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“Securing a Better environment for all the people of Birmingham”
Planning Committee – 20 February 1992

(Hereon, Councillors Hudson, Lines, Roy, Walker and Mrs Watts-James asked that it be recorded that they dissented from recommendations 1, 2 and 3 that had been put to the Joint Strategy Sub-Committee).


The following joint report was submitted:-

(See interleave No 4)

The Work of the Cycling Advisory Group

RESOLVED:– That the valuable work of the Cycling Advisory Group be noted and the annual report of the Group and the implementation of the City’s cycling policy be received and noted.

JOINT REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF HOUSING AND THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURE

The following joint report was submitted:-

(See interleave No 5)

The Holmes Estate, Garrison Lane, Bordesley-Development Proposals

Councillor Foster commented on the fine quality of the buildings and requested that the report be also referred to the Conservation Areas Advisory Committee.

RESOLVED:– That the contents of the report be noted and be referred to the Conservation Areas Advisory Committee.

REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURE

The following reports were submitted:-

(See interleave No 6)

(A) Proposed Extension to St Paul’s Square Conservation Area

RESOLVED:– That this Committee agrees to designate, under Sections 69 and 70 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, an extension to the existing St Paul’s Square Conservation Area to include the properties outlined on the plan attached to the report.

(B) Exchange of Land – Former Elite Cinema Site, Nos 114-118 Soho Road and Site at Corner of Thornhill Road and Soho Road, Handsworth

The Committee was advised of progress made on this matter and agreed with a suggestion made by the Chairman that a report on the proposed Development Brief should be presented to Committee within three months, with the Outstanding Minute therefore not being discharged.

RESOLVED:– That the contents of the report be noted and a further report on the proposed Development Brief be presented within three months.
Reference was made by Councillor Eustace to the need to design car parks that were both attractive and safe, and he particularly spoke of the under-use of many car parks, partly due to perceived dangers. He believed the policy was not looking to prohibit motorists from the City Centre, but rather to place emphasis on short-stay parking provision and not permit the City Centre to be congested by all-day parking by workers. He therefore believed the report indicated a bold step in the right direction. Differing views were then expressed by members regarding the parking policy review, with Councillor Renee Spector particularly noting that the question of evening usage by theatre-goers etc, which would not clash with business use, was not addressed within the report.

Referring to the point raised earlier by Councillor Hudson regarding the meeting of the Joint Sub-Committee, Councillor Stacey noted that the point in question had been raised at the last meeting of the Technical Services Committee when the Committee Clerk responsible had assured members that the Joint Strategy Sub-Committee had adopted the recommendations set out in the report. The Chairman then confirmed that had been his impression, and he then advised the Committee that the Technical Services Committee had approved the recommendations made by the Joint Sub-Committee insofar as it was concerned and had also instructed the City Engineer to report further on accessibility, availability and safety aspects of off-street car parks.

The Director of Planning and Architecture considered that there was an important underlying principle in this matter, in that the significance of car parks as a source of income had been relegated, with emphasis now being put on the need to get the management of the City Centre correct. He also referred to the seeking of commuted-sum payments in respect of new developments that were used to accommodate the travel needs of people attracted by those developments. Additional car parking provided through the commuted-sum system should be managed by the Council in order that it could be properly regulated and thereby used as a tool in the management of the City Centre. He added that the proposed design guide would clearly need to address the question of safety; whilst the City Centre enhancement budget might be used to improve existing car parks.

Mr J Bird, Department of Planning and Architecture, then responded to specific points raised by members and, in particular, to the current under-usage of car parks. The City Engineer had accepted that directional signposting of car parks had to be improved, with motorists needing to be forewarned whether such car parks were short- or long-stay. He then referred to the vastly differing tariffs used at the 17 most central car parks in the City. Mr Bird stressed that car parks should be seen to sustain the City Centre at all times of the day and, if the aim was to create a City Centre with 24-hour usage, those car parks had to be attractive to customers and charge sensible rates in the evenings.

