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Introduction

The Council is required under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 1994 to prepare a statement setting out the consultation it has carried out on any documents produced as part of the Local Development Framework. This includes the Draft Brindley II Planning and Design Brief Supplementary Planning Document. This is to ensure that the Local Authority adopt the best methods in involving the public in the planning process, especially where they may be affected by proposals of the plan.

The Council has produced a Draft Statement of Community Involvement, which had been prepared in line with government legislation, regulations and guidance, which sets out how the Council intend to involve the people of Sandwell in the planning process. This includes the minimum requirements as set out by Government Guidance, as well as additional methods of consultation which may be appropriate. The document has undergone examination and is due to be adopted January 2007.

The Consultation Statement should set out the methods of consultation undertaken, a summary of the comments received and the Council’s response to them. This is therefore the subject of this document.

The Brindley II site was allocated for Mixed Uses (Residential/Business) in the Unitary Development Plan, adopted in 2004. This Brief, therefore, does not intend to change Council Policy, but has been prepared in order to provide information and guidance on a range of issues concerned with the future development of this site. The SPD aims to highlight the expectations of the Local Authority on any future scheme submitted, regarding issues such as Design and Access as well as setting out the heritage assets to be protected and enhanced and draw attention to any planning obligations which may be required arising from this development.

Consultation on the Brindley II – Draft Supplementary Planning Document

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport approved the Draft Brindley II Planning and Design Brief SPD for public consultation on 22nd March 2006.


During this consultation period, copies of the Draft Planning and Design Brief were sent to a number of statutory and non-statutory consultees as well as other interested parties, together with a copy of the Sustainability Appraisal and a comments form. A list of these consultees is shown in Appendix 1.

In addition to this, on 14th August 2006, leaflets were distributed to all of those immediately affected by the Draft SPD, outlining the aims of the SPD, dates of consultation and details of where copies of the Brief could be viewed or obtained. Leaflets were also sent out to residents adjoining the site on 18th August 2006. These lists of consultees are shown in Appendix 2.
The Draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal were also made available during normal office hours in a number of locations for viewing between 14\textsuperscript{th} August and 25\textsuperscript{th} September 2006. These included:

- Planning Offices, Development House, Lombard Street, West Bromwich
- Council House, Oldbury
- Smethwick Library, High Street, Smethwick
- Sandwell Council's website

A formal legal notice appeared in the Birmingham Evening Mail on 14\textsuperscript{th} August 2006. This is shown in Appendix 3.

Following a press release, articles appeared in the Birmingham Evening Mail, the Express and Star and Sandwell Chronicle on 31\textsuperscript{st} August, 11\textsuperscript{th} September and 14\textsuperscript{th} September respectively. These are shown on Appendix 4.

Due to the timings of the meetings, it was not possible to present a full report to Smethwick Town Committee on the Draft SPD. However, its forthcoming consultation was mentioned at the Smethwick Town Committee on 20\textsuperscript{th} June 2006.

**Sustainability Appraisal**

**SEA Screening Opinion & SA Scoping Report**

In line with regulations governing the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal, a Screening Report was prepared and circulated to the four Statutory Consultees identified by Government in PPS12 (English Nature; English Heritage; Environment Agency; Countryside Agency). The consultation period ran between 9\textsuperscript{th} and 26\textsuperscript{th} May 2006.

Furthermore, in line with regulations governing the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal, a Scoping Report was again prepared and circulated to the four Statutory Consultees (English Nature; English Heritage; Environment Agency; Countryside Agency). The consultation period ran between July and August 2006. Comments received were taken on board in the preparation of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal. The Draft SA document was consulted on along with the Draft SPD and representations received (not only from the four consultation bodies) were taken into consideration when amending the document, as was the process with the Draft SPD.

**Responses to consultation**

During the consultation period, a total of 16 formal responses were received on the Draft Planning and Design Brief. The majority of the responses were from the statutory consultees and these are listed in Appendix 5. In summary, the responses reflected the following issues;
- Effect of development on surrounding area
- Traffic generation
- Effect on biodiversity
- Loss of heritage features
- The need to secure planning obligations arising out of development
- The need for sustainable development on the site
- Issues regarding design, access and layout.

Responding to Key Issues and Concerns

Sandwell MBC planning officers reviewed the 16 representations received on the Draft SPD prior to considering any potential amendments to the document. The document has been amended to take account of the comments received where appropriate. Some of the comments received did not require changes to the document and these have been noted within the Schedule. During the consultation period, a number of minor typographical errors were identified which will also require alteration to the text of the document. These are set out in Appendix 5.
Appendix 1 – List of Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees
Mr N. Russell
The Heart of England Tourist Board
Larkhill Road
Worcester
WR5 2EZ

Ms V. Jubb
British Trust for Conservation Volunteers
Unit 901A, Smethwick Enterprise Centre
Millennium Basin
Rolfe Street
Smethwick B66 52AR

Mr J Williams
Westbury Homes
Pendeford House
Pendeford Office Park
Wobaston Road
Wolverhampton WV9 5EX

Mr Musleh Uddin
Bangladeshi Islamic Association
10-11 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
Warley
West Midlands B66 2BP

Ms E. Cass
David Wilson Estates
Enterprise House
Pendeford Business Park
Wobaston Road
Pendeford WV9 5HA

Mr Assad Uddin
Smethwick Bangladeshi Muslim Welfare Association
253 Halfords Lane
Smethwick
West Midlands B66 1BD

North Smethwick Housing Development Trust
Brasshouse Centre
Brasshouse Lane
Smethwick
B66 1BB

Rachel J Best
Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd
(Formerly Beazer Strategic Land)
Persimmon House
Birmingham Road
Studley
Warwickshire B80 7BG

Mr R. Rivers
Bovis Homes (Central Region)
Bromwich Court
Highway Point
Gorsey Lane
Coleshill B46 1JU

Mr A Spencer
British Waterways
Peels Wharf
Fazeley
Tamworth
Staffordshire B78 3QZ
FAO Nick Barnet  
Npower  
Windmill Hill Business Park  
Whitehill Way  
Swindon  
Wiltshire    SN5 6PB

Mr S. Watson  
Redrow Homes (West Midlands ) Ltd  
Redrow House, Coombswood Business Park  
Steelpark Road  
Halesowen  
West Midlands    B62 8HD

Sarah Milward  
Bryant Homes  
2 Princes Way  
Solihull  
West Midlands  
B91 3ES

Councillor M Zaheer  
218 Birmingham Road  
Oldbury  
B69 4EH

Tim Bryan Executive Director  
Culture West Midlands  
The Regional Partnership Centre  
Albert House, Quay Place  
Edward Street  
Birmingham    B1 2RA

Brian Summers Chairman  
Tourism West Midlands  
c/o Advantage West Midlands  
3 Priestley Wharf  
Holt Street, Aston Science Park  
Birmingham    B7 4BN

Maggie Taylor- Planning Manager  
Sport England West Midlands  
5th Floor No 3 Broadway  
Five Ways  
Birmingham  
B15 1BQ

Julia Ellis  
Midlands Architecture and the Designed Environment  
Birmingham & Midland Institute  
Margaret Street  
Birmingham  
B3 3SP

Councillor G S Josan  
Milverton Grange  
74 West Park Road  
Smethwick  
West Midlands    B67 7JH

Councillor M Sakhi  
80 Bertram Road  
Smethwick  
B67 7NZ

Stewart Towe  
Hadley Industries  
Downing Street  
Smethwick  
B66 2PA

Andy Williams  
First City Ltd  
19 Waterloo Road  
Wolverhampton  
WV1 4DY
McCarthy and Stone (Dev) Ltd
Homelife House
26-32 Oxford Road
Bournemouth
BH8 8EZ

