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans.</p>		<p>endured and should be appropriately integrated into any refurbishment, replacement or new shop front.</p> <p>Where an existing historic shop front is present, all components and detailing should be retained and restored. If an historic shop front has previously been removed, new development should reinstate a traditional design.</p> <p><b>Local guidance</b>  <i>If the property / site lies within an area that has a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, local design guide, neighbourhood plans or design codes in place / adopted, relevant guidance within these documents should be used to help inform the shop front design and signage.</i></p>
<p><b>Pages 43-50 - Tall Buildings –</b></p> <p>There is concern that this section includes information which goes beyond the role of a SPD. In particular City Note LW-45 sets out information on the location of tall buildings. This is new information which is not informed by any robust evidence base, including Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal or by Mapping zones of Theoretical Visibility. Neither is it included in any adopted development plan documents.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledges the comment made and is proposing to review its approach to the location of tall buildings.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment:</p> <p><b>City Note LW-45</b>  <b>Location The siting of tall buildings</b>  The development of well designed tall buildings may be supported in the following locations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>The City Centre Core (as defined by the BDP Plan 5 p.41 and at City Note LW 44).</del></li> <li>2. <del>Along the primary corridors and gateways from the A4540 into the City Centre Core.</del></li> <li>3. <del>Within large scale regeneration projects and areas of change, where the role of a tall building can be justified.</del></li> </ol>

<p>There is the potential for significant environmental effects in respect of the historic environment in terms of the locations set out in the SPD but we have not been consulted on a Screening opinion for the document and are not aware of any associated Strategic Environmental Assessment associated with this document.</p> <p>The 2003 Tall Buildings Strategy is not current and should be revisited as part of the development plan review process with an evidence base of assessment and analysis to identify areas where taller buildings may be appropriate.</p> <p>We would respectfully submit that the Design SPD is not the appropriate way to deal with the issue of taller building locations and that City Note LW-45 should be deleted and considered at the appropriate strategic level through plan review.</p>		<p><del>Tall buildings will not be accepted:</del></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1. Within any of the city's conservation areas.</del></li> <li><del>2. In locations that would have an unacceptable impact on the significance of a listed building or heritage asset.</del></li> <li><del>3. Where it would impact negatively on the city's skyline, an existing character area, key views and/or an existing landmark building.</del></li> <li><del>4. Lead to unacceptable impact on surrounding environment or adjacent uses.</del></li> <li><del>5. Where it is contrary to specific site or area guidance within a draft or adopted SPD.</del></li> </ol> <p><del>Where a proposal is seeking support for a tall building that does not align with these locations or criteria, applicants must clearly demonstrate how their proposal will positively enhance its surroundings and contribute to the wider place-making agenda of Birmingham.</del></p> <p><del><i>In assessing the acceptability of a proposed site for a tall building/s, consideration will be given to the following factors:</i></del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>- character of the surrounding area and the potential impact the proposal may have on this</del></li> <li><del>- the role and potential role</del></li> </ul>
---	--	---

		<p>- the location and hierarchical position of the site</p> <p>- within the street scene and urban block</p> <p>- relationship with existing landmark buildings, presence within existing views / street scene and impact on the skyline</p> <p>- impact on the surrounding heritage assets</p> <p>- impact on surrounding environment and adjacent uses</p> <p>To aid this assessment, applicants must undertake a Townscape Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) in line with the Landscape Institute's Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3) (or superseded) together with a detailed site analysis to help justify why the proposed site is suitable for a tall building, and the development proposed will be a positive addition to the surrounding area and wider cityscape.</p> <p>The information and analysis provided must also be accompanied by a 3D model compatible with the City Council's City Model.</p>
<p><b><u>Page 53 - Conserving and utilising Birmingham's Historic Assets –</u></b></p> <p>Historic assets' should be replaced with 'heritage assets' as set out in the general comments section above. As with comments on Design Principle 22, if</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>'Birmingham's Historic Assets' section of the City Manual will be superseded by the Historic Environment</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>City Notes LW-49 to LW-54 to be deleted.</p>

<p>the city note is referring to built form only it should be made more clear in the overall text of this section.</p> <p><b>Page 56 - typo</b> - Should read 'de minimis', not, 'diminimus'.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas</b> - It is not clear how these statements sit with management tools set out in Conservation Area Appraisals/Management Plans.</p>	<p>SPD. As such, this element of the City Manual will be deleted.</p>	
<p><b>6) BDG Efficient and Future-ready City Manual</b></p> <p>The intentions of City Note EF-5 are welcomed. You may find HE's information on energy efficiency in relation to historic buildings of use in this respect:  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technicaladvice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technicaladvice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/</a></p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment:  <b>City Note EF-5</b>  <b>Building re-use</b>  <i>Historic England provide a range of technical guidance related to enhancing the energy efficiency of historic buildings, which could be applied to a range of existing buildings.</i>  <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technicaladvice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/">Historic England advice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/</a></p>
<p><b>HUB</b> (residential developer)</p>		
<p><b>Design Principles 14 and 16 –</b></p> <p>In respect of residential amenity and outdoor amenity spaces, we are supportive of ensuring suitable and diverse amenity provision, particularly where this will enable the wellbeing of future</p>	<p>As reflected in the NPPF design principles 14 &amp; 16 seeks to ensure high levels of residential amenity for existing and new dwellings.</p>	<p>Proposed amendment: none proposed.</p>



<p>residents. However, the amenity requirements set out within Design Principles 14 and 16 will need to be balanced with other key considerations including site context and other benefits that a proposed development might provide. If applied too rigidly, or onerously, as quantitative requirements then they could stifle quality and innovation.</p>	<p>The City Council believes having numerical standards as minimum standards helps to deliver quality residential environments and provides consistency to the developers.</p> <p>But as reflected in the Design principle and accompanying City Note, exceptions to these numerical standards will be considered where an applicant can demonstrate high levels of amenity are achieved and/or retained by their design.</p>	
<p><b><u>Design Principles 12 and 20 –</u></b></p> <p>Guidance provided in relation to increasing densities and tall buildings are supported, although will need to be applied with balance and with allowance for exceptional circumstances where this can be justified. Ultimately the common aim for developers and the City Council should be to achieve the optimal development of a site at an appropriate density and of a suitable scale for its context and the character of the local area. These will also be key</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The City Council has proposed a revision to its guidance on the siting of tall buildings in response to comments received from HE.</p>	<p><b><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></b></p> <p>Please see proposed revisions to the location of tall building above (see Historic England comments &amp; response).</p>

<p>factors affecting the deliverability of the proposed development.</p> <p>It is also agreed that there is a need to manage the acceptable location of tall buildings, and provide further guidance for areas that may be more sensitive to the impacts of scale. However, it is not necessary to prevent any tall buildings from coming forward within conservation areas, provided it is made clear that context and respect for heritage assets and character will be key considerations for any proposed developments.</p>		
<p><b><u>Design Principle 22</u></b></p> <p>We are supportive of heritage assets being conserved, protected, and respected where possible as part of the development and regeneration process. The draft design guide sets out that new development can add to and enhance such designated heritage assets, which we would support. The guidance should also acknowledge the importance of technical inputs through appropriate heritage appraisals to ensure suitably robust consideration is made of the potential harm to any</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>This Design Principle will be superseded by the emerging Historic Environment SPD. As such, this design principle will be deleted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>Design Principle 22 to be deleted.</b></p>
<p>heritage assets affected by emerging design proposals.</p>		
<p>Overall, HUB support the purpose and general principles of the draft Design Guide as a single coherent document to assist with ensuring the delivery of high quality, inclusive, and sustainable development within the City. They also support the recognition within the guidance of the need for developers and investors to employ their own design teams and to bring forward innovative proposals that contribute to the evolving character and identity of the City.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>
<p><b>IMP PROPERTIES PLC (development partner for Peddimore)</b></p>		

heritage assets affected by emerging design proposals.		
<p><b><u>ID-2: HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE</u></b></p> <p>The DBDG sets out that significance can be gauged on one or more of four values. The values identified are evidential, historic, aesthetic and communal. It is noted that these terms are taken from ‘Conservation Principles’ (2008) by Historic England. <u>A consultation on a revised ‘Conservation Principles’ closed in February 2018 with the findings of the consultation currently being analysed. The revised guidance may be issued during the preparation of the final Birmingham Design Guide, which BCC should monitor for implications on the DBDG.</u></p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>This Design Principle will be superseded by the emerging Historic Environment SPD. As such, this design principle will be deleted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>City Note ID-3 to be deleted.</b></p>
<p>Furthermore, BCC should ensure the ID-2 is consistent with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which refers to ‘architectural or historic interest’ of listed buildings and the ‘character or appearance’ of conservation areas in relation to historic significance. In addition, it should be noted and recognised in ID-2 that the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) (February 2019) glossary identifies that significance may be ‘archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic’.</p> <p><u>In light of the above, ID-2 should acknowledge that different criteria for the definition of significance exists.</u></p>		
<p><b><u>ID-3 SIGNIFICANCE OF SETTING</u></b></p> <p>As set out at paragraph 9 of Historic England’s ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3’ (2007) - setting is not itself a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation. Instead, its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset. Annex 2 of the NPPF clarifies that “elements of setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance, or may be neutral” define setting of a heritage asset.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>This Design Principle will be superseded by the emerging Historic Environment SPD. As such, this design principle will be deleted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>City Notes ID-3 to be deleted.</b></p>

<p>To ensure compliance and consistency with the NPPF and national guidance it is recommended that where ID-3 refers to the “significance of setting” reference should instead be made to the contribution made by setting to the significance of the heritage asset. Consideration must also be given to setting and the impact that potential new development may have on the contribution it makes to significance of the asset.</p>		
<p><b><u>LW-28: STORAGE, DISTRIBUTION AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS</u></b></p> <p>IMP generally support the design principles set out at LW-28, particularly in relation to the provision of visual links; use of cladding materials and roof design for articulation and interest; building orientation; and use of landscaping and public art to enhance of the appearance of non-residential buildings.</p> <p>There is an opportunity in the DBDG to ensure that the design of non-residential buildings is not homogenised and instead offer diversity and variation to celebrate the international profile of Birmingham as destination for business. Therefore, on a site wide basis, non-residential buildings should offer different architectural design and language to add visible interest, which reflect the aspirations of occupiers in tandem with BCC.</p>	<p>The City Council believes the guidance in the DG related to non-residential developments will help developers create modern working environments that also enhance the wider context. This can help guide site specific design responses.</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>

<p><b><u>EF-1: ENERGY EFFICIENCY</u></b></p> <p>EF-1 states that “the initial focus of designs should be to reduce the energy demands of a building with the residual energy requirements provided by appropriate decentralised and/or renewable energy technologies”. Whilst IMP support this approach towards net zero; it is unclear why and how residual energy requirements will be achieved by decentralised and/or renewable energy technologies. It is considered that this statement needs to be explained in further detail to support the consideration of future net zero strategies for nonresidential buildings.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The City Council acknowledges the error.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> <b><u>City Note EF-1</u></b></p> <p><b>Energy Efficiency</b> The initial focus of designs should be to reduce the energy demands of a building; with the residual energy requirements <i>needed</i> provided by appropriate decentralised and/or renewable energy technologies, <i>where possible</i>.</p>
<p><b><u>EF-3: DECENTRALISED ENERGY GENERATION</u></b></p> <p>In most cases, storage, distribution and industrial building are unheated, so systems like combined heat and power are not required.</p> <p>Consequently, IMP consider that the requirement to explore the provision of routing and ducting to / from storage, distribution and industrial buildings is inappropriate if systems like combined heat and power are not technically and operationally feasible.</p>	<p>The users of industrial buildings can change over time, as can their energy and heat requirements. As such, it is important developers considered future flexibility and change. City Notes EF-3 reflects this.</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>

<b>LANGLEY SUTTON COLDFIELD CONSORTIUM</b>		
<p><b><u>Design Principle 4: Creating great streets</u></b></p> <p>Bullet 7 seems to imply the engagement of local artists in the design of every single street in Birmingham, which is clearly not the aim of the guidance. It may be appropriate for local artists to engage with aspects of larger schemes, particularly in assisting with the creation of unique local character. We suggest that this requirement is removed from Design Principle 4 and moved to Design Principle 1. It should refer to the proportionate engagement of artists in strategic proposals where they will add value in the creation of local identity or beauty.</p> <p>Caution is needed in advising that anti-terror measures are needed (in some way) in every street. This requirement should be caveated with the insertion of text stating 'where necessary'. Specific anti-terrorism measures will not be necessary in most streets, and this amendment would better reflect the detail of City Note SS-6.</p>	<p><u>Bullet point 7</u> Comment is noted. The City Council agrees that artist engagement may be appropriate in larger schemes.</p> <p><u>Bullet point 10</u> Comment is noted. The City Council agrees that antiterror measures may only be needed where necessary.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>Design Principle 4</u></b> .....shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>In large scale schemes, where appropriate,</i></b> engage local artists in the design process to aid the creation of innovative, engaging, playful environments.</li> <li>• Where appropriate, provide spaces for community, cultural activities and facilities for exercise, sport and play and resident engagement.</li> <li>• Avoid street clutter.</li> <li>• Incorporate appropriate anti-terror measures, <b><i>where identified as necessary.</i></b></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Design Principle 15: Architectural cohesion and quality</u></b></p> <p>Innovation should be encouraged, but it is not necessary for the creation of great places. Sometimes the best design solutions are to follow</p>	<p>The City Council recognises the desire of the respondent to support the application of 'traditional' (house type)</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strong, <b><i>innovative creative</i></b> architectural concept <b><i>and rationale.</i></b></li> </ul>

<p>tradition. Whilst architectural innovation therefore has a part to play, we do not believe that this should be a requirement for every scheme. <b>We therefore suggest that bullet two is amended to require 'a strong design concept'.</b></p>	<p>forms, but the City Council believes homes should reflect the modern needs and desires of today's society, whilst using and learning from the 'traditional'. Replication of 'traditional' is unlikely to achieve this.</p> <p><u>To note:</u> innovation in design is likely to be needed to create design that fulfil amenity requirements, whilst being under the numerical standards proposed.</p>	
<p><b><u>Design Principle 16: High quality homes</u></b></p> <p>It is unclear that there is any evidence that supports the requirement for 70sqm which is in excess of many existing properties in and around the city, and limits development to lower densities. We support the delivery of sufficient open space; but are also aware of the desire to increase densities where possible. This fixed requirement should therefore be removed, with instead a requirement to consider amenity space appropriate to the character and density of the proposed development, and proximity to existing outdoor spaces.</p>	<p>As reflected in the NPPF, design principles 16 seeks to ensure high levels of residential amenity for existing and new dwellings. The City Council believes having numerical standards as minimum standards helps to deliver quality residential environments and provides consistency to the developers. The standard were initially adopted by the</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>

	<p>Places for Living SPD, being well-established and robust.</p> <p>But as reflected in the Design principle and accompanying City Note, exceptions to these numerical standards will be considered where an applicant can demonstrate high levels of amenity are achieved and/or retained by their design.</p>	
<p><b><u>Streets and Spaces City Manual</u></b></p> <p><b><u>City Note SS-3 Active streets and space</u></b></p> <p>The note indicates that buildings should generally follow a consistent line along streets except where this detracts from the established local character. In some cases the proposed character may also be enhanced with buildings that vary in building-line along the street. We therefore suggest that this is amended to ‘... except where this detracts from the established local character, or is part of the proposed street character’.</p> <p>Alternatively, this part of the guide should be removed.</p>	<p>SS-3 – comment noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>City Note SS-3</u></b>  Buildings should generally follow a consistent line along streets, parallel to the carriageway, except where this detracts from the established local character, <b>or there is a design rationale for an alternative approach.</b></p> <p><b><u>City Note SS-16</u></b> – No amendments proposed</p>



	<p>Places for Living SPD, being well-established and robust.</p> <p>But as reflected in the Design principle and accompanying City Note, exceptions to these numerical standards will be considered where an applicant can demonstrate high levels of amenity are achieved and/or retained by their design.</p>	
<p><b><u>City Note SS-16 Minimise and manage car parking, ensuring it does not dominate</u></b></p> <p>We note the proposed requirement for designers to refer to BCC's most up to date parking standards; and for schemes to utilise a mix of parking arrangements. The guidance should ensure that sufficient parking is provided in new developments such that problems are not caused with parked cars on verges, or blocking access for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>We disagree with the strict adherence to the sequence of parking suggested under 'Parking to serve residential uses'. Primarily locating parking onstreet as a first consideration is unlikely to ensure that parking does not dominate the street scene. We recommend deletion of the requirement to consider the parking typologies suggested in sequence, and instead advocate the approach in Manual for Streets and (referred to by Manual for Streets) in 'Car Parking: What Works Where' (English Partnerships, 2006), which advocates a range of parking typologies depending on the character of the residential area and the anticipated car ownership of residents.</p> <p>BCC should recognise that car parking provision for new homes needs to be appropriate and that reducing car parking spaces does not equate to</p>	<p>Guidance regarding levels of parking is set out in the recently adopted Parking SPD therefore the Design Guide focuses on layout and design principles rather than supply levels. At the same time, the guidance aligns with the principles of the Birmingham Transport Plan which seek to ensure that parking is managed appropriately and sustainable travel modes are prioritised.</p> <p>The parking typologies are set out in a sequential manner to allow flexibility yet demonstrate that some design methodologies are preferable for ensuring efficient use of space and active and safe streets. Alternative typologies are not precluded and the text states that a mix of typologies is likely to be appropriate.</p> <p>BCC stands by the principle that unallocated/shared</p>	