RESOLVED:— (i) That approval be given to the recommendations made by the Joint Strategy Sub-Committee insofar as this Committee is concerned; and

(ii) that a site visit be undertaken to the new car park within the Arcadian development, with attendance by members being designated an approved duty for the purpose of claims for members' allowances.
The City Planning Officer presented the following Report:

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE 10th January, 1980
PROPERTY SERVICES COMMITTEE 22nd January, 1980

Jewellery Quarter

On the 9th August I reported to the Planning and Highways Committee with regard to future planning policy for the Jewellery Quarter. Their resolutions, subsequently communicated to the Property Services Committee were that:

"The City Planning Officer be authorised to assess public opinion in the Jewellery Quarter by means of a consultation document which advocates:

1. The abandonment of the status of Redevelopment Area.
2. The simultaneous declaration of an Industrial Improvement Area over the Jewellery Quarter as a whole and two Conservation Areas, one in the north and one in the south of the area, in conjunction with the West Midlands County Council.
3. That a development control policy for the Jewellery Quarter be formulated and, after public consultation, be embodied in the Central Area District Plan.
4. That the Jewellery Quarter Inset Plan be withdrawn from the Development Plan scheme."

Details of the consultation exercise are included in the Appendices. Appendix 'A' sets out in detail the information required for the declaration of an Industrial Improvement Area and Appendix 'B' is the Conservation Area designation report. The public response to the proposal has been favourable, indeed the public meeting ended in spontaneous applause.

In this covering report I would emphasise the relationship between the Conservation Areas and the Improvement Area, and their capacity, together, to protect employment levels and employment structure whilst enabling the quality of the stock of buildings to be improved.

Further discussions have taken place with Officers of the County Council and similar reports, (in the case of the Improvement Area, identical reports) will go to the County Committees.

Under the provisions of the Inner Urban Areas Act 1978 a three month waiting period is necessary to give central government the opportunity to negative the declaration. The Secretary of State for the Environment has indicated he will not use this power. In the County's case, the Improvement
Area declaration has to be made at full Council which is on February 11th. I therefore recommended that the City's declaration come into effect on May 11th.

RECOMMENDATION:

Planning and Highways Committee

1. That the status of the Jewellery Quarter as a Redevelopment Area be abandoned.

2. That the Committee designate the Jewellery Quarter and Key Hill Conservation Areas, as delineated in the plans attached to Appendix 'B', under Section 277 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1971.

3. That the Jewellery Quarter Inset Plan be withdrawn from the Development Plan Scheme.

4. That the City Planning Officer together with other Officers report back on a framework for action in the Industrial Improvement Area.

Property Services Committee

That the Committee declare the Jewellery Quarter as an Improvement Area as delineated in the plans attached to Appendix 'A' in accordance with Section 4 of the Inner Urban Areas Act, 1973, the declaration to take effect on the 11th May, 1980.

Graham Shaw
CITY PLANNING OFFICER
Birmingham Jewellery Quarter is a unique area and forms an important part of the City's economy and heritage.

Historically, working in precious metals in Birmingham dates from at least as early as 1586. In the 18th century, Matthew Boulton's enterprise at the Soho Manufactory raised the reputation of Birmingham's precious metal products. Other current Birmingham companies were formed during this period, for example, the Barker Ellis Silver Company, and Hammond, Turner and Sons.

Architecturally, the Jewellery Quarter is unique to Birmingham, with its multiplicity of small workshops and, as such, is an important element of Birmingham's heritage. The design of the buildings and the character of the area has been influenced by the physical demands for space for the various components of the trade. As a result, there is a great variety of architectural styles giving a semi-industrial and semi-domestic character.

The predominant building forms are:-

(1) The domestic house converted into workshops with resulting minor alterations to windows and other features to adapt to new uses.

(2) The small purpose-built workshop, the design of which was often influenced by the fashionable Venetian style of architecture at that time.

(3) The large workshop or factory, designed to house the bulky equipment of electro-plated goods and pressworks. These were often built in elaborate architectural styles, such as the Argent works designed in castellated Italianate style, and the Pelican Works and Great Hampton Street Works.

The traditional character of the area has been retained and comprises a variety of architectural styles and sizes of workshop. Some modern industrial premises, which have replaced original workshops, have maintained the character of the area, while others have been less successful in this respect.

There are three main aspects involved in the designation of Conservation Areas in the Jewellery Quarter. These are historical, architectural and economic. The economic perspective is of particular importance in this area, and this aspect is discussed in detail elsewhere in the I.I.A. declaration report.

The designation and implementation of the Conservation Areas, in conjunction with the declaration of an Industrial Improvement Area, is a joint endeavour by Birmingham City Council and West Midlands County Council. Both I.I.A. and Conservation Area initiatives are intended to be complementary and will enable financial assistance to be provided by the local authorities to building owners within the area to encourage the improvement of industrial performance and to enhance the physical environment. Initiatives by both Councils will be carefully co-ordinated and aim to provide a responsive service to owners.
It is proposed that there should be two Conservation Areas designated within the Jewellery Quarter. (see attached map).