Mr J Williams
Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd
West Midlands Region
Pendeford House, Pendeford Business Park
Wobaston Road
Wolverhampton  WV9 5HA

Gary Bowman
Sandwell Partnership
Kingston House
438 High Street
West Bromwich
B70 9LD

Mr Steven Watson
Redrow Homes Ltd.
Fountain House,
Great Cornbow,
Halesowen,
West Midlands.  B63 3BL

Adams Homes
Millhouse
Elmsfield
Worcester Road
Oxfordshire  OX7 5XS

D Emery
Kendrick Homes Ltd
Tasker Street
Walsall
West Midlands
WS1 3QW

National Housing Federation Central Region
2nd Floor
Concorde House
Trinity Park
Solihull  B37 7UQ

JJ Gallagher Ltd
Gallagher House
51 Bordesley Green
Birmingham
B9 4QS

Focus Housing Black Country
Phoenix Rise
Park Street South
Blakenhall
Wolverhampton  WV2 3EZ

Mr P W Richards
Fairclough Homes Ltd Midlands Division
The Pavilion
Amber Close
Tamworth Business Park
Tamworth  B77 4RP

Steve Hunt
Prime Focus
Daimler House
Paradise Circus
Birmingham
B1 2BJ

Peter Horridge
J Rigg Construction
C/O Stansgate Planning Consultants
Conrad House
Birmingham Road
Stratford Upon Avon  CV37 0AA
Vaughan Welch  
The Inland Waterways Association  
Birmingham, Black Country & Worcestershire Branch  
29 Dice Pleck  
Northfield  
Birmingham    B31 3XW

Mr R.G. Caffyn  
Black Country Housing Tenants Association  
1 Causeway Road  
Blackheath

Liz Davis  
Highways Agency  
C2/04  
5 Broadway  
Broad Street  
Birmingham    B15 1BL

Joe Murphy  
Bellway Homes  
Bellway House, Relay Point  
Relay Drive  
Tamworth  
Staffordshire    B77 5PA

R. P. White  
George Wimpey West Midlands Ltd.  
39 Dominion Court  
Station Road  
Solihull  
West Midlands    B91 3RT

West Midlands Regional Assembly  
Regional Partnership Centre  
Albert House, Quay Place  
92-93 Edward Street  
Birmingham    B1 2RA

Duncan Holness  
Government Office for the West Midlands  
5 St Philip’s Place  
Colmore Row  
Birmingham    B3 2PW

Miss Irene Ellis  
Chair - Albion Estate TRA  
91 St. Stephens Road  
West Bromwich  
West Midlands

British Gas  
House Contact Centre  
PO Box 50  
Leeds  
LS1 1LE

Rachael Jones  
Smethwick Town Team  
Crocketts Lane  
Smethwick  
B66 3BX

Rod Griffin  
Urban Living  
7th Floor  
Intersection House  
110 Birmingham Road  
West Bromwich    B70 6RP

John Sandland  
RegenCo  
7th Floor  
Intersection House  
110 Birmingham Road  
West Bromwich    B70 6RX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accord Housing Association</td>
<td>178 Birmingham Road, West Bromwich, B70 6QG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Country Housing Association</td>
<td>174 High Street, Blackheath, B65 0JE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromford Corinthia</td>
<td>9 Shaw Park, Business Village, Shaw Road, Bushbury, Wolverhampton, WV10 9LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Housing Association</td>
<td>35 Paradise Circus, Birmingham, B1 2AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephson Housing Association</td>
<td>1st Floor, Trafalger House, King Street, Dudley, DY2 8PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Housing Association</td>
<td>Waterloo House, 76-78 Boldmere Road, Sutton Coldfield, B73 5TL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC Chilton</td>
<td>West Midlands Police, Piddock Road, Smethwick, West Midlands, B66 3BW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Green</td>
<td>British Waterways, Canal Lane, Hatton, Warwickshire, CV35 7JL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldbury and Smethwick PCT</td>
<td>Kingston House, 438-450 High Street, West Bromwich, West Midlands, B70 9LD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: List of additional consultees
Olympic Leisurewear
Unit 6
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick, B66 2BN

Islamic Centre
10-11 Lewisham Industrial Estate,
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BP

12 Lewisham Industrial Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BP

13 Lewisham Industrial Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BP

Lal & Son
2 Lewisham Industrial Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BP

Kamal Ltd
Unit 5-7 Lewisham Industrial Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BP

R&S
8-9 Lewisham Industrial Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BP

Victoria Club
Pope Street
Smethwick
B66 2JP

G Hook & Co
Pope Street
Smethwick
B66 2JP

RWS Ltd
80 Bridge Street North
Smethwick
B66 2BJ

Midland Vacuum Metallisation Co
80 Bridge Street North
Smethwick
B66 2BJ

L K Engineering Co Ltd
Unit 5
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN
T J A Trading Ltd
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

B E R Polishing Co Ltd
Unit 8
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

M L Beebee
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

I B S Bearings Ltd
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

Brywell Services Ltd
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

Rainbow Fashion Garments
A1 Trading Estate,
Lewisham Road
Smethwick B66 2BN

Parkash
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

Paradise Dairy
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

Unit 3
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

A G Stringer
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

Barsan Engineering
Unit 9
A1 Trading Estate
Lewisham Road
Smethwick
B66 2BN

Midland Injection Moulding Co Ltd
Rear of 60 Bridge Street North
Smethwick
B66 2BJ
The Occupier
131 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
132 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
133 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
134 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
135 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
136 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
137 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
138A Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
139A Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
140A Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

The Occupier
146 Oxford Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DJ

The Occupier
147 Oxford Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DJ

The Occupier
138A Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH
The Occupier
141A Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DH

Johnstones Paints Ltd
Unit 4 Middlemore Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2DR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Occupier</td>
<td>Victoria Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pope Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S I Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pope Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2JG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewisham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 Lewisham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2BU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115 Lewisham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148 Oxford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149 Oxford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assi News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117 Lewisham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59 Lewisham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2BU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 Lewisham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smethwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B66 2BU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Occupier
62 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BU

The Occupier
63 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BU

The Occupier
64 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BU

The Occupier
65 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BU

The Occupier
66 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BU

The Occupier
67 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BU

The Occupier
68 Lewisham Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BU

The Occupier
4 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 1RP

The Occupier
1 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
11 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
13 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
15 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
17 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
19 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX
The Occupier
21 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
23 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
25 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
27 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
29 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
31 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
33 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
35 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
37 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
39 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
41 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
43 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX

The Occupier
45 Kimberley Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
B66 2BX
The Occupier
23 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
25 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
27 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
29 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
31 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
33 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
35 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
37 Whitehouse Drive
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
59 Mafeking Road
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
61 Mafeking Road
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
63 Mafeking Road
Smethwick
West Midlands

The Occupier
65 Mafeking Road
Smethwick
West Midlands
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Occupier 39 Whitehouse Drive Smethwick West Midlands</td>
<td>The Occupier 8 Whitehouse Drive Smethwick West Midlands B66 1RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Occupier 7 Hanson Close Smethwick West Midlands B66 2BY</td>
<td>The Occupier 5 Hanson Close Smethwick West Midlands B66 2BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Occupier 3 Hanson Close Smethwick West Midlands B66 2BY</td>
<td>The Occupier 1 Hanson Close Smethwick West Midlands B66 2BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Occupier 2 Whitehouse Drive Smethwick West Midlands B66 1RP</td>
<td>The Occupier 2A Whitehouse Drive Smethwick West Midlands B66 1RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Occupier 6 Whitehouse Drive Smethwick West Midlands B66 1RP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004

Notice of Deposit for the Draft Brindley II Planning and Design Brief
Supplementary Planning Document

THE BOROUGH COUNCIL OF SANDWELL

DRAFT BRINTELY II SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

The Borough Council of Sandwell has prepared proposals for the Draft Brindley II Supplementary Planning Document. The Brindley II site is considered to be of significant importance as there is the potential for a comprehensive, residential-led, mixed use scheme which would contribute to providing a sustainable community and would perform a key role in addressing the Borough's housing targets and regeneration of the Smethwick area.

