

**DIGBETH, DERITEND AND BORDESLEY HIGH STREETS  
(DIGBETH/DERITEND) CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER  
APPRAISAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING POLICIES  
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)  
March 2009**

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

People and Organisations consulted on the preparation of the SPD

393 people and organisations were consulted on the draft SPD between Monday 6<sup>th</sup> October and Friday 14<sup>th</sup> November 2008. In accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement these included statutory consultees and then, following the SCI guidelines, it was considered who else might be interested in the document. A newsletter explaining the context and content of the draft SPD was therefore distributed to every address in the conservation area. The local MP, the ward councillors, amenity groups, business associations and local development interests were consulted individually.

A press notice was placed in the Birmingham Post. The draft SPD and its supporting documents were available for public inspection in the City Council reception area on the 9<sup>th</sup> floor of Alpha Tower, Suffolk Street Queensway, and on the Council's website. Three three hour drop-in sessions were held at Moor Street Station on 8<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2008 when officers were available to answer questions and receive comments on the draft document. The sessions were advertised on the website, in the press notice and in the newsletters sent to consultees. 17 people attended. 19 responses were received as a result of the public consultation; most of these supported the document.

Main issues raised during this consultation.

The attached schedule summarises the responses received. The main issues raised were to do with biodiversity. Most respondents felt that it was important to retain the distinctive 'gritty' character of the conservation area and that any new development should be of high quality.

How have these issues been addressed in the SPD?

The attached schedule lists the comments received and the Council's responses. The responses state where the document has been amended.

The consultation process.

All revised documents will be available on the Council website.

[www.birmingham.gov.uk/digbethderitendca](http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/digbethderitendca)

**Digbeth, Deritend and Bordesley High Streets (Digbeth/Deritend) Conservation Character Appraisal and Supplementary Planning Policies**  
**Public Consultation Comments and Responses**

		<b>Comment</b>	<b>BCC Response</b>
1.	<u>Planning Committee</u> (16 <sup>th</sup> October 2008)	a) Significant document.	Noted
		b) Need to protect areas of interest from insensitive development.  (Resolved that the comments made in the foregoing preamble be referred to the Acting Strategic Director of Development)	Noted and welcomed.
2.	<u>Conservation and Heritage Panel</u> (10 <sup>th</sup> November 2008)	a) Well researched and scholarly document – welcome and timely. Important to set down history of area.	Noted.
		b) Support Policy B2.2 (b) normally limiting new buildings to height of six industrial/commercial storeys and Policy B2.2(i) discouraging new landmark buildings.	Noted.
		c) Current proposals for tall buildings on Digbeth/Park Street (Beorma development) not acknowledged.  Concern at implications for conservation area if Policy B2.2 (b), normally limiting new buildings to height of six industrial/commercial storeys, ignored in this case.	No requirement to refer to proposals or applications for development within the conservation area.  Noted.
		d) Expressed hope that policies included in the document would be adhered to in future development	Noted. Council committed to policies.

		schemes.	
		e) Document too long – concern at length of time that could be taken to produce appraisals and management plans for other conservation areas.	Document reflects complexity of area. Last in series of five appraisals and management plans covering city centre conservation areas. Currently considering general policy document for suburban conservation areas. Appraisals for these less complex areas are expected to be shorter.
		f) More specific guidance required on building heights to prevent deliberate misinterpretation of policy.	Guidance on height given in Policy B2.2(b) considered comprehensive and clear. Supported by Policy B2.2(c) (roof forms and rooflines) and Policy B2.2(i) (views and landmarks). No change.
		g) Executive summary would make document easier to understand.	Introductions to Parts A and B clearly set out background, aims and objectives of document. List of contents effectively summarises and indexes content. Executive summary would serve no additional purpose. No change.
		h) Clearer maps would make document easier to understand.	Budget allowed for production of draft document did not allow use of colour printing. Use of colour in adopted document will make maps much clearer.
		i) Sustainability Appraisal Report waste of time.	Requirement of planning system to produce sustainability