	<p>Places for Living SPD, being well-established and robust.</p> <p>But as reflected in the Design principle and accompanying City Note, exceptions to these numerical standards will be considered where an applicant can demonstrate high levels of amenity are achieved and/or retained by their design.</p>	
<p>reducing car ownership. BCC should also be mindful that an onerous requirement for additional unallocated car parking may have an impact on design, streetscape and densities. Furthermore the sale of residential properties with restricted allocated car parking provision could impact on sale process and cause financial viability implications for the scheme as a whole.</p>	<p>parking provision, even if accompanied by some on-plot provision, is an efficient way to accommodate varied parking needs and increases activity and safety of the street environment.</p>	
<p><b><u>Healthy Living and Working City Manual</u></b></p> <p>We are concerned with the standards, which are not able to cater for higher density development. In order to test the standards as currently set out we have prepared two 'example' layouts, which seek to show what the standards might mean if applied in accordance with the SPD.</p> <p><b>RETAINING QUALITY AT HIGHER DENSITIES</b></p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-1 Layouts and architectural response</u></b></p> <p>We note the acceptance that proposals may need to reduce the BCC privacy distances and/or the size of private outdoor amenity space, and that solutions to achieve this need to carefully consider internal and external spaces. We agree with this approach. It is not possible to deliver the requirements for residential layout, and amenity (see LW-3 below) and reach densities of 40dph or more without</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges the respondent has created 2 layout to try and illustrate the desires to increase density do not align with the minimum standards related to residential amenity. Yet neither of these layouts seek to create a layout that demonstrate how a quality residential environment could be created via a reduction in the proposed DG standards (which appears to be the thrust of the objections).</p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-1</u></b> – comment noted.</p>	<p><u>City Note LW-1:</u> Proposed amendment: none proposed.</p>

	<p>Places for Living SPD, being well-established and robust.</p> <p>But as reflected in the Design principle and accompanying City Note, exceptions to these numerical standards will be considered where an applicant can demonstrate high levels of amenity are achieved and/or retained by their design.</p>	
<p>compromising at least one of the identified standards. Reducing allocated off street car parking to inappropriate levels would not be a suitable solution.</p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-2 Street environment – street width / building heights</u></b></p> <p><u>It is unclear whether this guidance refers to new proposals or existing proposals, and it is unclear what this part of the guidance seeks to achieve.</u> New proposals are likely to create their own street character, particularly where they comprise a range of street types. The street enclosure or ‘ratio’ is a key element of the character of a street. This <u>guidance should be amended to simply refer to the need to consider street ratios; and in larger proposals that these could relate to both the street hierarchy and character of the areas proposed.</u></p>	<p><b><u>City Note LW-2</u></b> – comment noted.</p> <p>As with all of the guidance, LW-2 relates to new development; and principally relates to high density proposals as detailed within the text.</p>	<p><u>City Note LW-2</u> Proposed amendment: none proposed.</p>
<p><b><u>PROTECTING RESIDENT AMENITY</u></b></p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-3 Residential privacy and overlooking</u></b></p> <p>The guidance notes that exceptions can be made to this policy, but places an onus on any new development to show why these exceptions should be made. However, the guidance as it currently stands, creates the need for exceptions to be allowed because it is not possible to apply all of the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The guidance as written enables applicants on a site by site basis to demonstrate how a quality residential environment will be created, without meeting the minimum standards. The City Council suggests, ‘innovative’ house design, rather than</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u> none proposed.</p>

<p>required standards for residential amenity and create an acceptable quality layout in excess of about 35dph. Densities of up to 40dph would in our view not be possible.</p> <p>The Birmingham Design Guide SPD therefore needs to reflect that, in order to reach densities of greater than 35dph, it will not be possible to meet all of the standards set out in City Note LW-3. The wording of the guidance should therefore be amended to state:</p> <p><i><u>“These standards are for guidance only. It is recognised that for areas where residential densities higher than 35dph are proposed they will not be required to comply with all of the standards set out in the guidance. New proposals that deliver higher densities should therefore set out how street sections and layout will achieve good quality design, with smaller garden sizes, smaller back-to-back distances or reduced street enclosure”.</u></i></p>	<p>‘traditional’ may enable such high density, quality places to be created.</p>	
<p><b><u>Buildings and their uses</u></b></p> <p><b><u>DESIGNING HIGH QUALITY HOMES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-12 Natural light and solar gain</u></b></p> <p>The requirements for natural light and glazing are set out in building regulations. The SPD should not seek to alter building regulations as this will cause confusion. The last sentence of the first paragraph</p>	<p><b><u>City Note LW-12</u></b></p> <p>The guidance is not seeking to conflict with building regulations. The guidance relates to the quality of</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE LW-12</u></b> <b><u>Natural light and solar gain</u></b></p> <p><i><u>Note: it should be noted, this guidance does not seek to supersede or conflict with Building Regulations. Where potential conflicts arise, these must be discussed with the LPA.</u></i></p>

<p>should therefore be deleted along with the 4 bullet points.</p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-13 Outdoor amenity space for residents</u></b></p> <p>This note contradicts the requirement set out in Design Principle 16 for a minimum of 70sqm of garden space for family homes. The requirement for between 52sqm and 70sqm is consistent with most existing urban areas, although as set out above in our response to Note LW-3 these may need to be reduced for higher densities. Many of the existing residential plots across Birmingham have smaller garden sizes, and this can be particularly effective in helping to create higher densities that support nearby local centres or public transport.</p> <p>There is no justification for a requirement for 'tunnel' access for rear gardens in terraces. Short paths that run along the rear of properties can be equally as effective. This requirement should be removed.</p>	<p>internal environment being created.</p> <p>It should be noted, the text states '<i>must seek to</i>'. This allow for flexibility in its application.</p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-13</u></b></p> <p>The City Council does not believe there is a contradiction. But will revised the text to clarify align with the standards in Design Principle 16.</p> <p>Tunnels – the text states: Terraced houses should <u>generally</u> have 'tunnel' accesses between pairs of properties, rather than long paths that run between rear garden fences.</p> <p>The inclusion of 'generally' is considered to allow flexibility. However the City Council believes have long paths</p>	<p><b>CITY NOTE LW-13</b></p> <p><b>Outdoor amenity space for residents</b></p> <p>All residents should be able to access private outdoor amenity space, of sufficient size and quality to serve the occupants of the dwelling. Houses should provide <u>sufficient private garden space (in line with Design Principle 16) between 52sq.m and 70sq.m (depending on number of beds)</u>, to help enable children to play and exercise; provide the potential for food to be grown; and enable external leisure to take place.</p> <p><u>Tunnels</u>: Proposed amendment: none proposed.</p>
--	---	---

<p><b><u>City Note LW-21 Garages, outbuildings and parking</u></b></p> <p>We assume that the reference to Design Principle 10: High Quality Homes should be a reference to Design Principle 16.</p> <p>As set out above, we object to Design Principle 16 which is also contradicted by the more detailed City Note LW-13. The reference should be amended to refer to City Note LW-13.</p>	<p>feeding a number of gardens pose a potential crime and anti-social behaviour issue; and do not allow convenient access for residents to their rear garden space.</p> <p><b><u>City Note LW-21</u></b> Comment noted. The reference is incorrect has detailed.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> <b><u>City Note LW-21</u></b> A reduction in garden/amenity space resulting in provision below the amenity space standards outlined in Design Principle <del>16</del> 10: High Quality Homes, will not be supported.</p>
<p><b>LENDLEASE</b></p>		
<p><b><u>Design Principles Document</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Design Principles 2 and 3</u></b></p> <p>Make explicit that a detailed Character Assessment and Heritage Assessment (where there is potential for impact on heritage assets) will be an essential</p>	<p><b><u>Design Principles 2 and 3</u></b> comments welcomed and noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>part of the design process and Lendlease concurs with this.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principles 4 and 5</u></b></p> <p>Among the quoted requirements for development in transport terms are the need to 'deliver a clear hierarchy of connected streets', 'accommodate the transport needs of people with disabilities' and ensuring car parking provision 'does not dominate'. Lendlease agrees wholeheartedly that cities tend to become less accessible and feel less safe when vehicle movement has been prioritised above all other movement, and fully supports the prioritisation of the most vulnerable uses of our streets and public transport at all times.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principles 6-10</u></b></p> <p>focus on 'enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity assets', 'integrating existing trees', 'tree planting' and bringing forward 'innovative', 'high quality' landscapes in new development. Lendlease is committed to, and fully supports, the Council's intention to bring forward creative, biodiverse and accessible landscapes.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principles 11-16</u></b></p> <p>The intention for the future redevelopment of Birmingham Smithfield is to deliver on many of the</p>	<p><b><u>Design Principles 4 and 5</u></b> comments welcomed and noted</p> <p><b><u>Design Principles 6-10</u></b> comments welcomed and noted</p> <p><b><u>Design Principles 16-11</u></b> comments welcomed and noted</p>	
--	---	--

<p>aims and objectives set out within these Design Principles, including the maximisation of health benefits and wellbeing within residential developments, creating innovative building designs that enhance neighbourhoods and protecting residential amenity by providing high quality, desirable homes to live in. In relation to these draft Design Principles, Lendlease recognises that defining appropriate design, layout, orientation and density will be a matter of ongoing discussion and collaboration with Birmingham City Council.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principles 16-28</u></b></p> <p>Lendlease is broadly supportive of the requirements, aims and objectives set out and would welcome early engagement with Birmingham City Council.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principle Document – overview comments</u></b></p> <p>Lendlease would also like to suggest that an acknowledgement of the necessary nuances of design response to differing sites would be a positive addition to the document. For example, a central site delivered at high density within the Birmingham Smithfield masterplan site will require a different approach to daylight and sunlight to a development delivered in a more suburban area.</p>	<p><b><u>Design Principles 16-28 –</u></b> comments welcomed and noted.</p> <p><b><u>Design Principle Document – overview comments</u></b></p> <p>The City Council acknowledges the nuances between sites and different areas of the city; and the differing design responses that may be acceptable.</p> <p>The City Council believes the guidance within the DG allows developers to identify</p>	
--	---	--



<p>Similarly, the effect of Tall Buildings on their surroundings will vary across different sites and different short, middle- or long-distance views.</p> <p>Finally, Lendlease believe that an acknowledgement within this key Design Principles document of the significant pace of change of the built environment and emerging skyline in Birmingham City Centre would be beneficial to the document. Though the Design Principles document already provides some flexibility for developers, the document would ideally acknowledge established planning proposals and permissions to ensure the clear step-change in the scale of development in Birmingham City Centre can be factored into to decisions on future development and its design.</p>	<p>and highlight these nuances through an initial character assessment; and then respond to this in their design response to the site. The DG also allows exceptions to numerical standards, where these nuances, coupled with a good design, can justify the deviation.</p> <p>Regards daylight and sunlight, City Note LW-44 (related to tall buildings) outlines that the weight given to the BRE guidance will be balanced against a range of other considerations, given its suburban focus.</p> <p>The City acknowledges that relevant planning permissions should be considered when assessing the surrounding context, particularly where there is a consistent (from numerous approvals) change in character occurring.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u>  <b>Birmingham ID City Manual</b></p> <p><b>Understanding Character</b>  <b>CITY NOTE ID-1</b>  Elements of a Character Assessment  As detailed by Design Principle 2, architects and designers must demonstrate an understanding and acknowledgement of their site’s surrounding context, via a character assessment that evaluates the key characteristics of the surrounding area. A design response can then be created that acknowledges and enhances its surroundings.</p> <p><i>Where relevant, planning permissions that make a positive contribution to surrounding character should also help inform proposals.</i></p>
--	--	---

<p><b><u>Birmingham ID City Manual</u></b></p> <p>Lendlease has no further comment to provide on this document.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Streets and Spaces City Manual</u></b></p> <p>The development of a detailed Transport Strategy will form part of any application to redevelop Birmingham Smithfield and the principles set out within City Notes SS1 and SS2 have the full backing of Lendlease to the extent that they will be integrated and woven into this strategy.</p> <p>The remaining City Notes SS3-18 are acknowledged to be best practice design principles and the flexibility provided by the current guidance is praised in that it will allow developers and architects to bring forward a pragmatic yet bespoke and nuanced design response to individual sites.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed and noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Landscape and Green Infrastructure (GI) City Manual</u></b></p> <p>Lendlease praise the ambitions set out within these City Notes and the detailed guidance whose clear parameters will allow Lendlease, along with other large scale developers, to engage early with EIA and other specialist consultants to deliver a bespoke design response that delivers on the key aims of both local, regional and national importance such as</p>	<p>Comments welcomed and noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>biodiversity net gain and the introduction of increased green infrastructure.</p> <p>As the most detailed of all the City Manuals in terms of its design and document requirements, Lendlease suggest that this City Manual does not impose any further specific parameters above and beyond those already stated given that each development site will require a tailored and sensitive landscaping and green infrastructure response that may not fit a templated code.</p>		
<p><b><u>Healthy Living and Working City Manual</u></b></p> <p>These principles are acknowledged to be best practice and will be addressed in the design development, design codes and detailed design of the buildings at the Birmingham Smithfield redevelopment site.</p> <p>This guidance on early engagement and potential statutory or non-statutory consultees is useful and welcomed.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed and noted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Efficient and Future Ready City Manual</u></b></p> <p>Lendlease welcome the ambitions set out within this draft City Manual which work towards climate resilience, creating sustainable and adaptable development and ensuring all development is as future ready as possible.</p>	<p>The guidance provided by the Efficient &amp; Future-ready Manual is to present elements to consider to aid the delivery of zero and low carbon developments. It is</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><i>The City Council recognises that technologies and infrastructure that seek to reduce the environmental impact of development and the use of buildings is evolving and changing at a (positively) rapid rate.</i></p>

<p>City Manual becomes specific at points about the infrastructure, measures and even devices required to achieve these efficient and future ready objectives. In light of this, it is suggested that users of this City Manual would benefit most if the guidance could remain technology agnostic, which would allow the design response and fit out of a development to provide a bespoke response to the site whilst still achieve the broader goals set out such as ensuring the presence of low or zero carbon energy infrastructure.</p>	<p>not supposed to be prescriptive in its application.</p> <p>The City Council acknowledges the comment made and has proposed revisions that seek to be less prescriptive.</p>	<p><i>As a result, elements of the infrastructure and measures within this guidance may become superseded by new innovations or there maybe alternative solution more appropriate for a specific site or development.</i></p> <p><i>The aim is to provide developers with guidance on how their development could be designed and/or integrate infrastructure that would reduce the environmental burden of their development. If a developer has an alternative approach achieving this, the City Council would welcome working with them to achieve this.</i></p> <p><b><u>City Note EF-1</u></b>  Insulation and thermal mass  In order to efficiently use the passive heat gain considered orientation and layout, designs <del>must</del> <i>should</i> <del>the use of use sufficient</del> and specify materials with thermal mass</p> <p><b><u>City Note EF-2</u></b>  Buildings should seek to reduce the amount of water used by occupants; and <i>where appropriate</i>, infrastructure that encourages grey water and rain water to be captured and used productively within the development.  Coupled with grey and rain water capture, developers are also encouraged to specify water efficient insulation and shower stalls</p>
---	--	---

		<p>appliances ('A' rated) and infrastructure that will further reduce the overall water use burden of the development.</p> <p><b>City Note EF-5</b>  <b>Building re-use and sustainable materials</b>  Allied with the use of resources needed to run a building, the construction of new developments utilises a range of resources and energy, which developers and architects should seek to reduce. <i>This could be aided</i> through the use of sustainable building techniques, low carbon materials and re-using existing built fabric.</p>
--	--	---

**PUBLIC HEALTH ENGLAND**

<p>PHE sets out the following issues for consideration:</p> <p>a) Does the Design Guide support Birmingham's public health priorities, and is set in the wider strategy and place-based initiatives such as the Birmingham Public Health Strategy 2019-2023, Birmingham Tackling Inequalities Statement of Intent, the City's healthy weight priorities within its involvement in the national Childhood Obesity Trailblazer Programme (8), relevant system</p>	<p>The City Council believes across its wide ranging 5 Themes, the DG does (within the realms of the planning system) support the public health strategies detailed.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
---	--	---