(1) Proposed Key Hill Conservation Area

This area is located to the north of the area, with the Key Hill Cemetery on the east, and extending to Great Hampton Street to the west. The southern extent of this area is marked by the southern boundary of Warstone Lane Cemetery along Warstone Lane. There are a number of notable buildings in this area, exemplified by the Pelican Works on Great Hampton Street.

(2) Proposed Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area

This area is located to the east of St. Paul's Square, and is centred on Frederick Street and the adjoining roads. Included in this area is the Newhall Works to the south, and extends to Warstone Lane in the north. There are many fine buildings in this area, such as, the former Albert Works in Frederick Street, and several of the small workshops along Albion Street.

The respective boundaries for the two Proposed Conservation Areas have been drafted after consultations and representations had been carried out and collated. A Public Exhibition was produced, which outlined the aims and general proposals concerning I.I.A. declaration and Conservation Area designation. This was followed by a public meeting held at The School of Jewellery, Vittoria Street, on October 30th, 1979, and from this, and through the distribution of leaflets, comments and queries have been received from Industrialists, land-owners and the general public in the area. The draft proposals have also been put to the Conservation Areas Advisory Committee, who endorsed the general philosophy and policy, and suggested the extension of the Proposed Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area boundary to include the Warstone Lane Cemetery.

At present, approximately 80 representations have been received from within the proposed I.I.A., with about 50% being from properties within the proposed Conservation Area boundaries. The response has been almost entirely favourable and a great deal of interest has been shown in the possibility of grant aid as outlined at the Public Meeting. Several owners have suggested that their property should be included within the proposed Conservation Areas, while only one has asked for premises to be excluded. All comments have been considered in relation to the delineation of the boundaries now proposed.

Recommendation:-

That your Committee designate the Jewellery Quarter and Key Hill Conservation Areas, as delineated on the attached plan, under Section 277 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971.
Proposed Key Hill Conservation Area.

Proposed Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area.
RESOLVED:— (i) That the foregoing report be received and noted and that the recommendations for inclusion in the Draft Preferred Strategy, as set out individually therein, be approved;

(ii) that the West Midlands County Council be reminded of the need to determine a future road pattern, as a matter of urgency, for the Sutton Coldfield Town Centre in order to remove the existing blight, particularly from the Manor Road area, and be requested to include improvements of the highway at the bridge in Coleshill Road, near Riland Road;

(iii) that the foregoing report be forwarded to the West Midlands County Council for the observations of the County Council's Highways and Planning Committees.

Jewellery Quarter

RESOLVED:— (i) That the status of the Jewellery Quarter as a Redevelopment Area be abandoned;

(ii) that this Committee designate the Jewellery Quarter and Key Hill Conservation Areas, as delineated on the plans attached to Appendix 'B' to the foregoing report, under Section 277 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1971;

(iii) that the Jewellery Quarter Inset Plan be withdrawn from the Development Plan Scheme;

(iv) that the City Planning Officer, together with other officers as appropriate, be instructed to submit a further report on a framework for action in the proposed Industrial Improvement Area.

Town and Country Planning Act, 1971

1, 3, 5 and 7 Church Road, Erdington — Purchase Notice

RESOLVED:— That the Purchase Notice served in respect of 1, 3, 5 and 7 Church Road, Erdington, having an area of 0.23 acres (0.093 hectares) approximately, be accepted and that the City Estates Officer be advised accordingly.

REPORTS OF CITY PLANNING OFFICER

Planning and advertisement applications

The City Planning Officer submitted the following reports Nos. 1—25, advertisement schedule reports 'A' and 'C' and general schedule report 'B':—

(See documents Nos. 7—34)

RESOLVED:— That, subject to the following amendments, the recommendations appended to Reports Nos. 1—9, 12—21 and 23—25, advertisement schedule reports 'A' and 'C' and general schedule report 'B' of the City Planning Officer, be adopted:—
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REPORT OF THE ACTING DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & ARCHITECTURE

REGENERATION ADVISORY TEAM

DATE: 27th September 2000

WARDS: LADYWOOD & ASTON

PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990
PROPOSED EXTENDED JEWELLERY QUARTER CONSERVATION AREA

1. SUMMARY
1.1 This report recommends the extension and consolidation of the three existing conservation areas within the Jewellery Quarter in order to achieve conservation area coverage which is co-terminus with the Jewellery Quarter Urban Village as shown on the attached plan.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS
2.1 That your Committee formally de-designates the existing Key Hill Conservation Area and St. Paul's Square Conservation Area.