			appraisal report alongside adopted supplementary planning document (SPD). Document must be seen to support national, regional and local objectives.
3.	<u>Digbeth Business Association</u>	a) Excellent historical overview of conservation area. Should form basis of in-depth guide to Digbeth area.	Noted.
		b) Document does not give sufficient credit to sympathetic conversions of buildings to new uses in the area, e.g Custard Factory (former Devonshire Works, Deritend High Street).	Assessments of individual building conversions beyond scope of document. Examples of conversions to new uses listed in Part A8 <i>Economy</i> .
		c) Council needs clear policy on residential development in the conservation area to prevent displacement of business and 'protect' gritty nature of Digbeth.	Noted.
		d) Large areas of poor quality commercial development could be demolished for new high quality development. Poor quality or derelict buildings of whatever age could be replaced by new high quality development.  Well designed 1950s buildings should be recognised, particularly WJ Wild building on Floodgate Street.	Part B4 lists opportunity sites for new development. These are all vacant (gap) sites. Policy B1.2 <i>Conservation Area Consent</i> sets out conditions for demolition in conservation area (s), follows advice given in PPG15 paras. 4.25, 4.26, 4.27.  Examples of 1950s buildings given, particularly in Part A5 <i>Townscape Character -Architectural Character</i> (p.19). WJ Wild building no.4 (1955-1967) on

			Floodgate Street included in account of WJ Wild's property in Part A5 <i>Townscape Character –Works</i> (p.18).
		e) Need to bring current building stock up to current standards of energy conservation so long as impact on historic character not detrimental.	Noted.
		f) Should avoid pastiche while ensuring that new design is of highest contemporary design standard and build.	Agreed. Document aims to promote design of high quality which preserves or enhances the character of the conservation area as defined in the appraisal.
		g) Agree that area has 'gritty' character but suggest that some limited greening could take place.	Policy B3.4 <i>Planting</i> does not preclude limited greening but hard urban character as defined in the appraisal must be maintained in order to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Street trees, for example, are not part of the established character or appearance of the area. Policy B3.4 consistent with guidance in PPG15 para.4.40 that new tree planting in conservation areas only occasionally desirable and only 'where this would be consistent with the character and appearance of the area.' Complies with English Heritage

			guidance <i>Streets For All West Midlands</i> (2005) that 'trees and planting should reflect the history, architecture and tradition of places' and 'are not appropriate in every instance.' Document amended (p.21) to include reference to self-set vegetation.
		h) Agree that height and landmark status of viaducts should be respected.	Noted.
		i) More opportunity to view River Rea but to open it up too much would destroy its charm.	Noted.
		j) Conservation area lacks connectivity.	Agreed. Included in appraisal among factors contributing to economic decline.
		k) Vibrant mix of uses essential in ensuring good maintenance of conservation area.	Noted and agreed.
4.	Alistair Grills Associates for Ingleby Ltd.	<p>a) Conclusions of Beorma planning application (Digbeth/Park Street/Allison Street/Well Lane) at variance with two of the conservation area-wide recommendations (sic) set out in the CAAMP interim guidance (the draft SDP).</p> <p>1. blanket requirement for new development to reflect the building heights characteristic of the locality which is recorded as 'normally 6 commercial/industrial storeys.'</p>	<p>Noted. Uncertain what is meant by 'conclusions'.</p> <p>Document does not 'record' characteristic heights within the conservation area as 'normally 6 industrial/commercial storeys'. Part A5 <i>Townscape Character – Height and Scale</i> states that characteristic heights are variable, ranging from two domestic</p>

		<p>2. the requirement to build to back of existing pavement throughout the conservation area.</p> <p>Consider 'these recommendations should be amended to include taller buildings at the interface of the City Centre and the conservation area at its western end.'</p>	<p>storeys to five commercial or industrial storeys. Characteristic heights also given for each locality. No 'blanket requirement' to reflect normal height of six commercial/ industrial storeys. Policy B2.2(b) requires new buildings to reflect heights characteristic of the conservation area locality and states that '(t)his will normally limit new buildings to a maximum of six industrial/commercial storeys.'</p> <p>Purpose of document to provide policies for the preservation and enhancement of character of the conservation area as defined in character appraisal. Street frontage line at back of pavement characteristic of conservation area.</p> <p>Unsure what is meant by 'taller' buildings. Purpose of document to provide policies for the preservation and enhancement of the character of the conservation area as defined in character appraisal. PPG15 para.4.17 states that new buildings ' should be designed with respect for their context, as part of a <i>larger whole</i> which has</p>
--	--	---	--