The Draft Supplementary Planning Document aims to bring forward the comprehensive and co-ordinated development of this key site along the canal network which has been allocated for mixed uses in the Adopted Unitary Development Plan. It provides the planning and design context against which will be taken into consideration new development on this site. This document will be used as a material consideration in negotiations regarding proposals and the determination of future planning applications.

Copies of the Draft Brindley II Supplementary Planning Document are available for public inspection free of charge during normal office hours (Monday to Thursday 8.30 am - 5.30 pm and Friday 8.30 am - 5.00 pm) from 14th August 2006 to 25th September 2006 at the following offices:

(a) Sandwell Council House, Freeth Street, Oldbury, West Midlands B69 3DE;

(b) the offices of the Director of Planning and Transportation, Development House, Leonard Street, West Bromwich, West Midlands B70 8RU;

Copies will also be available at Smethwick Library, High Street, Smethwick, B66 1AB during normal library opening hours.

Comments in respect of the Draft Brindley II Supplementary Planning Document should be sent in writing to:

The Director of Planning and Transportation, Development House, Leonard Street, West Bromwich, West Midlands B70 8RU to reach the Director of Planning and Transportation no later than 26th September 2006.

Comments should specify the matters to which they relate and the grounds on which they are made. They may also be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the withdrawal, adoption, approval or rejection of the Draft Supplementary Planning Document.

Only those whose comments are made in writing and arrive at the address specified within the seven weeks period ending on 26th September 2006 will have a right to have their comments considered by the Council. Comments received within the consultation period will be collated and responded to prior to the document being adopted as Supplementary Planning Document, in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004.

Further information is available from the Planning helpline (0121 569 4123) at the offices of the Director of Planning and Transportation, Development House, Leonard street, West Bromwich, West Midlands, B70 8RU.

Robert A. Lee
Director of Planning and Transportation
Plans for canalside

Ambitious plans for a multi-million pound canalside development in Smethwick are being put before residents for their opinion.

The Brindley II development will be created off Lewisham Road and adjacent to the Birmingham Canal in Smethwick.

The move is seen as a way of regenerating decaying banks and walkways of the once industrious waterways and tap into an under-used historic resource.

The draft planning and design brief sees up to 250 homes, shops and the promotion of a landmark building at the junction of Bridge Street North and Lewisham Road.

Views sought on major plan for Smethwick

RESIDENTS’ views are sought on a draft design for Brindley II, an area off Lewisham Road adjacent the Birmingham Canal in Smethwick.

The design brief outlines ideas for the site which includes up to 250 homes, a shop and a ‘landmark’ building at the junction of Bridge Street North and Lewisham Road.

It also sets out issues such as access, open space, affordable housing and protection of the heritage features.

Residents have until September 25 to comment on the document. Copies are available by calling 0121 589 4254 or for inspection at the planning offices in Lombard Street, West Bromwich, or the Council House, Oldbury, and Smethwick Library. It can also be viewed on the council’s www.sandwell.gov.uk website.

Express and Star
11th September 2006

Sandwell Chronicle
14th September 2006
Chance to give views on plans

SANDWELL Council is seeking residents' views on a draft Planning and Design Brief for Brindley II.

The brief outlines ideas for the future of the site, which includes development of up to 250 homes on the site off Lewisham Road and adjacent to the Birmingham Canal in Smethwick.

It incorporates additional uses such as a shop and the promotion of a landmark building at the junction of Bridge Street North and Lewisham Road.

It also sets out issues such as access, open space, and affordable housing.

Coun Bob Baddock, Sandwell Council cabinet member for regeneration and transport said: "We are now seeking views on the Planning and Design Brief, which will aim to transform this area with an appropriate, well designed scheme."

Residents have until September 25 to comment.

Copies are available by calling 0121 568 4254 or for inspection at the Planning Offices in Lombard Street, West Bromwich, the Council House, Oldbury, and Smethwick Library.

Alternatively, it can be viewed online at website www.sandwell.gov.uk

Birmingham Evening Mail
31st August 2006
Appendix 5: Schedule of Responses
# Brindley II Table of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Nature of comment</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Michael Taylor     | English Heritage        | 1. EH welcome the Brief for this important site and the potential improvement it could make to the historic canalside environment  
2. Para 6.2 – need to add that development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area if it is designated.  
3. Para 6.4 – paragraph should make reference to preserving the setting of the listed buildings identified as well as the structures themselves.  
5. Para 9.5.2 – Agree with the design aspirations but advise against being unduly prescriptive in terms of building style.  
6. Design section does not cover public realm design. Suggest looking at “Streets For All: West Midlands” |
|        |                    |                         | 1. Comments noted.  
2. Paragraph 6.2 does mention that any development will need to respect the designation of a Conservation Area and be complimentary to it. However, reference to preserve and enhance the character or appearance would enforce this point further.  
3. It is noted that the setting of Listed Buildings are equally as important as the buildings themselves.  
4. The importance of PPG15 and PPG16 is noted and will be included in the National Policy Context.  
5. Any development proposals put forward will be assessed against the Adopted UDP and Supplementary Planning Guidance in order to ensure a high quality of design and materials is achieved. It is not considered this approach is unduly prescriptive as any proposal will be assessed on its merits.  
6. It is acknowledged that additional information needs to be included which covers the public realm issue. |
|        |                    |                         | 1.n/a  
2. Change para 6.2 to read "The designation of a Conservation Area on this part of the site does not preclude development from taking place. However, any development will need to respect and compliment the designation of the Conservation area as well as preserve and enhance the character and appearance. Regard .....".  
3. Change Para 6.4 to read "There are listed structures alongside the canal which will require the appropriate protection whilst development is undertaken. Consideration should also be given to preserving the setting of the listed structures. The listed structures are....."  
4. Include PPG15 and PPG16 in the National Policy Context.  
5. No change  
6. Additional information will be included within the Design Section to promote the use of appropriate materials in the public realm to reflect the historic |
| 2      | James Kitchen      | Environment Agency      | 1. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Authority has not yet been undertaken which will inform that allocations within this plan are sustainable from a flood risk viewpoint. Therefore the EA object and cannot comment until an SFRA is prepared.  
2. Para 7.2.1 – due to past activity, there should be the inclusion of PPG23: Planning and Pollution control |
|        |                    |                         | 1. Sandwell has begun the process of preparing the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Borough as part of the Joint Black Country Core Strategy. The SFRA will be in place in 2007, and will therefore be used to assess and amend as necessary the Brindley II SPD after its adoption in 2006. Any development which takes place on this site prior to the SFRA will need to assess the flood risk with the most |
|        |                    |                         | 1. Under the Constraints section, insert a paragraph under the title "Flood Risk" stating "Sandwell has begun the process of preparing the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Borough as part of the Joint Black Country Core Strategy. The SFRA will be in place in 2007, and will therefore be used to assess and amend as necessary the Brindley II SPD after its adoption in 2006. Any development |

02 November 2006
in the National Policy Context of Section 3.
3. There is a need to ascertain ground conditions due to past activity on the site. Need to change Para 7.2.1 to read "A full survey will be required in order to ascertain the amount and level of contaminants on site, this must be undertaken and submitted with any planning application"
4. Would like to see an additional bullet point added to the design section to read "The site will need to take full account of the use of sustainable drainage systems and obstacles to their use fully justified.
5. Consider that Policy PC7: Surface Water should be included in Appendix 1 as a relevant UDP Policy.