2.2 That your Committee formally designates the enlarged Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3. Contact Officer:

Christopher Hargreaves
Conservation Group
Tel No. 303-3854
Fax No. 303-3193
e-mail: Chris Hargreaves@birmingham.gov.uk
4. BACKGROUND

4.1 At your meeting of the 31st May 2000, your Committee agreed the principle of an enlarged Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area to encompass the whole of the area of the Urban Village and furthermore agreed that a public consultation exercise be undertaken.

5. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

5.1 Some 2,204 address points were individually mailed, a report was taken to the Jewellery Quarter Partnership Board and the Conservation Areas Advisory Committee; articles appeared in the Hockley Flyer, the Birmingham Voice and the local press.

5.2 At its meeting of the 14th June, the Jewellery Quarter Urban Village Partnership Advisory Board "welcomed and fully supported the proposed extension and consolidation of the conservation area to encompass the Jewellery Quarter and the potential benefits that designation would bring." The Conservation Areas Advisory Committee fully supports the proposal, as does English Heritage.

5.3 15 written responses were received of which all were supportive. 8 e-mails were received of which 5 were supportive. A number of responses indicated a concern regarding the comparative fragility of the jewellery industry and the impact of pressures for residential development on the Quarter. A summary of the responses is detailed in the Appendix.

6. PROPOSED JEWELLERY QUARTER CONSERVATION AREA

6.1 It is proposed that the whole of the Urban Village should be designated as a conservation area. There are 3 existing designated areas within the Quarter; St. Paul's Square, Key Hill and the Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area. In order to reduce confusion and simplify administrative procedures it is recommended that St. Paul's Square and Key Hill be de-designated and that the Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area be extended to include the whole of the Urban Village area, the boundary to be as indicated on the attached plan.

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 On the basis of the response to the public consultation exercise, it appears that there is strong support for the proposal.

7.2 It is appropriate to reiterate that the Quarter is now recognised as an area of European significance; the primacy of the jewellery industry is recognised as is the concern over the impact of pressures for residential development.

7.3 Whilst endorsing the Jewellery Quarter Urban Village Framework concept of a mixed use area, the need to protect the traditional industries and the encouragement of the creative industries is a priority. This is being addressed through a Management Plan for the Quarter which is being produced by the Director of Economic Development. The production of a Character Appraisal for the enlarged conservation area will now be an urgent matter which will be pursued with English Heritage and the Economic Development Department.
Proposed Extended Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area
Public Consultation Responses

**Written responses:**
15 - all supportive, but including the following comments:

1 expressing need for Management Plan.

4 expressing concern over residential developments inhibiting industrial uses.

1 expressing particular concern over heavy industrial user.

1 expressing concern over increasing numbers of licensed premises.

1 expressing concern over Council's lack of action over derelict buildings.

**E-Mails:**
5 supportive.

3 opposing:

1 (within existing conservation area) questioning ability and expertise of officers and members in making planning decisions.

1 concerned that manufacturing will be inhibited through need to retain buildings.

1 complaining that inclusion in conservation area will lead to increased bureaucracy.
Proposed Extended Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area
September 2000

Existing Conservation Areas
--- Proposed extended boundary of Jewellery Quarter Conservation Area

Birmingham City Council
Department of Planning and Architecture

Director of Planning & Architecture
P.O. Box 28
Baskerville House
Broad Street, Birmingham B1 2NA.

PLAN NUMBER: DP/LP/00/44
SCALE: 1:7000
DATE: June 2000
DRAWN: Ken Dovey - Urban Design
7.4 Funding regimes will also be pursued with appropriate Departments of the City Council and English Heritage which will be aimed specifically at assisting the jewellery and creative industries through grant aid for the repair and adaptation of premises.

7.5 It is worth repeating that designation is intended to assist in the regeneration of the Quarter and the emphasis will be on achieving high standards of new design and developing the area as a national exemplar for conservation and regeneration.

8. IMPLICATIONS FOR RESOURCES

8.1 The costs attached to the formal designation of the conservation area can be contained within the Departmental Revenue Budget allocation.

9. IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY PRIORITIES

9.1 Implications for Women

No specific implications have been identified.

9.2 Implications for People with Disabilities

No specific implications have been identified.

9.3 Implications for Black and Minority Ethnic People and Race Relations

No specific implications have been identified.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS


EMRYS JONES
ACTING DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURE

PC/C/CEH/SC/CEH1