		Should include reference to need to secure unified 'link space (St Martins Place) between Bullring/Selfridges, St Martins Church, Beorma Quarter and the rest of the Conservation Area.'	a well established character and appearance of its own.' Six storey height limit preserves character and appearance of <i>whole</i> conservation area as defined in the appraisal. No change.  Beyond scope of document.
	5.Localise West Midlands	a) Largely approves of document for ways in which it promotes local distinctiveness.	Noted and welcomed.
		b) Object to 'no planting policy' - trees and planting specifically excluded.	See 3 g) above.
		c) Impression of imbalance between biodiversity and building conservation.  Concerned for example that on gap sites developers would be told to remove all 'wildlife' greenery.	Document complies with statutory requirements and national and local policy and guidance. Sole clearly stated purpose is to define special interest of conservation area which justifies designation (Part A) and to provide policies for the preservation and enhancement of character or appearance based on that definition (Part B). Focus necessarily therefore on architectural and historic interest of built environment.  Document does not require removal of 'wildlife' greenery from gap sites.
		d) Green roofs beneficial for wildlife. Concerned that lack of any mention of green roofs	Discussion of benefits of green roofs for wildlife beyond scope

		means will not be permitted.	of document. Purpose of document is to define interest of conservation area as set out in 5c) above - green roofs not part of established character.
		e) Climate change may require visible rooftop equipment – concerned that current policy would require blanket ban.	Policy B2.2 (c) does not place a blanket ban on rooftop equipment. Requires that where this is ‘unavoidable it must be designed and sited to avoid any adverse visual impact.’
		f) Sometimes better to build in modern style than pastiche.	See 3f) above.
		g) Support development of gap sites but biodiversity value must be protected.	Noted.
		h) Digbeth should be protected from ‘clone town effect’ i.e. lack of local distinctiveness.	Agreed. Purpose of document to preserve and enhance special and locally distinctive character of conservation area.
	6. Living Streets Birmingham	a) Interested to read document and appreciate depth of research and clarity of history.	Noted and welcomed.
		b) Creation of fake pseudo nineteenth century character would be counter productive.	Document reflects long history of development in conservation area from mediaeval beginnings to twenty-first century. No attempt to create fake character of any period.
		c) Gap sites could provide features neighbourhood needs e.g. pocket parks.  Also lack of places to sit.	Green open space not characteristic of conservation area. City park projected for Eastside will be easily accessible from conservation area.  Beyond scope of

		<p>Could be a policy on provision of benches.</p> <p>Should set out pedestrian friendly policies.</p>	<p>document.</p> <p>Policies aimed specifically at pedestrians beyond scope of document.</p>
		d) Document could require creation of brown or rubble roofs for wildlife.	Beyond scope of document.
		<p>e) Implication (Policy B3.4 <i>Planting</i>) that street trees would not be welcome. Untenable position to hold.</p> <p>Would go further in advocating that development should not be back of footway but should include space for low hedges and climbing shrubs.</p>	<p>See 3g) above.</p> <p>Street frontage line at back of pavement as required in policy B2.2 a) characteristic of the conservation area.</p> <p>Low hedges and climbing shrubs at back of pavement are not traditionally found in conservation area and would erode hard urban character essential for local distinctiveness.</p>
	7. The Bond Company	a) Welcome document. Will assist in further regeneration and development of area.	Noted and welcomed.
		<p>b) General text refers in several places to 'Gritty design'.</p> <p>Parkinson's intention directed</p>	<p>Document makes no reference to 'Gritty design'. 'Gritty' used only in context of two references (p.31, p.37) to Parkinson Report (2007) which recommends that Council should build on distinctive 'gritty' <i>character</i> of Digbeth area as whole.</p> <p>Assume that respondent means use</p>

		<p>towards tough robust contemporary design, embracing modern materials such as steel and glass.</p> <p>Need to emphasis importance of high quality contemporary design.</p>	<p>of steel and glass in modern design rather than as modern materials. Document does not preclude use of steel and glass where this would preserve or enhance appearance of conservation area.</p> <p>Document's clearly stated purpose is to define special interest of conservation area which justifies designation (Part A) and to provide policies for preservation and enhancement of character or appearance based on that definition (Part B). Aims therefore to promote 'good new design which responds sensitively to historic context' and to encourage new development 'to complement the character of the conservation area while clearly reflecting its own time and function.' (Part B <i>Introduction – The Need for Policy Guidance</i>).</p>
		<p>c) Report recommends that all new buildings should follow street frontage. In general an acceptable position – street pattern should be preserved and enhanced through any new development.</p> <p>Area would however benefit from provision of one or two new squares, could be</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Beyond scope of document. In any case public squares are not</p>