3 Maggie Taylor  Sport England
1. Para 3.1 – requires further information on how PPS1 puts more emphasis on Local Authorities to deliver more places which encourage the population to be more active in terms of provision of open space, sports facilities and good quality pedestrian/cycle routes.
2. Section 4 and 5 – the proposals will require the provision of new open space, sport and recreation facilities and access to the towpath.
3. Section 6 – need to incorporate the potential benefits of utilizing the canal and associated towpaths for active travel, walking and cycling to maximise the value of this site.
4. There is a need to request contributions for sporting facilities in the area such as swimming pools, badminton courts and indoor bowling rinks. The commuted sum has been

1. There is a reference in PPS1 regarding ensuring accessibility to leisure and community facilities, as well as a range of other facilities and services and to providing sustainable communities by ensuring appropriate sites are identified, particularly by walking and cycling.
2. Sections 4 & 5 provide the current local policy context and site description for Brindley II. The issue of the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities and access to the towpath are better dealt with elsewhere in the document. In fact the issue of open space is within Section 9 - Requirements of Development. Access is also mentioned but not specifically access to the towpath, only across the canal. There are swimming baths within 1.4 miles of this site, and indoor sports facilities within 0.75 miles. Provision of

1. Insert additional wording to para 3.1 (PPS1).
2. Insert additional wording to para 5.6 to encompass comments made in respect of access to the towpaths. No change in respect of provision of open space as this is already dealt with elsewhere in the document. No change in respect of provision of new sports facilities.
3. Insert additional wording to Section 6 to encompass comments made.
4. Insert a reference in Requirements of Development for the possibility of a contribution to sporting facilities where there is an identified need.
5. Insert additional wording to para 9.5.1 to encompass comments on active design.
6. No change.
7. Amend plan(s) accordingly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Nature of comment</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Richard Booth</td>
<td>Centro</td>
<td>calculated at £161,288 using the Sports Facility Calculator. Will also need to take into account the playing pitch assessment currently being undertaken by the Council.</td>
<td>Sport and Recreation facilities is not considered appropriate on this site. 3. The benefits of the canal for active travel, walking and cycling are considered to be important and is mentioned in para 9.1.6. &quot;...as well as increasing usage of the canal corridor&quot;. However, Section 6 could be amended to incorporate these comments. 4. Further discussion with the relevant sporting providers is required to identify whether there is existing capacity for these facilities. Should a need be proven, a contribution for new facilities will be sought.</td>
<td>1. Change 2nd sentence of para 5.5 to read &quot;...The area is served by a half hourly evening and Sunday service (No.478) running along Lewisham Road and Bridge Street. There are proposals to divert this service to Brasshouse Lane. During the daytime, services 450, 123.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 November 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
daytime, access will probably be met by bus services 450, 123 and 445 from Halfords Lane and Rolfe Street.

2. Para 9.2.1 – Any potential developer should be encouraged to seek opportunities to improve public transport access in the area as well as improving routes to existing public transport services in the area. This should be applicable whether the site eventually has an element of affordable housing or not.

3. Para 9.1.4 – Any proposed signalised junctions will need to ensure that there is no detrimental effect on bus service operation.

4. Para 9.5.2 – A bullet point should be inserted stating “Direct safe pedestrian routes should be provided through site and to the surrounding area to improve connectivity to public transport services” in addition, other complimentary measures should be sought to improve routes to public transport services for pedestrians beyond the boundary of this site. These may include lighting, pedestrian crossings and improved signage.

5 Hanna Mawson Home Builders Federation

1. Planning Obligations – Development should only be required to make provision for facilities arising out of a direct result of new development as laid out in the tests of Circular 5/2005. The nature and extent of existing provision is not recognised in these requirements meaning the whole approach is fundamentally flawed.

2. Education Provision – It is not appropriate for all new housing development to contribute towards the planning application, and will be expected to have pre-application discussions with the relevant agencies in order to examine ways to achieve this.

3. The proposed junction improvement has been designed as part of a package of improvements aimed at aiding movement of heavy goods vehicles through the area without detriment to the existing and future residents. The improvements may have an effect on bus service operation although it may be beneficial rather than detrimental. However, this issue will need to be discussed further, with the bus operators, when a detailed planning application is submitted.

4. Any development will be assessed against adopted Policies on security and safety, including the issue of safe pedestrian linkages to public transport services. The additional bullet point as proposed will reinforce this issue. Where possible, improvements to pedestrian routes outside the site boundary, such as lighting and signage, will be pursued through various routes, where there is an identified need.

1. Planning obligations will be requested to provide facilities which are required as a result of any development proposed, and in line with Council Policy and Circular 5/2005. This need will be identified once a detailed planning application is submitted as contributions are normally formula based, dependent on the scale of the development.

2. The Brief promotes residential development on this site. It is envisaged that a good portion of this housing will be occupied by families.
provision of educational facilities if there is no direct link between the need for those facilities and the development proposed. This could be because of the type of housing proposed, or because there is adequate provision already.

3. The HBF object to inclusion of policies which dictate to the internal layout of dwellings which encourages standardisation of house types and not encouraging mixed communities as advocated by PPS3.

6. Kevin Harvey, Highways Agency

1. There is no mention of the M5 Junction 1 nor any indication within the document that the impact on the Strategic Road Network has been considered. A development of up to 250 dwellings will have a significant impact of the SRN, and especially the impact on air quality.

2. The HA will require copies of any Assessments which have already been carried out, and if there are no assessments, these will be required to feed into the strategic appraisal of the transportation implications of the proposals.

3. Sustainable Transport – The HA welcomes the promotion of walking and cycling improvements within the SPD area, including the identification of the detailed measures that will be considered and the proposals for their delivery. This

The Brief also outlines that capacity at existing schools is limited at present, therefore, there will be a requirement for a contribution to additional educational facilities in the area to accommodate the new residents in line with adopted Policy.

3. It is not considered that the design guidance for residential development is over prescriptive. The guidance referred to merely attempts to raise the quality of design within the Borough. Each application will be dealt with on its merits.

1. The Brief does not mention the M5 Junction 1, nor the impact any development may have on the Strategic Road Network. However, this can be incorporated within the text of Sections 5 (Site Description) and Section 9 (Requirements of Development).

2. There are no Assessments for this particular site at present. However, any development will be subject to a Traffic Assessment as part of the planning application.

3. Sustainable travel will be encouraged wherever possible and the Council will endeavour to work with Developers to establish a Residential Travel Plan in order to achieve this. This may include the provision of incentives such as vouchers for public transport, additional shoppers buses or appropriate cabling to be provided to enable home shopping. Attention will also be drawn to Government guidance on “Making Residential Travel Plans Work” (DfT) and current, adopted Council Policy on The Preparation of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.

4. The Council will encourage potential developers to explore improved

1. Additional text will be added to encompass comments received.

2. Additional text will be included within Requirements of Development regarding the need for a TA as part of a Planning Application.