<p>drivers at the West Midlands Combined Authority (9), opportunities through the Birmingham and Solihull Integrated Care System including social prescribing and alignment with the National Framework of Green Infrastructure Standards (10) being trialled in Birmingham.</p>		
<p>b) Does the Design Guide principles and design manuals go beyond just the physical and visual aesthetics of a building or place to include an understanding of the human experience of the indoor and neighbourhood environment as a whole and its impact on physical and mental wellbeing, which the PHE spatial planning for health evidence review can assist with?</p>	<p>The City Council believes that within the scope of the planning system, the design guide does seek to ensure the designers of building and places go beyond the visual/physical aesthetic. The DG seeks to ensure all development delivers form and function. Design Principles focused on residential amenity, the internal layout of homes, enhancement of GI and the promotion of biophilic design principles will all aid this approach.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p>c) Does the Design Guide provide specific guidance on designing for the life course through lifetime homes and neighbourhoods and to meet the needs of an ageing population?</p>	<p>The DG does not require the application of lifetime homes or neighbourhood. But it does contain guidance that could</p>	<p><u>Proposed amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

	<p>help meet the needs of an aging population:</p> <p>City Note LW-11 promotes the need to create adaptable residential layout can that change with the needs of the residents.</p> <p>Design Principle 9 requires designers of public open space to create spaces that respond to different ages and social groups.</p> <p>City Note GI-4 promotes the creation of spaces to aid health &amp; wellbeing, with specific requirement to respond to the local demographic and reference to dementia friendly environments.</p> <p>City Note LW-25 provides guidance on the accessibility of buildings.</p>	
<p>d) Can the outcomes of the Design Guide help support multiple priorities including environmental sustainability, climate change mitigation and</p>	<p>The City Council believes that developments which effectively align and respond</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p>adaptation such as urban heat island effect, and COVID-19 recovery?</p>	<p>to all the Themes of the DG will help support the multiple priorities detailed (within the realms of the planning system).</p>	
<p>e) Should Section 4 of the Design Guide on Submitting a Development Proposal require the proportionate use of health impact assessments to deliver on the outcomes?</p>	<p>Commented noted. A requirement for proposals to submit a health impact assessment would need to be introduced to the Validation Criteria.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

adaptation such as urban heat island effect, and COVID-19 recovery?	to all the Themes of the DG will help support the multiple priorities detailed (within the realms of the planning system).	
f) Has the Council set out measurable outcomes and evidence of impact of the environment on people's health and wellbeing to be reported through the Authority Monitoring Report or other appropriate local mechanisms?	The content of the AMR will be reviewed as required to respond to any new policy or guidance adopted by the City Council.	<u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed
<b>PUSH BIKES</b>		
We are very pleased with the emphasis in the Streets and Spaces City Manual on active travel and the 5 key design points laid out on page 16 - Safety, Directness, Coherence, Comfort, and Adaptability - are very important.	Comment noted and welcome.  City Note: SS-11 page 18	<u>Proposed Amendment:</u>  <u>City Note SS-11:</u> New streets and public routes should be linked up and connect seamlessly to the existing network to provide a choice of convenient routes. <del>Proposals must avoid</del>



<p>On page 18, there is reference to avoiding "unnecessarily circuitous routes", which we presume to mainly refer to motor traffic. We understand why that might be suggested, but a key tool in discouraging driving is to give active travel and public transport a time advantage over private motor traffic through the principles utilised in Low Traffic Neighbourhoods.</p> <p>We suggest that reference should be put in about Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and the guiding principles behind those and that circuitous routes where necessary to discourage motor traffic, and give active travel modes a time advantage, should be looked on favourably. Birmingham City Council is already starting to implement Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, and the design guide wouldn't need much change in wording to push forward those principles.</p>	<p>The text referred to does relate to the road network and whilst the City Council acknowledges the query raised, having efficient routes / roads can aid other forms of transport beyond the private vehicle. Public transport and cyclists can also benefit. It must also be noted, that whilst a road/route is direct / efficient in its routing, this does not automatically translate into all users directly gaining. Vehicle restriction can still be introduced.</p>	<p><del>unnecessarily circuitous routes and vehicle turning areas that detract from an area's appearance.</del> Cul-de-sacs should be kept short and used sparingly, whilst gated forms of development will not normally be acceptable</p> <p>Hierarchies should focus on creating pedestrian environments, perhaps encompassing streets that range from tree lined avenues, to the more intimate character of mews and pedestrian focused areas that encourage user interaction, play and safe movement, <b>and limit through-trips for motorised traffic.</b></p> <p><b>The key principle of the Birmingham Transport Plan to prioritise active travel in local neighbourhoods is underpinned by reducing car dominance through street design. Design which delivers lower traffic neighbourhoods will be supported. Further guidance is available at: <a href="https://www.sustrans.org.uk/for-professionals/infrastructure/an-introductory-guide-to-low-traffic-neighbourhood-design">https://www.sustrans.org.uk/for-professionals/infrastructure/an-introductory-guide-to-low-traffic-neighbourhood-design</a></b></p>

<b>TRANSPORT FOR WEST MIDLANDS (TfWM)</b>		
<b><u>Birmingham Design Guide: Streets &amp; Spaces Manual</u></b>		

<b>TRANSPORT FOR WEST MIDLANDS (TfWM)</b>		
<p><b><u>Create safe and inviting, inclusive spaces for people and prioritise active travel (SS-1)</u></b></p> <p>TfWM fully supports the principles laid out in this section. However, the importance of shared spaces, through the removal of features such as kerbs, road surface markings and traffic signals should be mentioned. TfWM is aware of many spaces which are shared between public transport, cyclists and pedestrians, and with the increase in new micromobility modes like escooters, more areas will likely function as shared spaces. Therefore, reference to this concept would be welcomed throughout the manual.</p>	<p>The City Council recognises the potential benefits to creating 'shared spaces', but equally the application can create challenging environments for certain users, particularly those visually impaired. As such, the City Council may support the implementation of shared surface environment where tested with accessibility groups, but it does not want to provide broad support in the DG as the DfT stance on level-surface schemes remains relatively unclear. Every design should consider the role and location of a space and create an appropriate design response.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><u>City Note SS-1</u>  Streets and spaces should be accessible and welcoming to all. Pavements should be level, smooth and free of obstructions and sufficiently wide.  <i>Consideration should be given to provision for a wide variety of mobility options including all ability cycling options and e-scooters (as legislation allows). Designs should consider the use of textures and colours to aid accessibility, allied with appropriate wayfinding where necessary. If an area of 'shared space' is proposed, the designer must work closely with the City Council and appropriate accessibility groups, to ensure the design delivers a safe environment for all users (particularly those with visual or hearing impairment).</i>  <del>As well as pedestrian accessibility considerations, inclusive design should include all ability cycling provision wherever possible.</del></p>
<p><b><u>Prioritise Active Travel (SS-2)</u></b></p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p>

<p>TfWM feel there is duplication in this section, with that of SS-10 and that potentially both sections could be merged.</p>		<p>City Note SS-2 has been deleted.</p>
<p><b><u>Servicing of Buildings (SS-4)</u></b></p> <p>While we fully support the text in this section, we are aware of the rapid growth in freight and the increase in small scale deliveries, particularly by vans – which contribute to congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>We feel this guide could present principles which could help minimise the adverse impacts freight can bring to communities. Exploring ways deliveries could be consolidated, the use of low- and zeroemission vehicles including electric vehicles, cargo/E-cargo bikes and the required infrastructure to accommodate these, as well as changes to procurement practices could all be further principles to explore in the guide.</p> <p>The role of Mobility Hubs could also be considered in this section. Such hubs provide sustainable transport options ranging from shared mobility in the form of car / cycle hire clubs to electric mobility (ebikes, e-scooters and Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV)) – giving rise to opportunities to merge shared and electric transport options with the public transport network. Such hubs can also act as parcel pickup/drop off points and can include a retail</p>	<p>Comments noted and acknowledged.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment: <u>City Note SS-4</u></p> <p><i>To minimise potential impacts on congestion, air quality, road safety and the public realm, design considerations should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Accommodating 'last mile' freight consolidation and use of low emission vehicles where possible, for example through EV charging provision, space for electric cargo bikes and parcel locker schemes.</i></li> <li>- <i>Efficient servicing and delivery provision which can be used by multiple businesses at once.</i></li> <li>- <i>Provision for over-night parking and rest facilities for freight drivers.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>City Note SS-17:</u></b></p> <p><i>Mobility Hubs</i></p> <p><i>Co-location of a variety of transport facilities can be a great way to extend travel choice beyond private car usage, make efficient use of space, and promote sustainable travel. Designers of new developments are encouraged to consider a mobility hub approach</i></p>

<p>function. Subsequently, TfWM will be happy to provide further information on such hubs.</p>		<p><i>which co-locates mobility options and other community facilities. This could include provision for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Shared transport such as e-scooters, cargo bicycles, West Midlands Cycle Hire, bike loans, car club vehicles and zero emission vehicle charging points.</i></li> <li>• <i>Active travel support including wayfinding maps, bike hangars, tool stations and digital public transport information and timetables.</i></li> <li>• <i>Public space and community facilities, such as a shelter, seating, micro-parks, and parcel lockers.</i></li> <li>• <i>Space for pop-up retail, food, public services and grassroots initiatives.</i></li> <li>• <i>Further guidance on mobility hubs is available from TfWM, or Comouk.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Avoid Street Clutter (SS-5)</u></b></p> <p>While we agree with some of the principles outlined in this section, TfWM feel that certain groups could be hindered. For example, with an ever-aging as well as a growing disabled population, we feel it is important not to remove seating areas from public spaces together with toilets as these can be vital for so many groups.</p>	<p>The City Council does not view functional street furniture such as benches or bus shelters as street clutter.</p> <p>In all the public realm projects the City Council undertakes, close</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>SS-5 should also include the importance of passenger waiting environments, and the locations of bus shelters in new developments. Consideration should be paid particularly to ensuring bus stops / shelters are clearly visible in busy, well-lit and safe areas, with visible bus journey times also on display.</p>	<p>engagement is undertaken with Accessibility groups to ensure their needs are considered in the project design.</p>	
<p><b><u>Advertisements (SS-7)</u></b></p> <p>Whilst we fully support the advertising policies in this section, it may also be worth considering the 'nature' of the advertising. The WMCA has recently sought to reduce the amount of junk food advertising on the transport network, to help tackle childhood obesity and encourage healthy lifestyles. Therefore, considering the actual nature of such advertisements and the appropriateness of content in busy, city locations, may further be worth considering in the guide.</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges the comment and supports the promotion of healthy lifestyles. However, the Regulations related to advertisements do not allow for the bespoke selection of advertisement. Depending on the nature of the advertisement, planning consent may only relate to the advertising infrastructure, not the advert itself.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Health – sport/exercise/play/culture (SS-9)</u></b></p> <p>Whilst not always used just for leisure usage, the role of scooters should be considered in this section, as well as other micromobility modes. How these connect then with traditional public transport routes, as well as interchanges should further be considered in the guide. Up to 10,000 scooters will</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges a hire scheme is being trialled within the region, and has included reference to scooter provision in SS1 and under</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> See provided revisions to City Notes SS-1 and SS-17.</p>

<p>be in operation across towns and cities in the region and it is important the design guide picks up on this and accommodates the required infrastructure.</p>	<p>Mobility Hubs in SS17. Until legislation is provided regarding wider use of scooters it is not possible to include further detailed design guidance.</p>	
<p><b><u>Creating safe, attractive, efficient walking and cycling environments (SS-10)</u></b></p> <p>We fully praise this section of the guide yet as noted earlier, there appears duplication with SS-2 and both sections could be merged into one. Furthermore, several additional paragraphs could be added to strengthen this section, covering the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reference to <u>wider cycling and walking policies and infrastructure</u> covering Birmingham and the wider region should be stressed in the guide.</li> <li>2. <u>Connectivity and integration of modes</u> – with excellent connectivity of walking and cycling routes with that of the wider public transport network, along with public transport hubs being easily accessible by foot and by cycle.</li> <li>3. The importance of <u>good interchanges and transport hubs</u> to allow for enhanced integration of different modes.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agreed – additional text and links to appropriate documents will be included.</li> <li>2. And 3. Additional reference to integrated mobility options will be included.</li> <li>3. No planning reference – this is a provider issue</li> <li>4. No planning context – the bulk of the infrastructure doesn't require planning permission.</li> <li>5. The city council support the scheme, but the scheme does not require planning permission.</li> </ol>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>City Notes SS-10:</u></b></p> <p><i>Integrated mobility options – Cycling and walking infrastructure should be integrated wider public transport network. Public transport hubs should be easily accessible by foot and cycle and have excellent interconnectivity. Co-location of transport facilities should be sought where possible. (See information on Mobility hubs in SS17)</i></p> <p><i>Information on cycling and walking proposals in Birmingham and the wider region is available in the Birmingham City Council Walking and Cycling Strategy and infrastructure plan and the West Midlands Cycle Charter.</i></p>

<p>4. <u>Ticketing facilities</u> should also be available; allowing users to make journeys which are multimodal and across different operators with one streamlined ticket and payment service.</p> <p>5. The new <u>West Midlands Cycle Hire Scheme</u> should be fully referenced and incorporated into this section, with full consideration paid to the scheme's bikes, locks, charging and docking stations.</p> <p>6. The West Midlands as part of the Future Transport Zone, and is actively working with developers and transport providers to ensure that new developments are designed to enable the most up-to-date digital connectivity. The importance of transport innovation should therefore be highlighted in this guide; along with future micromobility measures and new demand responsive transport options.</p>	<p>6. The City Council support the projects and research being undertaken under the Future Transport Zone, but within the context planning, is not aware of specific guidance related to the projects can influence developments at this time.</p>	
<p><b><u>Deliver a clear hierarchy of connected streets (SS-11)</u></b></p> <p>The importance of good wayfinding signage to public transport networks, to enable members of the public to negotiate around transport systems with ease. Currently this is missing from this section but we strongly feel that good wayfinding can support the</p>	<p>The rationale for creating a clear hierarchy of connected streets is to aid movement without the need for additional signage. However, the City Council acknowledges that in some scenarios way finding may aid movement.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>wider public transport network and enhance a persons travel experience.</p>		
<p><b><u>Support access to public transport (SS-13)</u></b></p> <p>The first paragraph of this section should be replaced with: “TfWM’s refreshed local transport plan sets out a guiding philosophy on the importance of sustainable transport trips, including by public transport and active travel modes”.</p> <p>Within SS-13, reference to TfWM’s draft Planning Guide – which highlights the wider measures our organisation can offer support in should further be noted. In turn, these measures will help allow development to be sustainable as well as accessible and inclusive so everyone can benefit, and a copy of this guide can be provided on request.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>CITY NOTE SS-13</u></b>  <b>Support access to public transport</b>  <del>Movement for Growth, TfWM’s local transport plan sets out a guiding philosophy that every resident of the metropolitan area should be able to travel from their home and be able to get to a range of at least three main strategic centres, including the regional centre Birmingham, within 45 minutes in the AM peak.</del>  <i>TfWM’s refreshed local transport plan sets out a guiding philosophy on the importance of sustainable transport trips, including by public transport and active travel modes. These objectives are supported by the City Council, and development should seek to aid their delivery where possible. The TfWM’s draft Planning Guide will provide further guidance (once published) of how TfWM can work with developers to aid this.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Accommodate transport needs for disabled people (SS-14)</u></b></p> <p>TfWM feels full consideration of Ring and Ride vehicles, as well as other Demand Responsive Transport should be built into the design of new development. This is because many disabled and</p>	<p>The Parking SPD includes guidance/standards on accommodating ring and ride/demand responsive transport. A sentence will be</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> City Note SS-14:</p> <p><i>Key destinations, as set out in the Parking SPD, should include access and space for drop-off/pick-up</i></p>



<p>older people rely heavily on such services (especially those who can't use conventional public transport), and the guide should therefore note the importance of accommodating such vehicles.</p>	<p>added to support the design of this.</p>	<p><i>areas for ring and ride or demand responsive transport options in close proximity to entrances.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Provide cycle and motorcycle parking and infrastructure that is convenient, safe and secure (SS-15)</u></b></p> <p>1. TfWM fully supports this section. Yet further consideration could be paid to cycle parking requirements of disabled cyclists and the need to accommodate adapted cycles as well as scooters.</p> <p>2. As mentioned earlier, the requirements of TfWM's Cycle Hire Scheme in terms of the schemes lockers, charging stations/points and docks should also be noted.</p> <p>3. We also feel more information should be provided on how to minimise and manage car parking, ensuring it does not dominate public spaces. Within the recently Drafted Birmingham Parking SPD (2020) there was clear policies presented on restricted / controlled parking, therefore reference to these policies and standards should be noted in the manual.</p>	<p>1. City Note SS-15 does provide reference to facilities for non-stand and inclusive cycles:</p> <p><i>In designing cycle storage, consideration should also be given to non-standard and inclusive cycles that may be used by residents, employers or users. These may range from cycles with child trailers or trailer bikes, to cargo bikes, recumbent or wheelchair friendly tricycles. Where it is likely that such cycles may be used, the capacity of storage should be designed to successfully accommodate and secure these larger bikes.</i></p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