		achieved while enhancing the street pattern. Important that recognised in statement.	characteristic of distinctive urban form of conservation area.
		<p>d) Recognise in general that six storey height limit appropriate.</p> <p>Area embraces dramatic juxtapositions in height e.g viaduct against two storey buildings. Difficult to see how uniform approach advocated by guidelines will further enhance the area.</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>No uniform approach. Document acknowledges varied heights in area up to five commercial/industrial storeys. (Part A 5 <i>Townscape Character Height and Scale</i>). Policy B2.2b) allows variation in building heights, reflecting those in conservation area locality, up to a limit of six commercial/industrial storeys. This is in order to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area as defined in the appraisal.</p>
		<p>f) Guidelines could lead to 'Disneyland pastiche'. Buildings should follow own architectural logic. High quality contemporary design should be encouraged by guidelines not discouraged.</p>	<p>Guidelines (Part B 2.2 a –j) fulfil Council's statutory duty to produce policies to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area, through promotion of high quality new design which responds to architectural and historic character defined in the appraisal.</p> <p>Consistent with PPG15 which states that it is important 'not that new buildings should directly imitate earlier styles, but that they should be</p>

			<p>designed with respect for their context, as part of a larger whole which has a well established character and appearance of its own' (para.4.17) and that a 'high priority' must be given 'to the objective of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the [conservation] area' (para.4.19).  Quality of new design should lie therefore in thoughtful and imaginative response to architectural and historic context, enhancing character of conservation area.  See also 7b) above.</p>
		<p>g) Landmarks not just big or tall buildings, can be 'memorial stone in wall' or 'statue in alcove.'</p>	<p>Part A <i>Townscape Character Landmarks</i> identifies established landmarks contributing to the character of the conservation area. Clear from this and from text of B2.2i) that features such as 'memorial stone in wall' or 'statue in alcove' would not fall within the parameters of the policy. Would be regarded rather as local monuments fostering a sense of place and identity.</p>
	8. Centro	<p>a) Interested in document since Phase 2 Metro Airport route currently being developed is proposed to run along High Street Deritend.</p> <p>Would therefore welcome opportunity to discuss Metro</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p>

		<p>proposals and impact might have on conservation area.</p> <p>Bus routes should not be undermined but enhanced. Also vital that document should not have any adverse impact on operation of Moor Street Station.</p>	<p>Document will have no impact on either bus routes or operation of Moor Street Station.</p>
	<p>9. Friends of the Earth</p>	<p>a) Concerned that little mention of biodiversity in the document or how links to Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>Would like to see protection and enhancement of green features for biodiversity value.</p>	<p>Document complies with statutory requirements and national and local policy and guidance. Sole clearly stated purpose is to define special interest of conservation area which justifies designation (Part A) and to provide policies for the preservation and enhancement of character or appearance based on that definition (Part B). Focus necessarily therefore on architectural and historic interest of built environment.</p> <p>Protection of green features for biodiversity value beyond scope of document. Decisions on applications for development within the conservation area will take into account biodiversity interests where these are identified as being of international, national, regional or local importance in accordance with national, regional and</p>

			local legislation and guidance.
		b) Feel that gap sites should be left as such and protected for public open space and biodiversity value.	Noted. See 9a) above.
		c) Disappointed by attitude to green space -'guerilla' landscape part of Digbeth's history.  Formal planting not deemed appropriate but opportunistic landscape of sporadic greenery compatible with conservation area.	See 3g) above. Document does not require removal of self-set vegetation  Document does not preclude self-set vegetation.
		d) Would like to see strategy for for green/brown roofs in conservation area	Beyond scope of document.
		e) Renewables should be exempted from blanket ban on rooftop plant.	Discussion of renewables beyond scope of document. No 'blanket ban' on rooftop plant. See 5e) above.
		f) Agree with comments regarding pedestrian barriers. High Street needs to be active 'street' with emphasis on pedestrian and cycle movements as opposed to fast vehicle trunk road.	Noted and agreed.
	10. Council for British Archaeology West Midlands.	a) Wish to commend Birmingham City Council on exemplary nature of draft appraisal.  Comprehensive appraisal informed by latest research with range of pertinent sources. Clearly presents development from mediaeval period and character that has arisen from this development.	Noted and welcomed.
		b) Prompted by archaeological excavation and ongoing topographical work City Council to be congratulated on	Noted and welcomed.