3. Additional text will be included which makes reference to the need for the Council and Developer to work together in drawing up a Residential Travel Plan.

4. Text will be incorporated into the Brief (para 9.1.1 & 9.1.6) outlining the need for Developers to consider encouraging more use of sustainable forms of transport.

5. No Change

6. Include Travel Modes and Volume as an indicator to Objective 15 of the SA.

7. Additional text will be included which requires the Developer to undertake an assessment of the implications for development on the existing road system prior to a scheme being
would establish a framework against which individual planning applications could be judged and developer contributions to sustainable transport initiatives required.

4. The HA also recommends further opportunities for improvements to the local public transport network, including the rail and bus networks, should be explored. This could include the intensification of number of routes and frequency of services in the local area. Encouragement could also be given to measures to increase bus patronage by new residents including, for example, the provision of bus passes to new residents by developers as part of any legal agreement.

5. Car Parking - The HA is fully supportive of the document’s emphasis of a reduction on the over dominance of car parking as part of the scheme. The HA requests that further guidance provided continues to ensure that this objective is upheld and that any parking is provided in-line with the maximum standards set out in the UDP.

6. Sustainability Appraisal - the SA sets out the sustainability objectives of the Brindley II SPD. Targets for the proposed development, the baseline information used to provide indicators from which targets can be set and the implementation of the SA. The Agency supports the sustainability objectives in order to assess and monitor the implementation of the scheme proposed as set out in Appendix 3. However, the Agency would suggest the following amendment to the proposed monitoring framework as set out in accessibility to public transport provision as part of the planning application and TA which may include pre-application discussions with public transport providers. Developers will also be made aware of Travel Plan Considerations for Housing Developments, prepared by the council’s Transport Planning Section.

5. Car parking provision will be assessed in line with existing Council Policy.

6. The amendment to the Sustainability Appraisal Monitoring indicator relating to Objective 15: Increase transport choice and reduce the need to travel’ has been noted and will be taken on board.

7. The comments of the highways agency are noted however, given that this is an SPD and the principle of the development has already been established in the Unitary Development Plan (2004) a STA is not considered to be appropriate. However, the SPD will have an amendment, which identifies that there maybe implications on the adjoining highway network arising out of the development and that applicants may be advised to consult the Highways Agency.
Appendix 7: For 'Objective 15: Increase transport choice and reduce the need to travel' include the indicator 'Travel modes and volume', which should include the monitoring of both residents and workers in the area.

7. The HA would recommend that a strategic assessment is undertaken of the transportation implications of the proposals. This should include assessment of the interaction between the local and strategic road network and the wider transportation system. The aim should be to identify the scale and nature of improvements that would be required to accommodate the development and the opportunities to reduce travel demand at source, influence travel behaviour and promote the use of sustainable transport modes. The HA would suggest that this is then developed into a range of specific measure to be included in an Area Travel Plan.

7  Mr Chris Parry  Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust  1. Chapters 1 & 2 Introduction and Aims of the Brief - The Trust is disappointed that neither the Introduction or Aims provide a Vision. Para 1.2 touches on some of the elements that would contribute towards one. The Black Country Vision which has been used as the foundation for the work relating to the Black Country Study and draft RSS Phase 1 Revision can also make a contribution. The importance of environmental quality, both broadly and in terms of the natural and the historic environment also need to be stressed as part of the Vision.

1. It is considered that the Introduction and the Aims of the Brief cover sufficiently, the vision for this site, that is, to bring it forward for comprehensive development which encourages a high standard of development which reflects and complements the natural and built heritage.

2. Given the size and proposed use of the site, it is not felt that consideration of the range of information provided is required in this instance. However, it may be appropriate to include PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation within the National Policy.

1. No change 2. Include PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation within the National Policy Context.
3. Add additional text to Site Description to include the wider area.
4. Add additional information to Section 6.
5. No change 6. Add additional information to Site Plan.
7. No change 8. Include Open Space within para 8.3.
9. No change 10. No change
Environmental quality should be at the heart of the Black Country (and Sandwell) regeneration and play a critical role in raising people's quality of life.

2. Chapter 3 & 4 National Policy Context & Local Policy Context - It is right that the SPD must be aligned with, and influenced by, other guidance and strategies, in order to demonstrate the joined-up thinking of the Council and to make the most of policy and implementation linkages. However, the Trust has the view that this document needs to articulate more clearly guidance and advice from government, other environmental strategies and evidence from the national, regional, sub-regional and local policy base available to Sandwell Council, as well as legislative requirements. Examples are provided. The NERC Act 2006 is especially important because it establishes a new duty for all public bodies to conserve biodiversity in carrying out their proper functions. The preparation and adoption of new planning documents provide an opportunity for local authorities, as public bodies, to demonstrate this. The draft RSS Phase One Revision is especially important because policy encourages corridor-focused regeneration.

3. Chapter 5 - Site Description - the draft provides limited information about the environmental context of the area and its immediate surrounds. More environmental context could be provided, especially in relation to biodiversity.

4. Chapter 6 - Conservation and Canals - Both levels of the

Councils response

3. It has been decided to include additional description of the site and how it sits within the wider area following comments received.

4. This additional information will be included within the Brief for information.

5. Comments noted.

6. Areas having wildlife interest could be shown on a plan within the document.

7. The title of Section 7 is considered appropriately titled.

8. The provision of open space will also be a valid land use and should be included in the list.

9. It is the intention that any open space provided, except for the private realm, will be publicly accessible.

10. Comments noted

11. Amend to include emphasis on aspects of sustainable design that can be promoted and sought from new development.

12. The issues which may have an impact arising out of the development and which may require a planning obligation have been identified within Section 9. Should the development have an identified impact on biodiversity issues, then this could be explored at application stage.

13. It is considered that the broad range of baseline information is appropriate given the size of site and potential development.

14. See above.

15. Comments noted, However, it is considered that the consultation has been carried out within the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement.

16. It is considered unlikely that the site
Birmingham Canal are also of nature conservation importance coming within the definition of Article X of the Habitats Directive and Regulation 37 of the Habitats Regulations, both of which relate to "linear features of the landscape". They are afforded protection by these documents and their management is a requirement of the Directive and the Regulations.

5. We welcome the identification of the canals as Wildlife Corridors - this reference could be strengthened by referral to the protection previously mentioned.

6. There may be other features within the SPD boundary or its environs that may harbour biodiversity interest, such as BAP Priority Habitats and protected species, Biodiversity Action Plan species ad Species of Conservation Concern within the SPD area or its environs. For example water voles have been recorded previously in the Birmingham Canal nearby and the area also contains habitat suitable for black redstart. In the nature of Good Practice, we recommend that the SPD attempts to identify potential features and their importance, either in a map-based format and/or within the text. How well potential features are protected, managed and enhanced would be an issue for future delivery and implementation processes within the SPD area.

7. Chapter 7 Constraints - Perhaps this chapter could be titled differently in that as currently titled it presents a negative picture and a negative message about the issues that are identified. Constraints also provide opportunities. The Trust would also

will not come forward for a mixed use development in the future given the agencies involved in bringing it forward for redevelopment.
make the case that biodiversity and even geodiversity warrant investigation because of the potential issues raised previously.

8. Chapter 8 Future Land Uses - Open Space should also be identified as a valid land use, including potential accessible natural green space. The development area also offers opportunities for the delivery of features expressing the Black Country as Urban Park concept.