	<p>Mention of Scooter considerations has been included, but design guidance regarding these is currently limited as they are not legal outside of pilot scheme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. The City Council supports the TfWM cycle scheme, and the Parking SPD includes a requirement for all large-scale developments to consider space for cycle and/or scooter hire. The infrastructure proposed / installed to date does not require planning permission. If any future infrastructure requires planning permission, this will be considered on its merits.</li><li>3. City Note SS-16 provides guidance on the design of car parking. If the draft Parking SPD provide guidance on the restricted</li></ol>	
--	---	--

	<p>/ controlled parking, the DG should not duplicate this. This issue may also fall within highway regulations, rather than planning policy?</p>	
<p><b><u>Minimise and manage car parking, ensuring it does not dominate (SS-16)</u></b></p> <p>Whilst clearly the document presents a range of parking measures to manage demand, TfWM feels further parking restrictions should be noted such as controlled parking measures, which in some cases, should be designed into development and implemented from the outset. This is vital in helping manage travel demand and unsafe and obstructive parking.</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges the comment related to controlled parking measures within the public highway, but this falls under a different regulatory process to planning.</p> <p>It is felt that the Parking SPD includes sufficient mention of these controls to ensure their consideration in new developments.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p><b><u>Additional parking considerations (SS-17)</u></b></p> <p>Under this section, reference to Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV) should replace the term EV's.</p> <p>The role of the WMCA in developing ZEV charging infrastructure should also be noted alongside producing the conditions for growth in take-up and</p>	<p>EZ to ZEV – agree</p> <p>Comment noted, but the City Council does not believe this has any planning context. The infrastructure being</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b><u>City Note SS-17</u></b>  <b><u>Electric vehicle charging</u></b>  <del>Electric vehicle (EV)</del> <b><u>Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV)</u></b> chargepoints need to be positioned carefully, whether on-street or off-street,</p>

<p>manufacturing of ZEVs. Adding to this, reference to ESB being on board as a partner in the roll out of ZEV charging points and charging hubs should be noted.</p> <p>Finally, in this section car club provision should be integrated with the wider public transport network to ensure greater levels of connectivity and reduce car journeys across the region.</p>	<p>provide by TfWM does not require planning permission.</p> <p>Car Club – as stated within City Notes SS-17, further guidance on the provision of car clubs is provided by the Parking SPD. The DG will not duplicate this guidance.</p>	<p><i>Birmingham City Council has adopted an Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy which details proposals for the roll-out of publicly accessible chargepoints across the city. Any development with on-street charging requirements should ensure integration with the proposals in this Strategy. New developments such as supermarkets, retail outlets and fuel stations may be required to collaborate with delivery partner ESB Energy in supporting deployment of publicly accessible EV chargers on private land.</i></p>
<p><b>VICTORIAN SOCIETY</b></p>		
<p>The Victorian Society broadly welcomes the publication of these new policies. We are particularly interested in two areas of policy: those relating to historic assets, and those concerned with the development of tall buildings.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcome.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p>It is not enough to write good policies: they must be intelligently implemented in practice. Birmingham has a history of writing good policies and then expediently ignoring them when it is convenient to do so. The recent and widespread breaching of the current policy on tall buildings in High Places is a prominent example of this.</p>	<p>High Places has successfully guided the design and location of tall buildings across the city, but as the city has evolved and grown it is appropriate to review the guidance in this existing SPD via the DG.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p>We consider that the policies relating to historic buildings and areas – their conservation, extension, alteration and management – are broadly sound. We</p>	<p>The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>

<p>expect them to be developed in more detail in the forthcoming Historic Environment SPD which we understand is being produced. We identify a general emphasis in the policies on cohesiveness and contextualism in the built fabric of the city. We welcome this.</p>	<p>guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting process of this Historic Environment SPD.</p>	
<p>We consider that the policy towards existing buildings (not only registered heritage assets) could be strengthened by encouraging the establishment of a default policy of retention and reuse, whereby the making of a positive case for their demolition and replacement would be required. This would recognise the importance of historical continuity in the city, the economic case for affordable reuse, and the critical need for a reduction in carbon emissions, much of which is generated by demolition and the construction of new buildings.</p>	<p>The City Council acknowledges the comments and support the ethos behind them. But the Local Planning Authority is bound by regulations and national policy, which currently do not enable a default policy of retention and re-use to be adopted.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> none proposed</p>
<p>We consider that the general policy on conservation areas is sound. But we are surprised by the inclusion in LW54 of a policy on “replacing a positive building in a conservation area”. This ought by definition not to be allowed.</p>	<p>The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> City Notes LW-49 to LW-54 to be deleted.</p>
<p>On policy towards tall buildings, we welcome the explicit exclusion of tall buildings within conservation areas (LW45.1). But at the same time, we propose that this policy should be extended to cover tall buildings on or near the boundaries of conservation</p>	<p>The content / approach to the location of tall building has been reviewed in response to comments received from Historic England.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u> Please see proposed revisions to the location of tall building above (see Historic England comments &amp; response).</p>

<p>areas, which have a damaging effect upon the area's character by impinging on street views within the area. This policy is in fact implicit in LW45.2 , "In locations that would have an unacceptable impact on the significance of a listed building or heritage asset", but it would be firmer if it were more explicitly stated. If the policy were to be extended, there would need to be a statement included that tall buildings on the boundaries of conservation areas which had already been given permission would not be seen as a precedent.</p>		
<p>In any case, there needs to be contained in the policy an assessment of the distance across which a proposed tall building may have an impact on the significance of a listed building. The area of impact is clearly related to the height of a building.</p> <p>In this context, policy ID3, under the heading of Birmingham's Historic Assets, which considers development within the setting of a listed building, also needs to operate in reverse, to consider a listed building within the setting of a proposed tall building.</p>	<p>The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p>City Notes ID-3 to be deleted.</p>
<p>There is much good policy in the document which covers various aspects of the design of tall buildings. But we would like to see a greater degree of caution expressed towards their development. Even with the specific exclusions noted above, there is still no firm policy which can structure their cumulative effect:</p>	<p>Tall building by there very nature result in visual, physical and environmental changes to their scope of context.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Amendment:</u></p> <p><b>CITY NOTE LW-42</b>  <b>Clusters and grouping</b>  Carefully grouped tall buildings will help create a unique and memorable urban environment. But</p>

<p>their locations, heights and forms are largely determined by individual developers at different times. Whatever “a balanced rhythm of tall buildings” (LW42) may be intended to mean (and we do not understand what it means), we do not see any design policy which can achieve it.</p>	<p>And whilst the Victorian Society comments reflect concerns and their perceived negative impact of tall buildings on the city’s environment, the City Council believe its is important to take a balanced view towards their introduction.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged greater understanding and scrutiny of the climate impacts of tall building needs to be undertaken (as reflected in the DG), the positive elements of tall building must also be acknowledged.</p> <p>The thrust of the Victorian Society’s comments related to tall building appears to seek their rejection from the city. Yet, the City Council believes, well designed tall building can positively add to the city and successfully coexisting with the city’s</p>	<p>conversely, an indiscriminate proliferation of tall buildings may detract from the quality, form and legibility of the city. The City Council will <b>consider and assess how buildings singularly and collectively add to the seek to create a balanced rhythm of tall buildings that considers the city’s skyline and their surroundings. street environment, ensuring a degree of human scale is not lost.</b></p>
---	--	--

	<p>existing built fabric (including heritage).</p> <p>Regards cumulative impact, the City Council has a 3D virtual model of the City Centre, which enables Officers and Members to consider and assess the cumulative impact of tall building. The Validation Checklist requires all tall building proposals to submit a model of their proposal to enable this assessment to be undertaken. These considerations are not determined by developers as suggested.</p>	
--	--	--



## Responses via BeHeard

Do you support the guidance contained within the Design Principles 1, 2 and 3 and the Birmingham ID City Manual?	Do you support the guidance contained within the Design Principles 4 and 5; and the Streets & Space City Manual?	Do you support the guidance contained within the Design Principles 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10; and the Landscape & Green Infrastructure City Manual?	Do you support the guidance contained within the Design Principles 11 to 26; and the Healthy Living & Working Places City Manual?	Do you support the guidance contained within the Design Principles 11 to 26; and the Healthy Living & Working Places City Manual?	Do you support the guidance contained within the Design Principle 28?	If you know of any best practice examples, you feel should be shown or referenced by the Design Guide? If so, please provide details
--	--	---	---	---	---	--

Actions speak louder than words and if..."if", we are to become Carbon neutral why not consider investing in it doing so? Look at some of the major cities in the UK with a rapid transit systems? A please don't say the six or so miles of track in Birmingham is a metro system!

We already have streets and spaces....have done for decades. Streets will always be streets.

Birmingham has plenty of green spaces and they do what they do. they aren't proper parks like you get in London or even Solihull. Birmingham needs to learn about how to do parks better.

We will be future ready when we are able to travel around the city. Were you aware Birmingham, comically, is the largest city in Europe without a rapid-transit system . The development plans going back to the 1980s when 'Midland Metro' was planned explained a myriad of planned routes across the city however almost 40 years later we have six miles of track...six miles of track in our city and that all runs along existing rail and bus routes - This is not really a metro system.

From a practical and less 'Design Quality' standpoint, Manchester - England's truest second city - has a 100 station rapid transit network covering it's city and stations beyond.

All Future designs should be on the cities infrastructure - or lack of as the case may be - and make our city useable again.

BCC Response: The City Council welcomes the respondents support for the continued development of the Midlands Metro system. The continued expansion of this regional asset is undertaken and managed by Midland Metro Alliance on behalf of Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) which the City Council continues to support and work productive with, in helping to deliver this and other public transport assets.

Birmingham contains a number of parks across the conurbation, including Sutton Park one of the largest urban parks in Europe. The City Council will continue to seek enhancements to these existing facilities and GI gains across the city.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Actions speak louder than words and if..."if", we are to become Carbon neutral why not consider investing in it doing so? Look at some of the major cities in the UK with a rapid transit systems? A please don't say the six or so miles of track in Birmingham is a metro system!

We already have streets and spaces....have done for decades. Streets will always be streets.

Birmingham has plenty of green spaces and they do what they do. they aren't proper parks like you get in London or even Solihull. Birmingham needs to learn about how to do parks better.

We will be future ready when we are able to travel around the city. Were you aware Birmingham, comically, is the largest city in Europe without a rapid-transit system . The development plans going back to the 1980s when 'Midland Metro' was planned explained a myriad of planned routes across the city however almost 40 years later we have six miles of track...six miles of track in our city and that all runs along existing rail and bus routes - This is not really a metro system.

From a practical and less 'Design Quality' standpoint, Manchester - England's truest second city - has a 100 station rapid transit network covering it's city and stations beyond.

All Future designs should be on the cities infrastructure - or lack of as the case may be - and make our city useable again.

BCC Response: The City Council welcomes the respondents support for the continued development of the Midlands Metro system. The continued expansion of this regional asset is undertaken and managed by Midland Metro Alliance on behalf of Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) which the City Council continues to support and work productive with, in helping to deliver this and other public transport assets.

Birmingham contains a number of parks across the conurbation, including Sutton Park one of the largest urban parks in Europe. The City Council will continue to seek enhancements to these existing facilities and GI gains across the city.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

"In the last two decades all the regeneration and development around housing has been for the very rich and highly paid professionals and business people.

this time around particular attention needs to be focussed to ensure there is housing stock available within the reach of working class people on average earnings."

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges the comment and is activity seeking to increase the supply of affordable houses across the city. The Government via national planning policy and guidance sets the requirements for affordable housing contributions from private housing developers, but also enables adjustment to this via viability assessments. Within this national framework, the City Council scrutinises viability assessment submitted to ensure the highest contributions viable are delivered.

The Council's house builder (Birmingham Municipal Housing Trust) continues to expand the city's supply of social housing.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Landscape & GI

I appreciate that it mentions to "ensure they can be sustained within the areas proposed" with regards to species of trees. However, I believe this should be mentioned in "Green elements on buildings" section as it also applies to some of the green elements mentioned; living walls etc.

BCC Response: comment noted and supported.

**Proposed Amendment: City Note GI-7 – Green elements on buildings**

**System selection and maintenance**

The most appropriate green roof or wall system for a proposal will need to be influenced by the characteristics of the site, structural considerations and local climate. Species selection should also be informed by these site specific characteristic, with Aan effective maintenance system and irrigation system (if required) must also be established and adopted.

"Perhaps review Safe building practices with regards to green roofs, living walls and all other green elements on buildings; ensure that all fire rating compliance are met. I believe [www.scotscape.co.uk](http://www.scotscape.co.uk) outline good technical details related to green elements on buildings and are a leading provider of them. They also outline all credentials and standards that should be met, which would be good detail to include in the Design Guide.

I believe it would be important to mention fire safety regulations related to living cladding systems - as it is an on-going present-day subject."

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges the importance of both these issues, but these considerations are controlled by Building Regulations, which falls out of the scope of planning.

Proposed Amendment: No amendments

The Guide is very good. I wonder what input the Education Dept could have. The complete mishmash and divisive nature of the city's schools and colleges, driving kids miles across the city creating a large amount of traffic - would have an effect on the plans.

BCC Response: comment noted. The Planning Department engages closely with Education colleagues to secure developer contributions for educational infrastructure; and in the drafting of infrastructure delivery plans to support the local plan. This enable infrastructure providers (such as schools) to plan for the projected population and housing growth across the city.

The planning department / authority has no input into the day to day running of schools or colleges.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed.

We need to lift city 'morale' and make the visual impact of our streets greater in quality. Attention to detail is crucial. I'm not always certain the best people are being used to lay pavements etc.

BCC Response: comment noted. The City Council will continue to seek enhancement to the city's streets via public and private projects. Where funds allow, areas of the city will be enhanced to support the Commonwealth Games and its Legacy.

Streets & Spaces

From the perspective of good design and active travel, the design guide says the right words but will need enforcement in the design of developments coming forward.

With specific regards to City Manual I feel the following should be considered:



1. The design guide should make specific reference to continuous footways and try to move design away from large 'bell-mouth' junctions that prioritise vehicle traffic. This is illustrated in the West Mids cycle design guidance under 'DE040 Blended Side Road Entry Treatment.' This should be the default in low-speed residential developments.

BCC Response: In relation to highway design of new developments, the City Council aligns with Manual for Streets. Whilst City Council supports the comments, it does not want the DG to compete or contradict this well established national guidance document. Proposed Amendment: None proposed

2. The Manual should refer to the latest national guidance (LTN1/20) in the design of cycle infrastructure.

BCC Response: As an authority within the West Midlands, the City Council supports the use of the TfWM guidance on the design of cycle infrastructure.

Proposed Amendment: None.

3. The link to the West Mids cycle design guidance doesn't work (the link breaks at the . in .aspx in the link). The 2nd version of the guidance is saved here: <https://www.tfwm.org.uk/media/2713/2019-07-15-wmguidance-wcovers.pdf>

BCC Response: comment noted

**Proposed Amendment: City Note SS-10**

When designing cycle routes and infrastructure into a scheme, proposal should consult and adhere to the West Midlands Cycle Design Guidance, balanced against good urban design principles.

**West Midlands Design Guidance**

4. Developments of sufficient scale should make space (& contribute through S106 contributions) for the WM-wide cycle hire scheme docking stations.

BCC Response: the WM cycle scheme is self-funding by a private operator working with TfWM. Locations for the docking stations and hubs are determined by the provider, but the City Council will support proposals that wish to include docks within their scheme. The majority of the infrastructure associated with the cycle scheme does not require planning permission.

Proposed Amendment: none proposed.

5. Cycle parking needs to be considered with all applications including change-of-use applications. (A recent application within the Mailbox to increase office space hasn't offered any additional bike storage to relieve the overcrowded bike locker.

BCC Response: Comment noted. The guidance in the proposed City Manual and updated Parking SPD should apply to all relevant development.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

6. Sheffield stands are suitable when popping into a shop but anywhere bikes are left for longer than 30 minutes or so are a risk of theft. One broken/half-stolen bike then creates the impression of high theft. The design guide should strengthen requests for communal, long-term bike storage like the proposed Cycle Hub within the One Centenary Way Development.

BCC Response: The DG requires provision for building residents and occupiers to be secure and convenient. The West Midlands Combined Authority operates and manages the Cycle Hub network. The City Council supports the siting of further hubs as desired.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

7. The guide states "Doorways serving cycle storage or routes to storage must be at least 1.0m wide" this should also include electric push-button openers to avoid the need to hold a heavy door while pushing a bike.

BCC Response: Support request.

**Proposed Amendment: City Note SS-15**

Doorways serving cycle storage or routes to storage must be at least 1.0m wide **and have electric openers to aid access to the facilities with a bike.**

### **Landscape & GI**

I think overall its good but I think there should be additional emphasis on the incorporation and design of sustainable drainage to provide benefits to the city and meeting the aspirations of the Design Guide.