		having recognised the importance of Birmingham's mediaeval townscape. Reassuring that 'heritage' seen not only as 'thing of the past' but as building block for future. Document shows that 'heritage' can engage with diverse range of agendas.	
		c) Given regional and national importance of area, policy guidance appropriate and measured.  Offers necessary protection to vitally important townscape without stifling development opportunities city committed to regeneration would hope to achieve.	Noted and welcomed.
		d) Characterisation and associated proposals informed by and contribute to city's sense of place. Document visionary and represents good practice.  CBA West Midlands pleased to acknowledge recognition of importance of historic environment and lends its support to this document.	Noted and welcomed.  Noted and welcomed.
	11. The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country	a) Cannot support document because Eastside Biodiversity Audit Strategy does not inform content. Biodiversity contributes to local distinctiveness.	See 9a) above.
		b) Birmingham Nature Conservation Strategy identifies sites of biodiversity interest within conservation area. Risk that document might lead to Council breaking law or encouraging developers to break the law.	No risk. Decisions on applications for development within the conservation area will take into account biodiversity interests where sites are identified as being of international, national, regional or local importance in accordance with

			national, regional and local legislation and guidance.
		c) Council has statutory duty to conserve biodiversity. Consideration for biodiversity should be clearly demonstrated.	See 11b) above. See 9a) above.
		d) National and local policy contexts have failed to inform plan. Include PPG1. Climate Change Supplement PPS9 <i>Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</i> PPS25 <i>Development and Flood Risk Parks and Open Spaces SPD. Cutting CO2 for a Smarter Birmingham</i> and Adaptation Strategy. Regional Biodiversity Action Plan.	Beyond scope of document. See 9a) above.
		e) In terms of policy draft document should be amended to take above (11a), b), c), d)) into account. In particular – sites of interest and protected species, landscape and structural design of value to biodiversity, landscape and open space design in general, design for e.g. sustainable drainage schemes, renewable energy and energy conservation and efficiency provision and green and brown roofs, climate proofing.	All beyond scope of document. See 9a), 11b) above.
		f) Cannot support specific policies because of failure to consider issues in 11a) to 11e). Policies which might result in loss of green space and biodiversity habitats.	Noted.
		e) Draft document has potential to limit delivery of sustainable development.	Sustainable development will be welcomed where it preserves or enhances

			the character or appearance of the conservation area.
	12. Urban Futures	a) Note that document includes a rich description of area with detailed historic information and proposes guiding principles to ensure that new developments in line with existing character which consider very important.	Noted and welcomed.
		<p>b) With respect to Policy 2.3 <i>Vacant Sites</i> - important that vacant sites are considered carefully for redevelopment. Possibility for interconnected pocket parks which could soften hard urban character and promote biodiversity.</p> <p>Greater attention should be given to derelict sites – can contribute to greater incidence of crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>Hard urban character as defined in the appraisal must be maintained in order to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Green open space not characteristic of conservation area. City park projected for Eastside will be easily accessible from conservation area.</p> <p>See Policy B1.7 <i>Repair and Maintenance</i> Council has limited powers to compel owners to address derelict sites. Crime prevention policies beyond scope of document.</p>
		c) Preservation of existing (let alone increase in) biodiversity very difficult in this area.	Issues of biodiversity beyond scope of document. See 9a) above. Decisions on applications for development within the conservation area will take into account biodiversity interests where these are identified as being of international, national, regional or local importance in

			accordance with national, regional and local legislation and guidance.
		d) Disagree with Policy 3.4. <i>Planting</i> - street trees bring benefits – could soften and integrate new development and mitigate air pollution.	See 3g above.
	13. Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society	a) Archaeological potential well-covered as is role of buildings of historical interest and persistence of mediaeval plot boundaries.	Noted and welcomed
		b) Would be pleasing if, during any redevelopment of area, opportunity could be taken to re-erect Golden Lion close to original location in Deritend High Street.	Noted.
	14. EBNS East Birmingham North Solihull Regeneration Zone	a) Objectives of ebns in Eastside summarised.  Observed that ‘Digbeth area (which this conservation document partially covers) is more suited to organic change and regeneration utilising and complementing the existing urban fabric’ and ‘supportive of approaches that enable Digbeth .....to become an attraction in its own right while preserving inherent character of the area that makes it so special’.	Noted.  Noted and welcomed.
		b) Opportunities for ‘quality innovation’ could be accommodated within area as part of overall mix.	High quality new development preserving or enhancing character of conservation area welcomed.
		c) Should be greater emphasis on tourist potential which will help in aim of increased footfall.	Beyond scope of document.
		d) Potential of Digbeth area significant not only in maximising best use of	Noted.