9. Chapter 9 Requirements of Development - In line with previous comments we think that Section 9.3 should specify that biodiversity and accessible natural green space should provide elements of the open space.

10. Section 9.5 Design makes many specific requirements that the Wildlife Trust can support, particularly that relating to rear gardens not fronting open space or the canal.

11. This SPD also offers considerable potential to encourage and deliver sustainability benefits as the regeneration of Brindley II takes place. This chapter could identify a broad range of strategies and principles, particularly the degree to which development within the SPD area could contribute to raising environmental standards in respect of, for example;
- energy provision (eg renewables) and energy efficiency
- waste management
- sustainable drainage
- construction standards eg BREEAM EcoHomes
- open space/biodiversity/geodiversity provision
- action in planning for climate change
- potential for low carbon development

Each of the above areas could benefit from the identification of principles which development in the widest sense could deliver or encourage. In particular, attention should be paid as to how and to the degree to which the Black Country as Urban Park concept is taken forward. The canal location of the area lends itself well to the beacons - corridors - communities themes and other network features as described in Policy UR1A vi) in the draft RSS Phase One Revision: The Black Country

Developments within the SPD area should be accompanied by biodiversity, geodiversity and historic environment assessments to ensure that features of value are protected, managed, enhanced or restored.

12. Chapter 9 could identify a range of features or topics to benefit from planning obligations, including biodiversity, geodiversity and the historic environment, in addition to the other broad range of environmental issues raised above.

Sustainability Appraisal Comments
13. Para 4.2 Baseline Characteristics and Predicted Future Baseline - Environmental baseline data are presented in a broad form in the SA document. Selected more specific data/information could be presented.
14. Para 6.3 Proposed Mitigation Measures - The mitigation measures suggested from the SA work appear to be logical given the SA process that has taken place. However, if
more specific data had been used to illustrate the baseline assessment, the impact of future development would have been more specifically identified and hence the mitigation measures could be far more specific. These measures could then have been built into Chapter 9 - Requirements of Development. - an example of the above would be provided by 9 in the Table on p.19. The mitigation proposed is "Undertake site investigations" - in our view this could be much more specific by identifying the range of issues which require investigation. The Wildlife Trust would suggest that biodiversity and geodiversity would be one of these issues. The mitigation measures required can then be listed as requiring monitoring methodologies. 15. The Trust notes that Sandwell MBC officers have carried out this appraisal work. The SA work would have been a good opportunity to involve the local community and organisations in the development of the Brindley II SPD through workshops and other community-friendly ways. The SA work represents a missed opportunity to engage the local community early, in line with the principles and requirements of Sandwell’s Statement of Community Involvement. 16. SA Guidance encourages the consideration of uncertainty and risk. His consideration appears to be lacking in this SA. There is also the risk that the SPD or development in the Brindley II area may not be implemented is not considered, and neither is the possibility that it might
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Nature of comment</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Andrew Tryer</td>
<td>British Waterways</td>
<td>have to undergo amendment during the course of the LDF process. There is also the risk that the aims, objectives and policies are not challenging enough.</td>
<td>1. - 3. Comments noted.</td>
<td>1. - 3. No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. We support the general aims and objective so the document, in principle as it provides a broad framework for the potential regeneration of this site in Smethwick, which is bounded by Lewisham Road, and the Birmingham Canal. It also provides an important opportunity to transform the area with a mixed use development and at the same time it could enhance and afford protection to the existing important heritage value of the waterway in this local area.</td>
<td>4. Alter wording to para 6.2 to strengthen the importance of the locks.</td>
<td>5. Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Land Uses - We welcome the proposal of a mixed use development which is predominately residential. This scheme would accord with national, regional and local planning policy in relation to the re-use of brownfield land. In addition it is essential to the success of the development that the mix uses area able to offer a vibrant mix of retail, food and drink, office and leisure uses which are an integral part of the development as a whole.</td>
<td>4. Following comments received from a number of consultees, it is considered that the importance of the buried locks warrants an investigation into their quality. This will determine whether or not they should be incorporated within the overall scheme as a feature, or whether they should be recorded/retained in situ with preclusion of development in this area. Overlaying the current map onto the 1890 historic map would show the extent of the locks to be retained.</td>
<td>6. Amend Section 6 to refer to the importance of the locks. Amend Section 6 to refer to development and the setting of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Heritage - BW feels it is important that the document makes clear and strong references to the site in orientation and proportions of all new buildings which should be designed in a positive way in relation to the waterway and the setting of the</td>
<td>5. Comments noted.</td>
<td>7. No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. The design section will make references to development and the setting of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings.</td>
<td>8. Reference to the requirement of a Design Statement will be made in 9.5.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. There is a section which deals with all aspects of the design of any new development, which will be considered in pre-application discussions or on submission of a planning application.</td>
<td>9. Para 9.1.6 will be changed to accommodate the need for any access to be DDA compliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. In line with Policy UD2, a design statement will be required as part of any planning application which should include an assessment of the wider area.</td>
<td>10. Alter para 9.1.6 to encompass comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. New linkages will need to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act and will be assessed by the Council’s Access Officer.</td>
<td>11. Reference regarding the definition between private, semi-private and public spaces will be included in para 9.5.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Additional bullet point will be added to para 9.5.2 to refer to movement through the site.</td>
<td>12. Additional wording will be incorporated within para 9.5.2 referring to provision of open space and careful consideration for car parking areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Additional paragraph will be included under Section 9 - Requirements of Development referring to the need to consider Planning Obligation in respect of maintenance of</td>
<td>13. Additional wording will be included under Section 9 - Requirements of Development referring to the need to consider Planning Obligation in respect of maintenance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. An additional paragraph will be included under Section 9 - Requirements of Development referring to Planning Obligation in respect of maintenance of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conservation Area.
4. Given the historical and archaeological importance of this site it is also important that the brief makes it clearer that development is not appropriate on the footprint of the in filled lock flight as it would prevent any potential restoration and interpretation of these very significant features. It is suggested therefore that the plan of the Brindley II site boundary map could be overlaid with the historic 1890 Plan so that the document show the extent of the former locks which have potential for restoration.
5. Paragraph 6.2 of the brief refers to the 'lost' locks and then refers to them later in Paragraph 7. It would be useful for potential developers to be aware of the important historic significance of the locks and a paragraph detailing the historic and archaeological importance of the canal heritage features including the 'lost' locks should be provided in the document.
6. Design - BW feels it is important that the document makes clear and strong references to the design of the development in a positive way in relation to the waterway and the setting of the Conservation Area.
7. Design considerations for the new buildings should be spelt out in the brief and include siting, orientation, massing, scale, solid and voids relationships as well as details of construction, good quality materials and workmanship. A pastiche approach to the design of the new development should be discouraged. In addition the height of the roofs should be articulated to provide an additional maintenance costs. It is therefore considered that the Brief should make reference to the need for a Planning Obligation towards additional maintenance and upkeep of these facilities, in line with current Government Circular 5/2005. It may also be possible to consider further, the developer and the Council working together with BW the provision of additional information material. This would need to take place once a scheme is being drawn up.
10. The support from BW for a new bridge to link the north and south of the canal is welcomed. Appropriate design which respects the existing canal side, as well as the Conservation Area, will be the subject of further discussion between the relevant parties.
11. Comments are noted. Reference will need to be included regarding the definition between private, semi-private and public spaces.
12. Comments are noted. The design of any development on this site will need to consider pedestrian movement, to and through the site, as well as the canalside area.
13. The design of the development will need to respect the provision of appropriate open space throughout the site as well as the safe and appropriate car parking provision which should be referred to in the Brief.
14. It is considered that residential development alongside the canal will result in more usage of the canal towpaths/cyclepaths. This will require additional maintenance costs. It is therefore considered that the Brief should make reference to the need for a Planning Obligation towards additional maintenance and upkeep of these facilities, in line with current Government Circular 5/2005. It may also be possible to consider further, the developer and the Council working together with BW the provision of additional information material. This would need to take place once a scheme is being drawn up.
15. Comments noted.
interesting and varied skyline. Building blocks should be designed to allow views from and through the development to the canal.