These are numerous and far reaching covering the obvious in terms of better flood risk management but significant wider benefits from better landscaping, amenity & public open space, increased resilience to climate change (both in flood risk and urban heating) , increased biodiversity.

**BCC Response:** The City Council supports the comments and has proposed some revisions in light of comments made by the Environment Agency, but if does not want the DG to conflict or duplicate the 'The Birmingham Sustainable Drainage: A Guide to Design, Adoption and Maintenance'.

### **Healthy, Living & Working**

In line with my previous comments, Design Principle 21 should be strengthened. Overall the guidance should also direct to the LLFA's Sustainable Drainage design guide and make suitable reference to the SuDS manual.

In particular within Design Principle 21, the \* should include consultation with Birmingham City Council Lead Local Flood Authority alongside the Environment Agency and Canal & River Trust.

The principle should request applicants demonstrate how **designs support flood risk mitigation measures and policies within the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy.**

**BCC Response:** comments noted. Proposed revisions to City Note GI-7 (following comments from the EA) have referenced the 'The Birmingham Sustainable Drainage: A Guide to Design, Adoption and Maintenance'.

**Proposed amendments: Design Principle 21** \* In consultation with **Birmingham City Council Lead Local Flood Authority**, the Canal and River Trust and/or Environment Agency.

### **Efficient & Future**

There should be encouragement to BREEAM or other similar 'Code for Sustainable Homes' type considerations within residential buildings.

**BCC Response:** The reference to BREEAM requirements is a duplication of BDP policy TP3. This duplication is not required and will be removed.

**Proposed amendments:** none proposed.

### **Design Principle 28**

Value engineering of SuDS is a big problem where outline applications come forward with large and suitable above-ground SuDS which then get 'valued' out and changed to below-ground features at the reserved matters / detailed design phases. This should be strongly discouraged.

**BCC Response:** comment noted

**Proposed amendments: Fulfilling Design Quality**

### **Landscape proposals**

Equally detailed landscape drawings and rationale statement should also be submitted to demonstrate how the landscape, **SuDs**, public realm and any public open space would be constructed.

### **Retaining design quality – amendments and value engineering**

Value engineering will inevitably be applied through the construction process, but it should not be used as a tool to deteriorate the quality of the building or landscape **(including SuDs)**. Its role should be to resolve construction challenges, ensure best value and aid build efficiency.

## **Landscape & GI**

I think overall its good but I think there should be additional emphasis on the incorporation and design of sustainable drainage to provide benefits to the city and meeting the aspirations of the Design Guide.

These are numerous and far reaching covering the obvious in terms of better flood risk management but significant wider benefits from better landscaping, amenity & public open space, increased resilience to climate change (both in flood risk and urban heating) , increased biodiversity.

**BCC Response:** The City Council supports the comments and has proposed some revisions in light of comments made by the Environment Agency, but if does not want the DG to conflict or duplicate the 'The Birmingham Sustainable Drainage: A Guide to Design, Adoption and Maintenance'.

## **Healthy, Living & Working**

In line with my previous comments, Design Principle 21 should be strengthened. Overall the guidance should also direct to the LLFA's Sustainable Drainage design guide and make suitable reference to the SuDS manual.

In particular within Design Principle 21, the \* should include consultation with Birmingham City Council Lead Local Flood Authority alongside the Environment Agency and Canal & River Trust.

The principle should request applicants demonstrate how **designs support flood risk mitigation measures and policies within the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy.**

**BCC Response:** comments noted. Proposed revisions to City Note GI-7 (following comments from the EA) have referenced the 'The Birmingham Sustainable Drainage: A Guide to Design, Adoption and Maintenance'.

**Proposed amendments: Design Principle 21** \* In consultation with **Birmingham City Council Lead Local Flood Authority**, the Canal and River Trust and/or Environment Agency.

## **Efficient & Future**

There should be encouragement to BREEAM or other similar 'Code for Sustainable Homes' type considerations within residential buildings.

**BCC Response:** The reference to BREEAM requirements is a duplication of BDP policy TP3. This duplication is not required and will be removed.

**Proposed amendments:** none proposed.

## **Design Principle 28**

Value engineering of SuDS is a big problem where outline applications come forward with large and suitable above-ground SuDS which then get 'valued' out and changed to below-ground features at the reserved matters / detailed design phases. This should be strongly discouraged.

**BCC Response:** comment noted

**Proposed amendments: Fulfilling Design Quality**

## **Landscape proposals**

Equally detailed landscape drawings and rationale statement should also be submitted to demonstrate how the landscape, **SuDs**, public realm and any public open space would be constructed.

## **Retaining design quality – amendments and value engineering**

Value engineering will inevitably be applied through the construction process, but it should not be used as a tool to deteriorate the quality of the building or landscape **(including SuDs)**. Its role should be to resolve construction challenges, ensure best value and aid build efficiency.

## **Healthy, Living & Working Places:**

There needs to be protection to prevent over dense high or low rise student accommodation impact on surrounding communities, residential amenity and therefore density of student living accommodation in council wards. Suggested target, no more than 10% student occupation of council wards in HMOs and private PBSAs . City wide article 4 provides some protection of this nature at HMO level but there is no corresponding strategy for

PBSAs. There needs a strategy to control PBSA density for areas outside the City Centre where tall buildings may be more acceptable than in say Selly oak and Bournbrook. I'd suggest that the council limits the density of student populations in PBSAs to no more than 800 students within a 300 metre of any proposed PBSA outside the City Centre. This figure is used by planners in Camden, London, I understand. If adopted, it would protect community decline in areas such as bournville, Selly oak, Stirchley, edgbaston and Harborne, all being under potential threat of encroachment through over dense accumulations of private student residences and associated impact on community infra structure and quality of life for residents.

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges community concerns related to the development of student accommodation and all applications must be accompanied by a student needs assessment to justify the development.

The suggestion of a minimum distances between different PBSA providers would need to be supported by appropriate evidence and may be better enshrined in planning policy. If the City Council was to adopt a similar policy as provided, this would need to be considered by Birmingham Development Plan review. It is not considered a design issues and extends beyond the scope of the DG.

From a design perspective, the Birmingham ID (design principle 2) requires all development to effectively respond the character of the surrounding area, in terms of their scale and design.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

General Comment:

It doesn't cater to all forms of transport and discriminates against the disabled.

BCC Response: no further details were included to elaborate on the comment, but the City Council is disappointed the respondent feels this way. The DG supports and promotes sustainable forms of transport, but recognises that appropriate, well designed provision of private vehicle parking needs to be included in a number of schemes. The requirements related to disabled parking for all developments are outlined in the updated Parking SPD. City Note SS-14 of the Streets & Spaces Manual provides guidance on 'Accommodating the transport needs of disabled people'.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

**Birmingham Civic Society Planning Committee**



PBSAs. There needs a strategy to control PBSA density for areas outside the City Centre where tall buildings may be more acceptable than in say Selly oak and Bournbrook. I'd suggest that the council limits the density of student populations in PBSAs to no more than 800 students within a 300 metre of any proposed PBSA outside the City Centre. This figure is used by planners in Camden, London, I understand. If adopted, it would protect community decline in areas such as bournville, Selly oak, Stirchley, edgbaston and Harborne, all being under potential threat of encroachment through over dense accumulations of private student residences and associated impact on community infra structure and quality of life for residents.

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges community concerns related to the development of student accommodation and all applications must be accompanied by a student needs assessment to justify the development.

The suggestion of a minimum distances between different PBSA providers would need to be supported by appropriate evidence and may be better enshrined in planning policy. If the City Council was to adopt a similar policy as provided, this would need to be considered by Birmingham Development Plan review. It is not considered a design issues and extends beyond the scope of the DG.

From a design perspective, the Birmingham ID (design principle 2) requires all development to effectively respond the character of the surrounding area, in terms of their scale and design.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 1 - very positive generally, but suggests an opportunity to diverge from local character where this is identified as 'poor'. It is difficult to know, until tested in practice whether this will allow (say) very high rise buildings in a predominantly low rise area simply because the character is considered 'poor'.

BCC Response: comment noted.

**Proposed Amendment:**

**Character Assessment**

When creating new proposals, **architects designers** should have an understanding of, and embrace, all these elements, ensuring schemes successfully acknowledge and interpret relevant characteristics into their proposal. Where **the surrounding character is poor, or there is a design rationale to ignore established character, proposals must lead to an enhancement of the area. proposals seek to ignore established character, there must be a clear design rationale for this divergence, resulting in character enhancement. It must not result in a negative impact on the establish character area.**

**DESIGN PRINCIPLE 2**

The design of proposals must be informed by a clear understanding of the surrounding area's character. A direct synergy between the proposed and the existing should be evident and explained; unless there is a clear justification for an alternative approach, **or an opportunity for that results in** character enhancement.

Design Principle 2 - does not provide any protection beyond that already in the NPPF and we consider this unambitious

BCC Response: no details of the suggested 'ambitious' have been provided. Allied with City Notes ID-1, the City Council does not believe it is possible for a city-wide documents such as the DG to be more prescriptive. Via a character assessment, proposal should provide more place specific detail. The role of area specific guidance, such as design codes could also help provide this. Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 3 - could better define how significance is to be expressed, e.g. Conservation Principles by Historic England which appears to be the basis used. However it acknowledges other methods might be suitable, and in practice this might result in low quality information being presented.

BCC Response: Design Principle 3 will be superseded by the emerging Historic Environment SPD and deleted from the DG.

Proposed Amendment: *Design Principle 3 to be deleted.*

Design Principle 4 / 5 - while we support sustainable travel, there is a sense that we need to walk before we can run - new development often limits car parking, but this will have the affect of limiting who can live there. At present it is very difficult for families to live in Birmingham without a car, but simply removing parking will not make transport easier, it will simply discourage city centre living in the short term.

BCC Response: Comment noted. The DG focuses on the design of car parking. It does not set the standards. These are detailing in the Birmingham Parking SPD.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 6 - we note a recent tendency to reference local parks as amenity space in new development. The problem is that many developments may utilise this space such that it is no longer sufficient for the neighbourhood.

BCC Response: public amenity space within new developments should contribute to the wider provision in the area, serving new residents and the existing community. Public amenity space is well established term covering a wide range of publicly accessible spaces. It is also noted that private amenity space is provided by developments such as apartments, which are intended to serve residents only.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 7 - Consideration for protection of trees is valuable, although the requirements are curiously detailed in comparison to other areas of the guide.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 8 - Often the reason for not integrating new trees in developments is that they fall on the local authority to maintain them where roads are adopted. This could be avoided by placing firm requirements on developers for numbers of trees, or where property is rented, include for maintenance of trees in ground rent.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 9 - positive, consideration / expansion needed for protection from crime (e.g. lighting), but also permeability and enjoyment of the space as Secured by Design standards too often result in public spaces which are easy to police rather than to enjoy

BCC Response: Comment noted. The City Council agree public spaces need to be safe and enjoyable spaces to use / dwell.

**Proposed Amendment**:

**Public Open Space** – add after 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph:

*In designing areas of public open space, consideration must be given to user safety and potential for anti-social behaviour. But this should not result in featureless spaces than detract from their enjoyment or attractiveness to potential users. In consultation with the City Council, designer should develop creative response to these challenges.*

Design Principle 11 - positive, but needs concrete requirements. We have seen many large scale developments where there are no new shops, much less doctors, schools etc - developers will say these are provided through a contibution; but where a new development is in say a previously industrial area such as Digbeth, often this results in 'islands' of new high rise housing, with no facilities to support a community.

BCC Response: Comment noted. The LPA will continue to work with public services and developers to create the sustainable neighbourhoods desired. Responses will need to be tailored to the location, considering existing facilities and projected change to the community. The City Council will continue to update its Infrastructure Delivery Plan to help inform infrastructure needed to support the growth of the city.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 12 - positive; increasing density will make the city more liveable, reducing need for transport.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Design Principle 13 - positive; but use of 'biophilic' is rather esoteric. Need concrete requirements for levels of light - biggest problem is offices converted to resi through permitted development which will side-step this guidance.

BCC Response: Comment noted. The proposed separation distances between development and existing dwellings are intended to aid outlook, light and amenity.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 15 - it is very hard to see how design quality can be assessed objectively although this is a laudable objective. Concrete definition of how this will be considered required - for example by design panel rather than individual officer opinion for larger developments. No consideration of 'Building Beautiful' . Incongruous requirement for supporting biophilic design principles. Design codes required especially for smaller developments.

BCC Response: the City Council does not currently have a design review panel. The City Council supports the use of place or site specific design codes, as promoted by the Government.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed.

Design Principle 17 - positive, but this high-lights how the design guide is too far ranging; we were concerned by how a small builder or home owner would interact with a document of this nature which is better applied to large scale development. It is suggested a guide for small domestic extensions is produced.

BCC Response: Comment noted. The City Council propose to create a quick reference guide for small scale developers, highlighted the sections most relevant to them.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 18 - positive, but could give a concrete requirement, say no roof top extension to be greater than 25% of the height of the existing building.

BCC Response: Comment noted. The City Council believes the introduction of roof top extensions need to be assessed on a site by site base, considering the surrounding text and the character / design of the host building. Whilst the limit suggest maybe acceptable for some locations, in others it may result in a negative impact on the host and surrounding area.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 20 - positive, needs stronger definition of the locus of impact on historic buildings / areas which will need to be considered. Consideration of the general areas where tall buildings will be permitted (i.e. the city centre ridge appears no longer to be a limitation) is overdue. In practice, we have seen tall buildings, for example along Digbeth High Street or Colmore Row, which have had great impact on historic buildings and areas, and it is hard to see, where we have such precedents already, what impact a building would need to have in order to be rejected. This does rather undermine this principle, however laudable its intentions.

BCC Response: In response to comments received from Historic England, the City Council has revised its guidance related to the potential locations for tall buildings.

Proposed Amendment: please see proposed revisions to the location of tall building above (see Historic England comments & response).

Design Principle 22 - "Loss of a non-designated heritage asset will be resisted, unless its loss can be justified due to structural integrity, condition, wider design benefit and/or development viability." This is unacceptable. It appears that a developer simply asserting that repair of a non-designated asset is too expensive will be sufficient to permit demolition.

BCC Response: Comment noted. The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting process of this Historic Environment SPD.

Proposed Amendment: Design Principle 21 will be deleted.

Design Principle 27 - "should aim to meet BREEAM standard excellent (or any future national equivalent) unless it can be demonstrated that the cost of achieving this would make the proposed unviable." This is very weak. Meeting a BREEAM excellent standard is very difficult / cost prohibitive, so virtually all developments will discover this is 'unviable'. It should be defined what the 'fall back' is, or even state that ALL such developments should meet BREEAM Good or higher regardless of viability.

BCC Response: This element of the guidance duplicates the requirement of BDP Policy TP3. Any uplift related to BREEAM will need to be undertaken via the BDP review, not within an SPD.

**Proposed Amendment:** the policy duplication of *BDP Policy TP3 will be removed from Design Principle 27 and City Note EF-7 will be deleted.*

We are supportive. We welcome the fact that this City-wide Code allows for each distinct part of Birmingham to have its own identity rather than being shoe-horned into a one-size-fits-all identity. Are also pleased that anyone proposing deviations from these sound design principles will have to articulate a (presumably strong) case for such deviation. Finally, we welcome the protection of heritage assets as a means of safeguarding vital elements of local identity.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

#### Streets & Spaces

These principles are sound and, to us, non-controversial. However, they seem to be geared more to large new developments rather than smaller improvements and renovations which constitute the bulk of development in Moseley. We would expect all developments, large or small, to incorporate the need to make a positive contribution to the street scene and to support the Birmingham Transport Plan wherever relevant. Perhaps crossreferencing to the Healthy Living and Working Places section would help reinforce this point.

BCC Response: The City Council agrees with the sentiment in the comment. Whilst some elements of the DG are use or building type specific, overarching design principles such as those under the Streets & Spaces Theme apply to every development. It is important to note the DG should be read as a whole. A development of any scale will need to effectively respond all relevant design principles across the Themes.

Post-adoption, the City Council propose to create a checklist for small scale development to help them navigate to the design principles that maybe most relevant to them.

Proposed Amendment: none proposed.

#### Landscape & GI

Although we support these principles we note that they are heavily oriented towards tree management and preservation (of which we are enthusiastically in favour). We wonder if it might be possible to ask developers to evaluate the wider green infrastructure context with an eye to, for example, developing green corridors linking different neighbourhoods or developments.

BCC Response: the City Council welcomes the comment. Via the design principles under the Landscape & GI Theme, it is hoped existing GI assets can be retained and new provision provided. The City Council agree, linking with and expanding existing network should be a key element of this. Bullet Point 7 of Design Principle 6 states: '*Create connections to existing green corridors*'.