		<p>existing building stock and enabling new build where appropriate but also key landmarks in area, 'notably the River Rea and the major railway viaducts'</p> <p>'How best to utilise these in context needs to be explored further.....'</p>	<p>Document does not identify River Rea as key landmark in conservation area.</p> <p>Policies B2.2b) and B2.2i) protect landmark status of viaducts.</p>
	15. Advantage West Midlands	<p>a) Aims and role of AWM in Digbeth area summarised.</p> <p>Welcomes stated aims of appraisal. SPD will also play part in improving quality of public realm of Digbeth and surrounding areas and will support ongoing development of city centre. Regard document as positive step towards maximising cultural offer and assets of West Midlands region.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p>
		<p>b) Document needs to reflect plans and activities of East Birmingham and North Solihull Regeneration Zone.</p> <p>AWM working with Council to commission remodelling, transportation, urban design and noise studies in Digbeth.. Document should take these into account as progresses.</p>	<p>Beyond scope of document.</p> <p>Beyond scope of document.</p>
		<p>c) SPD needs to recognise activities that complement growth of screen image and sound industries in Digbeth. Should encourage streets to improve night-time and retail offer. Policies looking at opportunity sites for development should reflect</p>	<p>Beyond scope of document.</p>

		this.	
		d) Policies for branding, lighting and signage need to reflect Digbeth's growing role as creative and entertainment centre and increase visitor footprint in area.	Beyond scope of document.
		e) Agree that planting should be discouraged in most parts of Digbeth area and in most cases vacant plots should be in-filled with buildings consistent with the area and existing street frontages.  Absence of housing developments in immediate area (and detrimental impact on the industrial fabric that new housing in Digbeth might bring) means that public realm improvements should mitigate 'industrial monoculture'.	Noted.  Special interest of conservation area largely derives from industrial character. Public realm improvements should preserve and enhance character of conservation area.
		f) Innovative suggestion that walls should be planted with hanging grasses and some green spaces (e.g viaducts) could be used for urban farming without detracting from the character of the area should be accommodated.	Beyond scope of document.
	16. The Victorian Society	a) Welcome appearance of document which contains splendid assessment of history, architecture and character of the area. Will be of enormous benefit in assessing the increasing number of planning applications with implications for the area.	Noted and welcomed.
		b) Confusion over whether 164 High Street Deritend should read 164 High Street Bordesley (A5 p.16)	Text correct.
		c) B1.3 <i>Recording</i> – would be good to mention archaeology.	Policy B1.3 <i>Recording</i> relates to significant demolition of buildings. Other Council guidance relates to

			below-ground archaeology
		d) Particularly welcome Policy B2.2b) on building heights. Express hope that Council will adhere to policy statement ‘ This will normally limit new buildings to a maximum of six industrial/commercial storeys’.	Noted.
		e) Welcome policy statement (B2.2i) ‘The creation of new landmarks will be discouraged’ Express hope that this will also be adhered to.	Noted.
		f) Would prefer less of a firm line on tree planting.  Not in favour of unsuitable floral displays or hanging baskets.	See 3g) above.  Noted and welcomed.
		g) Could there be more explanation in B4 <i>Opportunity Sites for New Development</i> on implications of <i>Digbeth Millennium Quarter: Planning and Urban Design for the Future</i> (1996) and <i>Eastside Development Framework</i> (2001) for document. Concerned if valuable appraisal and supplementary planning policy were to be undermined.	Document consistent with <i>Digbeth Millennium Quarter: Planning and Urban Design for the Future</i> (1996) and <i>Eastside Development Framework</i> (2001).
	17. Pete, Liz and Rob Baker	a) Pleased that architectural heritage of Digbeth and Deritend is being valued.	Noted and welcomed.
	18. Iain Witts	a) As resident of Highgate looking forward to regeneration of Digbeth and Deritend area.  Retaining heritage of area of considerable importance but must balance with needs residents and users.	Noted.  Preservation and enhancement of character or appearance of conservation area will benefit residents and users.

		Supportive of comments put forward by Urban Futures (12 above). Specifically suggestion to pursue pocket parks.	Noted see 12b) above.
	19. Juliet Porter	a) Encouraging to see this document. Look forward to seeing real positive change in neglected part of great city of Birmingham.	Noted and welcomed.