8. We feel the brief should either a) clarify which existing industrial buildings should serve as examples of good design in relation to the new development, these could include buildings located beyond the immediate site boundary or b) require a potential developer to provide a site analysis and character assessment of the local area in relation to the design of the new buildings.

9. The brief acknowledges special attention should be given to the boundary treatment with the canal and the new improved linkages between the new development and the existing landscape...’ - the new linkages should promote vitality on the canal landscape but also be DDA compliant and designed with safety for all users in mind.

0. BW support in principle the proposal for a pedestrian canal bridge to provide links between the north and south areas of the development site. Careful consideration should be given to the design of the bridge which should be to an appropriate scale, height and materials in respect of the existing canal side building form/s, environment and structures.

11. Public Realm - The creation of public realm areas and open spaces within the proposed development site is supported in principle. Pedestrian generating activities should be located along the waterside and the public realm areas/spaces should be designed in a sympathetic way in relation to the conservation area and...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Nature of comment</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

the archaeological sites. The brief should include reference to the need to ensure that appropriate and clear transition between private, semi-private and public spaces should be provided, as lack of definition is unsatisfactory for residents, canal users or the public using the open spaces.

12. The presence of people on the towpaths and bridges and spaces adjacent to the canal encourages use of the canal waterfront. Pedestrian circulation should be encouraged within the development and the canal side and also access points and routes throughout the development should enable strong and clear links and connections to other places too.

13. The masterplan should consider a variety of open space, starting from the canal area as the main open space with a series of open spaces within the development thus providing open spaces of varying character and with a defined hierarchy. Empty and unmanaged spaces are to be avoided within the development and along the waterway. The brief should stress the need to provide a management plan including maintenance regime in conjunction with a development proposals. The design of vehicle parking for the new buildings should normally not be located adjacent to the waterway.

14. Planning Agreements - Paras 9.1.1 - 9.5.2 of the draft document makes reference to development requirements in relation to affordable housing, open space, play space and education provision. It is likely the proposed development will subject the canal towpaths to a) increased
footfall and usage and b) increased links to the pedestrian and cycle route network and we consider that the costs caused by the increased usage would require a developer contribution.

BW would request that reference is made in the document to support the requirement of a planning obligation agreement to ensure the improvement of the general canal side environment including towpaths, suitable landscaping and restoration of the locks and the canal heritage feature. We would also wish to explore with a developer and the Council, the possibility of an interpretation centre or similar facility including good quality signage and information boards about the canal and its heritage features.

15. BW wishes to remain involved with the development of the Planning and Design Brief for Brindley II and the subsequent stages including for example the master plan and detailed planning applications. If the Council or a potential developer would like to discuss any aspect of our comments in relation to the planning and design brief and the subsequent development stages then please contact me.

9 Hazel Fleming The Countryside Agency Thank you for consulting the Countryside Agency on the Brindley II SPD and Sustainability Appraisal, seeking our views on the content. This letter is the formal response of Comments are noted. No change.

02 November 2006
The Countryside Agency is charged with providing advice relating to the effects of the plan on landscape character and quality, visual amenity and enjoyment of the countryside as a whole, recreational opportunities and enjoyment of access land or a public right of way. The content of the SA is important to us, however, due to limited staff resources we are not able to have detailed involvement in every one. We do however provide an extensive set of publications and resources which set out our views and guidance on these aspects. Please contact us at the address above if you would like any further information on publications which may benefit your SA.

Our lack of comment at this stage should not be interpreted as a lack of interest but rather a prioritisation of our resources to where we can be most effective.

10 Vaughan Welch The Inland Waterways Association

1. The Inland Waterways Association (IWA) is a registered charity, founded in 1946, which advocates the conservation, use, maintenance, restoration and development of the inland waterways for the public benefit. IWA has over 17,500 members whose interests include boating, towpath walking, industrial archaeology, nature conservation and many other activities associated with the inland waterways of this country. This letter forms the Association’s response to the Summary Planning Report.

2. Comments noted.

3. The Council consider that the area adjacent to the buried locks is an important gateway location when approaching the site from the north and east, and visually, provides an excellent opportunity to promote a landmark building on this corner site. Due to the topography of the area, it is considered that a multi-story building could be accommodated without detriment to the Conservation Area or the setting of the canal and its landscape, and therefore this will be

1 & 2. No changes proposed.

3 - 4. No changes proposed.
Document (SPD) and is written by it's Birmingham, Black Country and Worcestershire Branch on behalf of its ruling Council.

2. IWA welcomes the proposals outlined in this summary consolation document and would compliment the Council and its staff on the way that it has been so well researched and the resultant information has been presented. It obviously contains all the points that we made last year when responding to the Smethwick Town Plan consultation, especially in respect of the conservation of the sites of the former duplicated locks (unique as far as the Birmingham Canal Navigations is concerned) for possible long term restoration, and so we have little to add to the Brief.

3. However, we do note that it is proposed that the canal side buildings, which are set behind the line of the former canal, will be four story. Given that these may well dominating effect on the Conservation Area we feel that, at least the block adjacent to Bridge Street, should be lower than the others and thus it would have less of a less visual impact on the canal landscape, and the background to listed junction bridges, when viewed from the Roebuck Lane direction.