**Proposed Amendment:** Design Principle 6

- Create connections to existing green corridors *to enhance and expand GI networks.*

#### Healthy, Living & Working

We are in support of all the principles listed, but do have comments on certain of them as follows:

Principle 11 (creating sustainable neighbourhood): We welcome the recognition that conservation areas need to be protected and that neighbourhoods need to be sustainable. We would add that developments such as re-purposing or re-developing existing buildings can have an impact on the sustainability of existing neighbourhoods (for example, conversion from single- to multiple-family dwellings or the reverse; increase in student or HMO repurposing, etc.) and suggest that a mechanism for evaluating this should be part of the planning process..

BCC Response: The City Council recognises concerns related to HMO. In response the City Council has applied a city-wide Article 4, meaning a planning application must be submitted for proposals to convert family houses (C3 use class) to small Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) accommodating between 3 and 6 people (C4 use class).

Beyond this requirement, further guidance on the design of HMOs is provided by Policy DM11 Houses in multiple occupation (HMO), of Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (DMB).

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

With regard to Principle 17 (residential extensions) and 18 (rooftop extensions), we are in support but question how these sit with extended Permitted Developments Rights which allow residential extensions and rooftop extensions in certain circumstances without individual planning permission. How will people intending to make use of PDR and build upwards get to know about Design Principles 17 and 18?

BCC Response: The City Council recognises that current PDR will remove the need for planning permission for a number of rooftop extensions. However, PDR changes and there maybe scenarios where permission is needed. The City Council would also encourage PDR proposal to respond to the guidance.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

We support Design Principle 23 (Lighting of buildings and spaces) but note that, admirable as it is, it is little different from the shopfront guide, which is observed more in the breach than the adherence in Moseley. How will tenants and commercial property landlords know about these design policies? How will these policies be enforced? We also note that there is little acknowledgement in these policies of the wider issue of light pollution and suggest that there should be a specific requirement to reduce neighbourhood light pollution.

BCC Response: If the proposal does not require planning permission, then it will not be possible to require or enforce the guidance from a planning perspective.

Comment related to light pollution of noted.

**Proposed Amendment: Design Principle 23**

*Place after 'floodlighting':*

***Any lighting proposal must ensure it does not result in unacceptable levels light pollution that impact on adjacent uses or public spaces.***

Design Principle 25 (waste storage) Again, we note the tension between these policies and PDR where businesses may convert from one type of low-waste to another of high-waste with no planning permission, but we would argue that any business applying to extend their premises must provide robust waste storage as part of the application. Likewise, robust waste storage and removal must be a condition of approval for redevelopment of existing buildings where this requires planning permission.

BCC Response: Comment noted. As mentioned in the comments, where a change of use of development requires planning permission, the guidance related to waste storage should be adhered to.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

We would make two further overall observations. First, a communications strategy must be considered as part of the introduction of this design code so that developers working within PDR are forewarned of the requirements they will face on completion.

Second, it is absolutely crucial that enforcement is given a high priority and resourced accordingly. Enforcement should also include the possibility of significant fines for violation. Unless enforcement is robust the Design Code will quickly come to be seen as an irrelevance or a set of rules to be gamed, to the detriment of us all.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Although we are supportive, we would ask that it be made clear that these policies extend to extensions and repurposing. We would also suggest that where a development consists of demolition and new build a case must be made why existing buildings cannot be refurbished or repurposed (assuming that demolition is in itself a form of waste).

BCC Response: City Note EF-5 promotes the re-use of existing buildings. But this 'desire' must be applied within the confine of national policy and guidance.

We cannot overstate how important we believe this is, having looked at far too many sub-standard and frankly inadequate applications. We suggest that clear guidelines should be provided regarding the required quality of drawings, elevations and supporting evidence such as photographs, and that where these guidelines are not adhered to the application is referred for revision without consideration. We are in sympathy with the White

Paper's desire to streamline the planning process, but we are also aware that this is a two-way street with developers (who in our case are often individuals and not large-scale property developers) needing to play their part in submitting high-quality documentation.

BCC Response: the Fulfilling Design Quality section and Design Principle 28 outline developer requirements related to the detail of drawings to be submitted; allied with details related to materials and build quality postapproval.

**SPORTS ENGLAND**

Paper's desire to streamline the planning process, but we are also aware that this is a two-way street with developers (who in our case are often individuals and not large-scale property developers) needing to play their part in submitting high-quality documentation.

BCC Response: the Fulfilling Design Quality section and Design Principle 28 outline developer requirements related to the detail of drawings to be submitted; allied with details related to materials and build quality postapproval.

Sport England has assessed this consultation in the light of Sport England's Planning for Sport: Forward Planning guidance <https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport>

The overall thrust of the statement is that a planned approach to the provision of facilities and opportunities for sport is necessary, new sports facilities should be fit for purpose, and they should be available for community sport. To achieve this, our objectives are to:

PROTECT sports facilities from loss as a result of redevelopment

ENHANCE existing facilities through improving their quality, accessibility and management

PROVIDE new facilities that are fit for purpose to meet demands for participation now and in the future.

Sport England along with Public Health England have launched our revised guidance 'Active Design' which we consider has considerable synergy the Plan. It may therefore be useful to provide a cross-reference (and perhaps a hyperlink <https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design>). Sport England believes that being active should be an intrinsic part of everyone's life pattern.

- The guidance is aimed at planners, urban designers, developers and health professionals.
- The guidance looks to support the creation of healthy communities through the land use planning system by encouraging people to be more physically active through their everyday lives.

Ten Active Design Principles have been developed to inspire and inform the design and layout of cities, towns, villages, neighbourhoods, buildings, streets and open spaces, to promote sport and physical activity and active lifestyles. They aimed at contributing towards the Governments desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design.

The developer's checklist (Appendix 1) has been revised and can also be accessed via <https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design>

Sport England would encourage development in Birmingham be designed in line with the Active Design principles to secure sustainable design. This could be evidenced by use of the checklist.

Active Design should be demonstrated in the major housing sites in the plan period.

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges the synergy between the DG and Active Design and is supportive of the collective promotion of sustainable, healthy communities. Whilst the City Council is supportive of the Active Design Principles, it does not want to create conflict or confusion to developers on what the City Council expects from development. As referenced by Sport England, we are both seeking to achieve the same desired outcome to the benefit of the city's communities.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

The draft Design Guide has a lot of synergy with Active Design and the 10 Principles:

1. Activity for all
2. Walkable communities
3. Connected walking & cycling routes
4. Co-location of community facilities
5. Network of Multifunctional Open Space
6. High Quality Streets and Spaces

7. Appropriate Infrastructure
8. Active Buildings
9. Management, maintenance, monitoring & evaluation.
10. Activity Promotion & Local Champions.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Designing High Quality Homes - Communal Spaces - page 18

Support for formal communal space providing space for exercise - consideration should be given to providing gym equipment in these spaces BCC Response: Comment noted.

Proposed Amendment:

**Communal space**

Within multi-unit schemes such as apartments, student schemes and elderly accommodation, communal spaces should be provided that enable people to interact with one another; to help support a sense of community. This should be in the form of formal areas such as lounges, exercise spaces / **gyms**, amenity space or shared dining

Designing High Quality Homes - Outdoor Amenity Space for Residents - page 23

Support for outdoor amenity space being large enough to allow exercise and for communal spaces to be suitable for multiple uses. Such spaces should be supported by seating and suitable for informal physical activity to take place.

BCC Response: The City Council believes the reference to 'enable external leisure to take place' responds to this. Proposed

Amendment: none proposed

Community, Cultural and Faith Buildings - page 35

Community buildings should be designed to allow the spaces within them to be used for physical activity if required. Community centres and faith related buildings provide local opportunities for physical activity in environments that the users are comfortable with. For example, halls and other suitable spaces within such buildings can be used for fitness, dance, martial arts etc. This should be specifically referenced in this section. Such buildings should also have layouts that encourage walking - same advice as that set out for places of work

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Proposed Amendment:

**CITY NOTE LW-26**

**Community (including schools and leisure centres), cultural and faith buildings**

The social role of community, cultural and faith buildings can result in them playing an important, influential role in lives of their users; a consideration that must be acknowledged by their design.

The City Council encourages the designers of these buildings to express their social and cultural functions within their designs. This should lead to innovative, bold, modern architecture and interior designs that support and encourage users to partake and interact in their learning, community, leisure and/or faith activities. *Designs are also encouraged to provide flexible space than could be used for a range of functions beyond the core use (indoor sports, events, community groups, etc).*

Places of work - page 35

Support for providing environments that provide outdoor amenity space and layouts that encourage walking such as prominently located stairs and less lifts. Also support for incorporating lockers, showers and changing space to support employees that run/cycle to work and provision of gym/exercise space in larger developments.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Water Assets - page 52



Support for this section especially design that would active the use of the water for leisure and lead to spaces. The section should also set out that water spaces are an important destination that will provide a focal point for a walk or cycle ride or form part of an active travel route. Therefore they should be supported by ancillary facilities that encourage this such as seating at viewpoints and refreshment facilities and toilets.

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges the route network provide by the city's canal network. This role is acknowledged by Design Principles 5 & 21.

Proposed Amendment: none proposed.

#### Lighting of Public Spaces - page 59

Support for this section as it recognises the role of lighting in supporting safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

#### General

Would make general comment about making the document an online interactive guide on the website rather than a PDF so it links directly to the cross referenced supporting documents rather than them having to be downloaded separately as this will encourage users to consider the linked guidance plus avoid issue of weblinks in the PDF having to be updated all the time e.g. Essex Design Guide <https://www.essexdesignguide.co.uk/>

#### Design Themes

Would a checklist to support a DAS help consistently and comprehensively demonstrate that developments have incorporated and addressed the design themes. Without this it will rely on the LA's interpretation of the DAS which will be difficult to resource and be consistent.

This would also give developer the opportunity to explain why they are not meeting a design principle. This could be considered to support the section about submitting a planning application on page 72.

How will the Design Guide be monitored for implementation and success?

Will there be an annual report? Case studies? To show success in its implementation?

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Once the DG has been adopted, the City Council hope to explore options on how to present the document in an accessible way on the website. It will also explore checklists and quick reference guides to help users navigate the document and help demonstrate compliance.

#### Birmingham ID

I'm not sure whether this needs to be addressed in this doc but I feel there needs to be an agreed process for determining Character. This should involve the participation of residents in a given area in a consultation process, with residents having final say in Character definition for their area/ward

BCC Response: Design Principle 2 and its accompanying City Notes outline the importance of understanding character and suggest elements to consider when undertaking a character assessment. This guidance does not preclude developers working with communities in undertaking these assessments; and the City Council would support it.

The National Design Code further supports the involvement of communities in helping to define and assess existing character.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

#### Healthy, Living & Working

I feel that aspects of this documentation needs to address the clear imbalance and hyper concentration of students in residential communities.

The document promotes balanced communities, yet imbalances are evident in Selly Oak and Bournbrook and likely in future to creep into surrounding areas due to a high percentage of students and their increasing

demand for accommodation . ( In HMOs and PBSA). The document needs to address the planning processes that have allowed this over concentration to happen and ensure that student accommodation development is spread around the university perimeter, being more shared with Harborne and Edgbaston than it is currently and to ensure that the university (uofB) takes more responsibility for developing its own land for these purposes.

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges community concerns related to PBSA and HMOs. There are a number of policy requirements applicants need to align with; which will be furthered by the emerging Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (DMB). The Birmingham Development Plan (BDP) will be refreshed over the coming years, which will include updated evidence on student accommodation needs, which will help inform any new policy approach to these development.

The mechanisms needed to guide PBSA and HMOs need to be policy led and are beyond the scope of the Design Guide.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Student Accommodation Housing Policy. There must be Councils in University Cities in the UK that have policies that protect residential housing from conversion to HMOs and creating imbalanced communities, which addresses the role universities and Councils can play in promoting a healthy balanced community and generally considering the planning of student accommodation. I would suggest that BCC reviews this literature.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

**CALTHORPE RESIDENTS SOCIETY**

demand for accommodation . ( In HMOs and PBSA). The document needs to address the planning processes that have allowed this over concentration to happen and ensure that student accommodation development is spread around the university perimeter, being more shared with Harborne and Edgbaston than it is currently and to ensure that the university (uofB) takes more responsibility for developing its own land for these purposes.

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges community concerns related to PBSA and HMOs. There are a number of policy requirements applicants need to align with; which will be furthered by the emerging Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (DMB). The Birmingham Development Plan (BDP) will be refreshed over the coming years, which will include updated evidence on student accommodation needs, which will help inform any new policy approach to these development.

The mechanisms needed to guide PBSA and HMOs need to be policy led and are beyond the scope of the Design Guide.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Student Accommodation Housing Policy. There must be Councils in University Cities in the UK that have policies that protect residential housing from conversion to HMOs and creating imbalanced communities, which addresses the role universities and Councils can play in promoting a healthy balanced community and generally considering the planning of student accommodation. I would suggest that BCC reviews this literature.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

The Calthorpe Residents Society (CRS) welcomes the preparation of the Birmingham Design Guide as a welcome addition to the planning policies of the City Council.

The CRS notes that the Design Guide is being prepared as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and that once adopted it will be used as a “material consideration in the assessment of planning applications”. This firm and clear statement of intent will be useful in assessing planning applications in line with the Design Guide. Will this also apply to development briefs for proposed development sites, and for any semi-formal plans?

BCC Response: Any development proposals should align with the relevant elements of the DG. This should equally apply to development briefs or plans. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

We believe that guidance and a clear framework which outlines the process by which the Design Guide is taken into account by Planning Officers (in the pre-application discussion with applicants and developers), by the Planning Committee, and in consultation with key interested parties in local communities would also be beneficial. Are there any plans for this?

BCC Response: As detailed by the applicant above, the DG will be a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications. As such, its application by the City Council will be akin to any SPD. The development proposal will be assessed against the design guidance (design principles and city notes) within the DG. The Planning Officer’s report will detail compliance with this. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

#### Birmingham ID

The Design Guide states “Birmingham’s unique identity is one of its key assets that must be celebrated, strengthened and positively utilised to help realise the city’s growth agenda”. Can the Design Guide Team elaborate further what this unique identity is?

BCC Response: This is broadly outlined by the introductory text and supporting text to the design principles. Given the size of Birmingham is difficult to distil the unique identity, but is derived from its diverse communities, history and growth.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

We suggest that CRS should for example, be included as a statutory consultee at all stages of the planning process; and that greater encouragement and resource capacity is provided to enable the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans.

BCC Response: Comment noted. These comments extend beyond the direct scope of the DG. The City Council fully supports engagement with local communities and encourages the creation of neighbourhood plans and emerging Design Codes.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

We are clear that the Design Guide must ensure that the lessons arising from the COVID experience are fully understood and included and implemented through the Design Guide. Will the value of our green spaces be positively protected and nurtured in future dialogue with landowners and developers?

BCC Response: The Landscape & GI Themes outlines the importance of protecting and enhancing the city's GI. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

We must take a broader view of the impact of developments on local communities. This is especially true in respect of the Edgbaston Ward, given its close proximity to the City Centre. The impact of tall buildings and increased density in the city centre, the planned "de-traffic" of city roads are already having impacts on neighbouring primarily residential areas, through parking, creeping pressure for increased density on individual plots adjacent to the city centre, and alterations to buildings unsympathetic to the historical and cultural character of the area. How will the Design Guide provide manage these huge pressures on historic areas & communities abutting the city centre?

BCC Response: The City Council believes the guidance detailed within the DG (and that proposed for the emerging Historic Environment SPD) will help establish a framework, from which developers, communities and the city council can effective balance the growth needs of the city, with the conservation of the city's historic assets. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

Will there be a process for ensuring that communities groups and residents associations are more directly involved in these development proposal and pre-app discussions before the submission of formal planning applications?

BCC Response: Pre-application enquiries by their nature are confidential. They enable applicants to submit concepts and test whether they maybe acceptable when considered again planning policy and guidance. If an applicant subsequently wants to submit a planning application, the City Council would support early engagement with the surrounding community, but this is not something the City Council can require. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

#### Streets & Spaces

In principle we support both of these Design Principles.

To deliver safe and inviting inclusive spaces for people should consider the wider impacts of restricting traffic movements and car parking on adjacent areas. Such considerations require substantially increased investment in public transport, cycling and pedestrianisation improvements.

It is unclear to us how this will be achieved if there is a disconnect in the timing of public transport improvements with this design policy. How will these Design Policies work with transport investment?

BCC Response: comments noted. The City Council will continue to work with TfWM and the combined authority on enhancing transport investment across the city. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

We also strongly feel that any encouragement of walking routes and cycling routes should have clear maintenance regimes to ensure that they are well maintained, litter and graffiti free such that they are actively seen as safe to use. What improvements to the maintenance regime for these routes will be made?

BCC Response: the majority of routes fall within the adopted highway. As such, will be maintained on behalf of the City Council. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

We would welcome plans for local artists to be involved in the future working with local resident groups. Will there be funding available to groups such as the CRS to support such local artistic initiatives?

BCC Response: arts funding is beyond the scope of the DG.  
Proposed Amendments: None proposed

#### Landscape & GI



Will the Design Guide strengthen the powers and fines applicable to those who flout TPOs and misuse of green space in our communities?

BCC Response: TPOs and their protection are guided by specific Regulations. The DG cannot extend fines or powers beyond these. Proposed

Amendments: None proposed

The Design Policies must recognise more formally the important role which nature plays in the Edgbaston area, and ensure these policies are actively considered in all future development plans. This should include any future long terms which the Calthorpe Estate itself may consider.

BCC Response: The City Council believes the guidance within the Landscape & GI Theme will ensure landscape and GI is a key element of any development. Proposed

Amendments: None proposed

The CRS as the leading residents group should be seen as a key consultee in all such discussions about the future of tree managements

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

#### Healthy, Living & Working

We especially support Design Principle 22 with regards to Development and Works involving Historic Assets. Our area is the largest Conservation Area in Birmingham and indeed the UK. However, we remain deeply concerned that this is not celebrated by the Council and landowners across our area. Can we be assured that this Design Policy and Design Principle 22 will be more rigorously enforced than hitherto?

BCC Response: The Historic Environment SPD will supersede the majority of the draft historic environment guidance within the DG. Comments provided will be feed into the drafting process of this Historic Environment SPD.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

We remain very concerned with regards to waste storage facilities and telecommunications infrastructure. Therefore, we welcome the Design Principles 25 and 26. However, we feel that the powers available to enforce better location and design remain weak, and the contact points to seek changes and improvement require improvement. Therefore, will there be stronger powers and actions to ensure that, especially in historic environments , these Design Principles are enforced?

BCC Response: The design principles are there to followed and aligned with by development. If they do not align, the proposal may not be approved. Proposed

Amendments: None proposed

#### Efficient & Future

We recognise that there are inherent contradictions with regards to our historic assets. But we would ask that very careful consideration is given to any proposals to alter such existing structures. We feel that the current capacity of the Council to enforce the existing rules with regards to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas is to weak and under-resourced.

Therefore, the CRS asks what consideration has and will be given to increase the capacity of the Council's Conservation team capacity and also what resource can be made to key areas of the city at a local level to monitor and manage their historic assets.

BCC Response: this is beyond the scope of the DG.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

#### Design Principle 28

We support the intent of Design Principle 28 to ensure that development proposals are "appropriately detailed". Our experience with regards to a number of proposals across our area is that this principle is easily flouted, and this is especially concerning with regards to listed buildings and historic landscapes and contexts.

Will there be a strengthening of enforcement by the Council to ensure that this Principle is adhered to?

BCC Response: Design principle 28 outlines what the City Council will expect provide to support their planning application and help discharge conditions. It does not alter the mechanisms within which planning approval function, but it reiterates the level of detailed need to demonstrate the design proposed. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

Other

We would ask that a public involvement and participation toolkit is prepared by the Council to enable local groups and residents to be openly included in such dialogues and discussions.

BCC Response: this request extends beyond the specific scope of the DG. However, the City Council want to continue enhancing its engagement with residents and communities; and will continue to explore and test effective means of enhanced engagement and participation in the planning system.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

Landscape & GI Theme

"I strongly support design principles 7 and 8 in relation to trees. There is, however, a noticeable spelling error in the heading for principle 7: it should read ""integrating"" and not ""intergrating"".

BCC Response: comments welcome and noted.

**Proposed Amendment:**

**Design Principle 7**

**Intergrating Integrating existing trees into development**

It is good to see such a large amount of detail on how existing trees will where possible be retained in new development. It would perhaps be good to give some more information on how trees that have to be removed will be replaced: I think I saw one reference to use of Cavat values in calculating how many new trees will need to be planted.

BCC Response: The City Council will use CAVAT to established mitigation resulting from the loss of existing trees on a site. Further details will be included in the Landscape & GI City Manual at GI-8 and (a new note) GI-9.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

The aspiration of increasing the city's tree canopy cover to 25% by 2030 is good and this will be of great help in tackling both the biodiversity and climate emergencies. The Woodland Trust ideally would like to see a minimum of 30% tree canopy cover in any new development: perhaps you could consider setting a target for new development to help you achieve your overall aim of 25% canopy cover by 2030?"

BCC Response: As detailed in City Note GI-16, the City Council has canopy coverage data by use from 2016, which it will use as a base reference to seek canopy gains of via new development. Given the varied character across Birmingham (from city centre to urban fringe), the City Council believes it needs to apply a site by site approach.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

BCC Response: Design principle 28 outlines what the City Council will expect provide to support their planning application and help discharge conditions. It does not alter the mechanisms within which planning approval function, but it reiterates the level of detailed need to demonstrate the design proposed. Proposed Amendments: None proposed

Other

We would ask that a public involvement and participation toolkit is prepared by the Council to enable local groups and residents to be openly included in such dialogues and discussions.

BCC Response: this request extends beyond the specific scope of the DG. However, the City Council want to continue enhancing its engagement with residents and communities; and will continue to explore and test effective means of enhanced engagement and participation in the planning system.

Proposed Amendments: None proposed

Streets & Spaces

Principle 4 mentions streets being designed with active travel in mind. A definition of active travel needs to be provided to make it clear to the reader what modes of transport are included. Does the increase in active travel mean that infrastructure such as cycle paths will be asked for at the planning stage?

BCC Response: Active Travel – comments noted

The size of the develop is likely to dictate whether cycle paths will be asked for. This will be site specific discussion between the LPA and the developer, but a focus on safe and efficient pedestrian and cyclist movement should be applied.



**Proposed Amendment: Design**

**Principle 4**

- Design streets to prioritise active travel (*walking, running, cycling, skate/scooter*).

We take note of the points made in principle 5. We are also aware that the parking SPD is currently being updated. If developers are encouraged to make access to public transport easier and minimise the use of private vehicles, guidance on standards rather than specific figures may be more appropriate. In addition, guidance on how to promote active travel would be useful for the developer.

BCC Response:

The promotion of active travel is a wide ranging issues, but from a planning perspective, the provision of infrastructure and safe, direct routes and spaces will help provide an environment to encourage and support active travel. Behaviour change activities to promote active travel are not considered a design issue, but are referenced in wider planning policy through the Birmingham Development Plan and the requirement for travel plans to support planning applications.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Landscape & GI

We agree to principle 6, however this should be adhered to where appropriate. Services and infrastructure, topography and levels are all mentioned as other detailed design considerations. However, density also needs to be taken into account by Birmingham City Council when considering landscape proposals at planning stage. A developable site needs to prove viable, so compromises may need to be taken in any of the mentioned disciplines to achieve good design. If it is not possible to provide the level of landscaping required, is there scope to provide an offsite contribution? Furthermore, there needs to be further clarification as to whether landscaping can be classified as 'open space'.

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges landscape proposal will need to specific to the characteristic of the site and the surrounding area. The City Council believes the guidance within Design Principle 6, all for this site specific approach to be undertaken.

Open Space – if private open spaces (aka private amenity space / gardens), then this must be a private space for residents. If public open space, designs for a wider landscape schemes could include public open space provision in terms of sport and recreation facilities. This would need to be considered on a site by site basis in consultation with the City Council.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

We also support principle 7 however, the Tree Preservation Order map that currently exists is hard to find on the Birmingham City Council website, so an easily accessible map would be of great use to applicants. BCC Response: Comment noted.

We agree with principle 8 where it explains how the applicant must 'appropriately compensate' for the loss of trees that have been removed. However, clarification on what compensation is acceptable would be welcomed, will it be a like for like replacement or will an overage be introduced, in that case we would raise concerns in that regard. In addition, if canopy coverage it to be maximised, input from Birmingham City Council regarding the location of the additional trees may be useful.

BCC Response: what constitutes 'appropriate compensation' would need to be considered on a site by site basis, considering the character and constraints of the site. The City Council's preferred compensate would be to provide on site compensation and gains. However, there may be site specific reasons where appropriate compensation cannot be accommodated on sites and financial contributions sought. The City Council will use CAVAT to calculate the financial value of the tree/s to be lost and the financial mitigate required.

We support principle 9 and think encouragement of Public Open Space will positively influence the city. If public open space is to be provided on new developments, input from Birmingham City Council needs to be given.

BCC Response: Agree. The City Council will work productively with applicants where public open space is to be included within a development.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Principle 10 mentions how ecological and/ or geological assessments are important to establish likely impacts of the proposal. We respect that this an imperative part of the planning process, however a balance between



the impacts and development must be reached. Principle 10 also mentions that management plans must be submitted and managed through construction. This statement implies that management plans are to be submitted at planning stage, however management companies are discussed and approached by the developer after planning approval.

BCC Response: The statement within Design Principle 10 is as below. The City Council does not believe this implies their submission at initial planning application stage. The submission of these documents are often attached to pre-commencement conditions, but there may be instances where part or all of this information may be needed to support the planning application.

***Management and monitoring***

*Proposals must submit management plans outlining how existing and new assets will be managed and monitored during construction and through the proposals lifetime.*

**Proposed Amendments: Design Principle 10**

**Assessment**

Development must undertake appropriate ecological surveys to understand the biodiversity and geodiversity assets present within the proposed development site and its surrounding area.

Proposals likely to affect any designated site, important habitat, species or geological feature must be supported by adequate ecological and geological information to assess the likely impact of the proposal. Any identified impacts must influence the design of a proposal, applying the sequential Mitigation Hierarchy; to avoid, mitigate or compensate the impacts. ***This process should inform a Mitigation Plan which will need to be submitted with a planning application (full or reserved matters), or subject to condition.***

Healthy, Living & Working

Principle 12 is positively welcomed by the house building community. Architects are encouraged to be innovative with their designs to create a sense of place and space. Nevertheless, an explanation of 'innovative' is needed to help guide architects to create buildings that confidently impact the surrounding area.

BCC Response: this is for the architect to interpret. Innovation could be derived from the visual appears, materiality and/or building techniques applied.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

We can fully support principle 13 and 14 as this should be standard practice within the planning industry. BCC

Response: Comment noted.

The Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted the need for high quality homes that are spoken about in principle 16. We will seek to accept the criteria set within this principle and will endeavor to produce a product up to this standard.

BCC Response: Comment noted.

Principle 21 stipulates that proposals should support and promote appropriate water based travel and exercise. Guidance on how a developer can achieve this will need to be given. As well as this, water transportation is rarely used within the modern day Birmingham. Are there plans to enhance this service and will highways contributions be affected by the upkeep of the water transportation?

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges the comment. The inclusion of water based travel is promoted by the Canal & River Trust, the premise of which the City Council supports. However, it does not envisage a modal shift back to water travel. The City Council envisage the use for exercise (canoes, paddle boards etc) rather than daily travel. As such, there are no intentions at this time to redirect highways contributions to water base travel. However, if there are sites where developers wish to enhancement water based transport infrastructure or projects, this can be discussed with the City Council.

Proposed Amendment: none proposed

Principle 25 asks the developer to incorporate waste storage within a building. This could create an undesirable place to live due to unpleasant smells and possible infestations of rodents. It may also prove challenging for refuse vehicles to collect waste from buildings such as apartments. If their bin stores are appropriately located in near the building, it will create easy access for dwellers and companies to collect waste. A similar situation should also be applied to bin collection points with houses. Most dwellings now have access to the rear of the properties. Having a designated collection point for waste will allow easy access for waste companies.

BCC Response: The City Council has approved numerous apartment schemes with integrated waste stores, with direct external access. Waste collection is managed by the building operator. The City Council does not object to the siting of waste collection points where necessary, but this must not be permanent storage areas.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Design Principle 28

Principle 28 states that detailed drawings will be required for both the validation checklist and for approval of the application. It further explains how landscape drawings will be conditioned where appropriate. If detailed landscape drawings have been submitted with the proposal, could discrepancies be discussed between the case officer and developer at planning stage, rather than having to submit them on a second occasion for a condition?

BCC Response: The City Council recognises that the majority of developers prefer to condition landscape details and management plans. However, if a developer wishes to submit such detail with a planning application, comments and feedback on this will be provided along with wider comments on the proposal. If the appropriate level of detail is submitted, there would be no reason to need an additional condition. The reference to the discussion of discrepancies is a specific element that would not be included in the DG. As with any changes to an approved scheme (building or landscape) is likely to require an appropriate amendment application.

**Council for British Archaeology, West Midlands**

Design Principle 28

Principle 28 states that detailed drawings will be required for both the validation checklist and for approval of the application. It further explains how landscape drawings will be conditioned where appropriate. If detailed landscape drawings have been submitted with the proposal, could discrepancies be discussed between the case officer and developer at planning stage, rather than having to submit them on a second occasion for a condition?

BCC Response: The City Council recognises that the majority of developers prefer to condition landscape details and management plans. However, if a developer wishes to submit such detail with a planning application, comments and feedback on this will be provided along with wider comments on the proposal. If the appropriate level of detail is submitted, there would be no reason to need an additional condition. The reference to the discussion of discrepancies is a specific element that would not be included in the DG. As with any changes to an approved schemes (building or landscape) is likely to require an appropriate amendment application.

The term "historic assets" should be changed to "heritage assets" because this is the term used in the NPPF.

BCC Response: comment welcomed & supported.

Proposed Amendment: Amend all references in the document from 'historic assets' to 'heritage assets'.

DPs 1-3 and the ID manual need to state a principle of working with what's already there rather than imposition.

BCC Response: The focus of a character assessment must be to focus on what is already there and respond positively to this. Design Principles 3 and its associated City Notes will be superseded by the Historic Environment SPD. As such, will be deleted.

Proposed Amendment: none proposed

Design Principles p15 This needs to make it clear that heritage assets (designated and non-designated) are a finite and non-renewable resource and their protection therefore contributes to sustainability.

BCC Response: Design Principles 3 and its associated City Notes will be superseded by the Historic Environment SPD. As such, will be deleted. Proposed

Amendment: deletion of Design Principle 3

The list of "heritage assets" should also include historic townscapes (street patterns, plot patterns, property boundaries etc) and historic landscapes (including field patterns and field boundaries)

BCC Response: Design Principles 3 and its associated City Notes will be superseded by the Historic Environment SPD. As such, will be deleted. Proposed

Amendment: deletion of Design Principle 3

DP2, DPD 3, ID-1, ID-2 and ID-3 should refer to the Historic Environment Record and Historic Landscape Characterisation.

BCC Response: City Notes ID-2 & ID-3 and Design Principle 3 will be deleted and superseded by the Historic Environment SPD. Proposed

Amendment: None proposed

ID City Manual:

p13 ID-3 "Significance of setting" should be Significance of setting of a heritage asset to make it clear that this is what it's referring to. The phrase "agree the significance of the setting" (which implies that interpretation of the setting will be determined by the proposed development) should be replaced by a statement about discussion on how the design can respect the significance of the setting.

p14- Historic Designations- this should be Historic Environment Designations.

Scheduled Monuments (which is the term used in the legislation and the NPPF) rather than Scheduled Ancient Monuments

Scheduled Monuments- the definition - use the definition on the Historic England website.

Local/non-designated heritage assets- this should be titled Non-designated heritage assets because not all of these are on the local list.

It should read: Buildings, structures and archaeological remains which are not currently considered to have national significance [some of them may be statutorily designated in the future].

BCC Response: City Note ID-3 will be superseded by the Historic Environment SPD. As such, will be deleted. Proposed

Amendment: deletion of City Note ID-3

The Streets and Spaces manual needs to be cross-referenced to character in the ID Manual, e.g. in SS-3 which refers to established local character.

BCC Response: the text in SS-3 relates to the characteristics of streets and spaces. Whilst there is a degree of relationship with the Birmingham Id Manual, the City Council does not believe cross reference is needed.

Proposed Amendment: none proposed.

SS-7 p11- as well as listed buildings, this should include reference to the impact of advertisement hoardings on the setting of a scheduled monument, registered park and garden and non-designated heritage assets.

BCC Response: comment noted Proposed

Amendment:

Conservation areas

Sites in and directly adjoining the boundary of a Conservation Area will not normally be an acceptable location for advertisement hoardings due to the visual impact on the character and amenity of the historic assets and environment.

Listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered park and garden and conservation areas

Listed buildings, their curtilage and sites adjoining Listed Buildings Designated heritage assets or their surroundings would not normally be an acceptable location for advertisement hoardings as their presence is likely to negatively impact on the amenity, character, significance and/or setting of the asset Listed Building.

GI-1 Existing features might also include archaeological remains, and landscaping should be designed to protect and incorporate them. There are opportunities to publicly interpret archaeological remains through landscaping.

BCC Response: comment noted Proposed

Amendment:

**CITY NOTE GI-1**

**Utilise and protect and use existing landscape assets**

Sites may also possess archaeological remains, which if present should be protect and incorporated into a design.

GI-15- The phrase "overriding design considerations" should be omitted because it implies that design of a development is more important than retention of a feature that contributes to character. Hedges include historic hedgerows which are part of the historic environment- they are significant in their location, therefore their loss cannot adequately be mitigated by translocation or replanting.

BCC Response: comment noted, but in determining the outcome of a planning application, the decision often requires the effective 'planning balance' to be undertaken. The City Council will also ways seek the retention of existing landscape assets, but there may be circumstances where this is not possible due to other overriding considerations. Proposed Amendment: None proposed.

GI-17- On-site constraints might include heritage assets therefore an assessment of the impact on these would be required.



BCC Response: as detailed within the text of GI-17, tree planting schemes must respond to the constraints and characteristics of the site. If heritage assets are present, they will be considered within this assessment.  
Proposed Amendment: none proposed

This section seems to be largely about buildings- it should also mention archaeological remains and historic townscapes and landscapes, and refer back to DP3. It should also refer to design to preserve archaeological remains in situ within a new development, as has been achieved on some sites in Birmingham.

BCC Response: comment noted. This Theme does focus on the design of buildings. The City Council supports the desire and promotion of preserving archaeological remains and historic landscapes, but this should be identified by the developer via character assessment and any relevant heritage statement / assessment and then feed this into the design response. Any reference to preserving and using / celebrating should be included within the design principles related to heritage assets and the emerging Historic Environment SPD. Proposed Amendment: none proposed

LW-46- 49- water assets include designated and non-designated heritage assets, so this needs to be acknowledged and cross-referenced.

BCC Response: the presence of any heritage assets will be identified by the character assessment. Proposed Amendment: none proposed

LW-51- demolition in conservation areas- "poor design", "poor quality or failing materials" and "structurally compromised" do not necessarily have a negative impact on the character and appearance for which the conservation area was designated and are not therefore necessarily appropriate criteria to justify demolition.

BCC Response: comment noted. This section of the draft DG will be superseded by the Birmingham Historic Environment SPD and will be removed from the DG. These comments will be fed into the drafting of the Historic Environment SPD.

Proposed Amendment: City Note LW-51 to be deleted.

LW-53- demolition of non-designated heritage assets- structural integrity and development viability are appropriate terms because they are open to interpretation to suit a proposed development rather than in relation to the significance of the heritage asset. Compromise of structural integrity may result from deliberate neglect in order to justify demolition.

BCC Response: comment noted  
Proposed Amendment: None proposed.

LW-54- new buildings in conservation areas.- Omit reference to pastiche forms.  
This should acknowledge the opportunities to retain, reuse and adapt historic buildings and other structures, to contribute to sustainability.

BCC Response: comment noted. This section of the draft DG will be superseded by the Birmingham Historic Environment SPD and will be removed from the DG. These comments will be fed into the drafting of the Historic Environment SPD.

Proposed Amendment: LW-54 to be deleted.

**Design Principles p74-** should be scheduled monument and scheduled monument consent (which is granted by the Secretary of State and administered by Historic England).

"Local and undesignated heritage assets-this should be "Non-designated heritage assets"

p77- list of professional expertise- add archaeologists to this list.

BCC Response: comment noted

Proposed Amendment: Works to and consents for historic assets etc..... @ page 74 of the Design Principles document to be deleted.

**Works to and consents for historic assets**





Historic assets across the city are often protected to help retain and preserve their historic significance; in some cases requiring specific consents to undertake any alterations or repairs to them.

#### Listed buildings and structures

For a listed building or structure, listed building consent is likely to be required to undertake any works to the building. Such works include internal and external alterations, new heating and ventilation systems, cleaning of external masonry,

painting of historic surfaces and replacement or alterations of windows to the construction of an extension. This is by no means an exhaustive list; as such the City's Conservation Officer must be consulted prior to any works taking place.

Depending on the scale of works proposed to a listed building, a planning application may also be required.

#### Conservation areas

Within a conservation area, planning permission may be required for works that would otherwise have been permitted development, or where an Article 4 direction has been placed over the conservation area, removing certain permitted development. Consent is also required for works to trees and the demolition of an asset in excess of 115cu.m.

#### Scheduled ancient monuments

Works affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument will require Scheduled Ancient Monument Consent from Historic England.

#### Registered parks and gardens

No separate permission is required for development affecting a registered park or garden. However, the potential impact development may have on the asset will be a key consideration in determining a planning application.

#### Local and undesignated heritage assets

No separate permission is required for development affecting a local or nondesignated heritage asset. However, the potential impact development may have on the asset will be a key consideration in determining the planning application.

### **P.77 - Professional expertise**

More complex developments (due to size of development or characteristics of the site) may require additional professional expertise, such as building conservation specialists, archaeologists, ecologists, arboriculturist, transport engineer, landscape architect, professional artists, town planner, drainage and flood risk engineer and building surveyor.

#### Streets & Spaces

Advertising billboards have become a real nuisance to residents, especially as they are changing over from paper and paste to internally illuminated digital billboards. Sometimes it can feel like we are surrounded and bombarded by constant advertising, often for products which are damaging to public health (e.g. fast food) and the environment (e.g. new cars). If residents voice their complaints to the Council over a nuisance billboard (too bright, too distracting, broken/untidy, too many in one area etc) we would like the Council to recognise this and take all necessary steps to remove any billboards which the residents feel are a nuisance or a blight on their neighbourhood. Ideally, the Council would aim to remove half of the billboards without the residents having to say anything as that would improve things a lot.

We also object to the use of scanning software and targeted ads on digital billboards which we feel are an invasion of privacy. We believe Birmingham would be a much more pleasant place to live, work and visit with fewer advertising billboards around.

BCC Response: the City Council acknowledges the concerns raised about advertising and particularly digital systems.

Within the DG Deign Principle 4 (Creating Great Streets) and its accompanying City Note SS-5 (Advertisements) will enhance the guidance on how the City Council will assess advertisement application. However, it must be noted that the City Council must align with national guidance and regulations, which residents may not consider sufficiently robust enough to deter the installation of freestanding advertisements and billboards.

Proposed Amendment: no amendment proposed.

#### Healthy, Living & Working

Developments next to water assets. Ensure that the Flapper pub site on Cambrian Wharf remains a pub and not a housing development. A housing development there would be completely unsuitable but a pub there is ideal and we need it.

BCC Response: comment noted. Any planning application for this site will be assessed against existing planning policy and guidance.

Proposed Amendment: No amendments.

Efficient & Future

Allow for greener transport so ensure that electric car charging points are put in to new buildings which could encourage people to switch to electric vehicles.

BCC Response: comment noted and welcome. The City Council has a project seeking to install electric charge points across the city; and via the Parking SPD and the DG, will encourage new developments to provide charging facilities.

Proposed Amendment: non proposed.

**Exchange (Birmingham) Limited Partnerships, the owners of Allegro scheme**

Proposed Amendment: No amendments.

#### Efficient & Future

Allow for greener transport so ensure that electric car charging points are put in to new buildings which could encourage people to switch to electric vehicles.

BCC Response: comment noted and welcome. The City Council has a project seeking to install electric charge points across the city; and via the Parking SPD and the DG, will encourage new developments to provide charging facilities.

Proposed Amendment: non proposed.

#### Streets & Spaces

The contents page of this document suggests that at Section 4 "Submitting a development proposal" there is guidance on Design Review Panels, however on turning to the Section there is nothing there. This detail should be included and reconsulted upon - the process of Design Reviews is particularly important for taller buildings in city centre contexts and should be compulsory for schemes of a certain scale.

BCC Response: comment noted. The City Council does not currently operate a design review panel. **Proposed**

#### **Amendment:**

##### **CONTENT PAGE**

##### **4 Submitting a development proposal**

Consents and pre-application engagement

- Formal pre-application advice
- Design review

#### **Healthy, Living & Working**

Within the 'Healthy Living and Working Places City Manual' - LW45 'Location of Tall buildings'. We advise that following underlined words need to be added:

Conservation Areas play a crucial role in creating and establishing design quality. They should be protected from harm that poorly placed tall buildings can cause them.

Tall buildings will not be accepted: 1. Within any of the city's conservation areas, "or where they would cause harm to the setting of a conservation area" (added words in speech marks).

BCC Response: in response to comments submitted by Historic England, the City Council has revised the guidance elated to the location of tall buildings. **Proposed Amendment:** please see proposed revisions to the location of tall building above (see Historic England comments & response).

We also believe that this document should also state that:

"Tall buildings exceeding 30 storeys in height must be reviewed by an independent Design Review Panel, which shall include independent heritage expertise."

BCC Response: comment noted. The City Council does not currently operate a design review panel. **Proposed**

Amendment: none proposed.

#### Tall Buildings - Amenity Space

Finally, we believe that the document should be more specific in stressing tall buildings should not be accepted when they have a substantial detrimental impact on the sunlight/daylight and experiential nature of nearby green amenity areas and parks. The importance of such green amenity areas unquestionably increased in recent times. Tall buildings must not create overshadowing of these areas and this should be reflected in the design guide in more specific and stronger terms.

BCC Response: City Note LW-44 provides guidance related to minimise and mitigating the impact of development on the local environment and microclimate. This includes a requirement to submit daylight, sunlight and overshadowing studies.

Proposed Amendment: none proposed

We support the introduction of a Design Guide in Birmingham, as we have been proponents of excellent design in the city as shown by the Allegro development.

BCC Response: comments noted

The production of this document represents much hard work and is to be commended.

My initial reaction was - looks stunning - want to live there! Next my thoughts turned to the reality of litter, graffiti, decay, lack of maintenance and care, speeding traffic, anti-social behaviour, loss of mature trees, filthy canals, the list is extensive. I'm finding it difficult/nay impossible to understand a way forward /link for the first to improve the state of the latter. How do a City's Communities regain a sense of pride and environmental care.

The images in the various documents are photographically exemplary.

How was that achieved? No sign of urban clutter. How will you ever achieve the aspirations for the Design Guide Utopia? Architects and developers may be comfortable with this vision, but I worry most people of the City will feel excluded. Time to discourage vanity and architectural ego trip projects - lets try for harmony not contrast.

Of the few images in the Design Guide that include people - they are merely pedestrians! Walking aimlessly. How's about including images of happy people - enjoying their City environment, even a few pooches.

More attention and action must be invested to seriously deal with Enforcement. We note that the same Enforcement Notices appear on the GIS interactive map layer - for years?!

BCC Response: the above comments and passion for Birmingham is noted and welcome. A number of the concerns raise exceed the scope of the DG, but the City Council recognises the need to reduce street clutter across the city and it working with service providers (and undertaking its own in-house 'cleaning') to remove redundant infrastructure. Whilst the City Council's resources are increasingly diminishing, it has increased resources on street cleaning within the city centre.

The City Council is committed to increase tree coverage across the city, which is reflected in the DG.

The DG seeks to ensure quality, functional design is delivered at all levels to improve the quality of environments. The quality of homes is a key consideration within this. Proposed

Amendment: None proposed

Reflected in comments above.

I refer again to 'The Monocle Guide to Building Better Cities' 5 minute film and book.

We need humanity, a sense of scale, keen citizens, a small act of faith to encourage people to enhance their street environment without fear of theft/vandalism/anti-social behaviour to any enhancements they invest in where they live and/or work.

BCC Response: comments acknowledged and supported. Within the scope of the DG, creating active, secure places is a key requirement; and by creating places / development that encourage community / resident ownership and interaction, it is hoped this sense of community can prevail.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

We now have the invasion of 5G 20m high masts with their numerous associated cabinets. There have been several attempts [failed] to site these in residential and Conservation areas.

It is hoped the Design Guide can discourage Highways/whoever? enthusiasm for creating 'art'/installing displays of vulgar coloured cladding e.g. the Bristol Road underpass at Holloway Head.

BCC Response: the City Council will assess planning application for telecommunications infrastructure in line with National Policy and the local guidance with the Healthy, Living & Working Manual at City Notes LW-61 to 63.

The City Council believes art can be an important way to engage communities and enhance the surrounding environment. As with all art, the result may not be to everyone's personal taste. Proposed Amendment: None proposed

Should the image - Page 20 of the tramlines on 'the lawn' be included? How would this be maintained - litter collected and grass cut, whilst dodging trams.

BCC Response: The image on page 28 in the Design Principles Document is of the grass track at Snowhill in Birmingham. The grass elements are maintained by the owners of the Snowhill development. The City Council believes these are an effective way of introducing green elements into what can be a very hard landscape.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

We must save and care for our existing Green spaces, link them up, encourage more. More funding must be invested to deal with fly tipping, litter, graffiti, street cleaning etc. Our canals are being used to dump rubbish! Gimmick greening should be avoided

Trees [substantial size, not saplings] should be planted wherever feasible in all residential roads - don't rely on private gardens - many citizens are slow to appreciate the importance of trees!

Not enough is invested in caring for our City trees. There are many examples of trees outgrowing their decorative railings and/or pavement grid, and/or breaking up pavements - it appears that nobody from the City notices - or cares?

There must be on-going checks that developers actually include the greening promises they include to get their Planning Applications approved AND they also maintain this - maybe fines for not doing so?

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges and supports the respondents desires to enhance and maintain the city's green infrastructure.

The Landscape & Green Infrastructure Theme and its accompanying City Manual, gives great weight to the enhancement and protection of the city's landscape assets. This will help ensure development schemes protect existing landscape assets, including mature trees (and there they are not, a financial contribution will be secured to fund a replacement tree/s).

Landscape management plans are conditioned to the majority of large development, outlining the ongoing maintenance required for set time periods. Where these are not fulfilled, enforcement can be undertaken.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

With a City so unique, young/colourful/vibrant as Birmingham - one should not attempt a one size 'tasteful design guide' fits all! Each Ward 'village' has unique character.

These should be researched and their individuality developed with their residents - dare I say - towards specific individual 'Village' Design Guides. Encourage citizens to live/work/play within their village, visit other villages.

We already have Moseley Village, Edgbaston Village, Bournville Village, - encourage more!

BCC Response: The City Council fully supports the creation of place specific guidance such as the neighbourhood or village design guides detailed. This local 'detail' is also promoted via the Government's Design Code agenda.

The DG does not seek to replace these area specific documents. It is hoped it can establish overarching design guidance, from which area specific guide can be added. As detailed in the Birmingham ID Theme, detailed character assessment must be undertaken by all development in order to gain an understanding of the surrounding context. The DG does not seek to provide or dictate what this may be. Proposed Amendment: None proposed

There should be stricter controls over utility companies and the potential damage they often cause to our environments.

BCC Response: The City Council acknowledges the comment, but due the statutory powers the utilities companies have, a large majority of their work and infrastructure falls outside the scope / control of the planning system.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

We support the intent of Design Principle 28 to ensure that development proposals and applications are appropriately detailed. Our experience with regards to a number of proposals across our area is that this principle is easily flouted and this is especially concerning with regards to listed buildings and historic landscapes and contexts.

BCC Response: comments noted.

Proposed Amendment: None proposed

We object in part to the provisions of Design Principle 16: High-Quality Homes.

Whilst the need to deliver homes of high quality, and which provide high levels of residential amenity is recognized, we refute the Principle's inflexible application of outdoor amenity space standards. Adopted Policy advocates a more pragmatic approach to the application of numerical standards than is proposed within the emerging Design Guide, asserting that 'careful design rather than a blanket application of numerical standards can often address concerns such as privacy and amenity'. Moreover, the emerging policy appears inconsistent, where Principle 14 states that where minimum privacy distances/ the 45-degree code are not adhered to, the Council will consider these on a case by case basis having regard to the surrounding context, the quality of the proposal, and the impact on existing residents, for example, whilst no such provision is made for the consideration of outdoor amenity spaces within either Design Principle 16 or note LW-13.

Further to the above, within the adopted Development Plan, Birmingham City Council acknowledges that it is not possible to meet the Authority's housing needs within the City boundaries. Strictly applying outdoor space standards reduces the ability of the Authority to meet such housing requirements by effectively constraining the ability of developers to build at higher densities and make the most effective use of land, particularly within an urban context. It is therefore recommended that an additional element of flexibility is written into the guidance, in order to ensure that homes continue to be built at the appropriate densities whilst retaining a high level of residential amenity.

BCC Response: The City Council recognises the need to provide quality residential environments for its existing and future residents. As detailed within the NPPF (130) and the NDG (123), ensuring good quality internal and external environments is a key element of achieving this. The numerical standards detailed within the draft DG are well established standards that the City Council believes are minimum spatial requirement to delivering the 'good quality' environment required. However, the City Council recognises that it may be possible to provide good quality amenity space below these numerical standards, which is reflected in the design principle's supporting text (at page 44 of the draft DG):

*Beyond the internal elements of a home, designs must deliver functional outdoor amenity space, ensuring the quality and functionality of the home's internal environment extends into its outdoor spaces. These spaces, whether integrated or external, individual or communal, must create private, functional areas where residents can relax and connect to the outdoor environment and nature (helping create biophilic led design). The City Council has minimum private amenity space requirements (as below) to help achieve these requirements, but recognises there may be bespoke designs that can deliver quality amenity space under these thresholds. Where a proposal is seeking to achieve this, it must demonstrate how their reduced provision will deliver the quality, useable outdoor space needed to serve the residents.*

Proposed Amendment: no Proposed Amendment.