4. In conclusion, other than the minor change in building heights, the IWA supports the proposals and asks that the Council include the point outlined above within the final SPD. We would of course be pleased to see a copy of the final document when it is produced and thank you in anticipation of the same.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Nature of comment</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr Musleh Uddin</td>
<td>Bangladeshi Islamic Centre</td>
<td>Future Land Uses</td>
<td>The subject of self build plots within this particular area has been recognised as</td>
<td>An area of land off Mafeking Road, will be earmarked as a potential site for consideration for self-build plots and text will be included within the Brief which makes reference to further negotiations with relevant agencies regarding how this issue is pursued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an important issue for some time. However, it was felt that the land required, i.e. land at Mafeking Road, could be better utilised if part of a wider, more comprehensive scheme. Nevertheless, because of the obvious demand for land for self build plots, especially in the Smethwick area, it has been decided that part of the site could be set aside for this use, subject to further negotiations with the Council and other agencies on how this could be developed further to ensure good quality design and materials are achieved that will not be detrimental to the wider scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Barbara McLoughlin</td>
<td>Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. The document seems too wordy - need to re-edit and consider better use and grouping of bullet points. 2. The Introduction could make more reference to the need to supply good quality housing. 3. Section 2.4 - Clarify the position regarding whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required. 4. Paras 4.1 and 4.2 - Need to insert a statement regarding the promotion of the site for good quality housing. 5. Section 5 - Site Description - this section needs to be more descriptive</td>
<td>1. Bullet points within the design section will be grouped into logical sections. Text within the document will be edited to take on board comments received/minor typographical errors. 2. Reference to the requirement for good quality housing will be inserted into the Introduction. 3. Para 2.4 will be amended to incorporate updated information. 4. No change 5. Further detail will be incorporated within Section 5 regarding the site description and the wider area. 6 and 7. Alter wording to para 6.2. to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 November 2006
about the condition of the site and its visual appearance. Try to link in to the wider area.
6. Section 6 Conservation - this section needs to be more assertive on the retention/refurbishment of the buried locks and to make a feature of them.
7. Section 7 - para 7.1.2 - need to reword this section in order to discourage development of this part of the site and encourage design which will incorporate the locks as a feature.
8. Para 8.1 - remove the phrase "most acceptable use" and reword to be more assertive on what the proposed use will be.
9. Para 8.1 - The aspirational housing referred to in this section needs further description. The housing should be aspirational as well as affordable and there is a need for innovative housing which meets the families needs as well as meeting the block structures.
10. The document requires reordering as the design section is felt to be more important than some of the other sections and should therefore be brought forward.
11. More emphasis should be put on the open space on the canalside, as well as the wildlife corridor and heritage assets.
12. Para 9.5.2 - the first sentence needs rewording to remove ambiguity to what the proposed use is to be. Suggest removing the word "any".
13. There should be a reference to the need for a phasing plan which shows the phasing of development to ensure that comprehensive development takes place. This will allow for the was required as part of the SEA Directive. This information has now been received and confirmed that an SEA will be required. Therefore the text will require updating.
4. Paras 4.1 and 4.2 set the Local Policy Context for the site. The promotion of the site for good quality housing is mentioned more appropriately elsewhere in the document.
5. It is recognised that the Brief could benefit from more detail regarding the site and its wider area which is best dealt with in Section 5.
6 and 7. Due to other comments received during the consultation exercise, it has been decided that the retention of the locks should be pursued if appropriate and the text within Section 6 and para 7.1.2 will be amended to reflect this decision.
7. As the principle for the future use of this site has already been established within the Adopted UDP, it is considered that the phrase "most acceptable use" is superfluous and the text requires rewording to reflect this.
9. The Brief would benefit from further description of the type of housing required for this site although this will need to be flexible enough not to be prescriptive. This will allow developers to design a scheme which accommodates a wide range of housing types to meet the needs of the area.
10. It is agreed that the layout of the Brief needs re-ordering to address the importance of the design issues for this site and therefore bring forward this chapter.
11. The open space on the canalside is an important feature, not only for this site, but for linking this site with other areas of the Borough through the canal and its wider area which is best dealt with in Section 5.
8. Remove "most acceptable use" from para 8.1.
9. Alter para 8.1 to reflect the type of housing expected on this site.
10. Bring forward the Design Section to the start of Chapter 9.
11. Alter Section 9.3. To reinforce the importance of the canal and wildlife corridor and the heritage assets of this site.
12. Remove "any" from the first sentence of para 9.5.2.
13. Alter the third sentence of para 9.5.2 to read "Comprehensive development of the site is preferred. Therefore, should a phased approach be taken, applications for development will need to provide a phasing plan for development, together with a legally binding undertaking to complete development for the whole of the site."
14. Change bullet point to read "Car parking courts, if proposed, should be well lit and overlooked to ensure adequate natural surveillance. They should incorporate security measures, should be gated and the locking mechanism should be approved by Police Architectural Liaison Officer."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Nature of comment</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deletion of the reference to phased development not being allowed.</td>
<td>corridor as well as linking the areas north and south. The importance of the wildlife corridor and heritage assets also need reinforcing which may be possible through additional wording within Section 9.3.</td>
<td>1. The site is partly within the Conservation Area and should therefore have been included within the Local Policy Context. Minor amendment to the text should overcome this. 2. This paragraph does not truly represent the main source of funding which was mainly Sandwell MBC and Manpower Services Commission. This paragraph will be rewritten to provide clarity. 3. This additional information will be included in para 6.2. 4. Comments noted. 5. The importance of the 'lost locks' will need to be assessed once an investigation has been carried out. It is not envisaged that development will be allowed on the line of the original canal. However, should the lost locks be approved by Police Architectural Liaison Officer.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Comments

1. Section 4 Local Policy Context - there is no reference to the Conservation Area.
2. Para 5.6 - Lottery funding was a minor source for funding New Pumping Station, credit should go to Sandwell MBC and MSC, not HLF.
3. Para 6.2 - The three lost locks date from 1768-9.
4. Para 6.4 - The three Listed Locks date from 1790-91 when Summit lowered to 473 AOD (Wolverhampton Level). The 2nd set of locks built are the survivors. The original 3 were infilled in the 1960’s. The outline of the Top Lock was retained as a feature under a recent scheme.
5. Para 7.1.1 - The 1768-9 locks are substantial below ground watertight structures and canals are trenches

1. Include reference to the Conservation Area in Local Policy Context.
2. Change para 5.6 to read "The Birmingham Canal (Wolverhampton Level) lies to the south of the site. Sandwell Council, supported by the British Waterways, Urban Programme and Heritage Lottery funding, implemented improvements to the canal. Smethwick New Pumping Station and chimney were restored as a visitor attraction, increasing awareness of the benefits of the canal environment and preserving the historical and cultural importance of the canal nationally and locally. Other schemes have improved the towpath and created new and improved links to"
lined with puddle clay. When infilled in the 1960's, they were tipped with waste to ground level. To develop on the line of the canal, you must dig out the (contaminated) waste, structures and puddle clay; dispose of the waste; bring in clean fill. This makes an expensive development site.

6. The issue of who owns and maintains the open space alongside the development will need to be discussed as part of any development proposals with the interested parties, i.e. the Council and British Waterways. This reference should be made within section 9.3.3.

7. Comments noted.

8. Comments noted.

9 and 10. Whilst it is accepted that the history of the canals within the Borough are important, this has already been documented in other material. It is considered unnecessary and inappropriate to repeat it within this Brief which is aimed at providing guidance for future development while respecting its heritage. Reference to other documents for background information can be incorporated within the Brief to raise awareness of the issues of its history.

Any development will need to respect the Conservation Appraisal. It may be appropriate to highlight this within the Brief.

the surrounding, restored bridges and locks, rebuilt a toll house and provided interpretation for canalside features, including the creation of a canal heritage centre and record of canalside pubs and cottages. The improvement work is ongoing and future schemes include improvement and restoration of the walls and towpaths, canal clearance as well as promoting events on and using the canal as a venue."

3. Add dates of canals to para 6.2.

4. No change.

5. No change.

6. Include additional wording to para 9.3.3. regarding the need for discussions between interested parties on future ownership and maintenance of open space as part of any proposals.

7. Details of Borough Archaeologist will be added to Council contacts.

8. No change.

9 and 10. Reference will be made in Section 7.1 to the Smethwick Summit, Galton Valley, Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review 2003.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Nature of comment</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
<th>Change Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Residents of Lewisham Road</td>
<td>Traffic using Lewisham Road cause noise and disturbance due to the speed bumps outside numbers 128 and 133 Lewisham Road. This may have resulted in property damage due to vibration. Would like to see the speed bumps removed, but the signs retained to deter motorists from driving through the residential area of Lewisham Road.</td>
<td>The traffic management system referred to is outside of the consideration of this Planning and Design Brief. However, it is hoped that the new highway and junction improvements, proposed for the wider area, will alleviate some of the heavy goods traffic along Lewisham Road which will in turn, lead to less noise and disturbance to existing and future residents. The issue of removal of the speed bumps has been passed to the Highways Section to consider.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>c/o Ron Southam</td>
<td>Providence Church</td>
<td>1. The document makes no reference to the Church which is within the site boundary. 2. The plans within the document show residential at the location of the Church. 3. There are legal issues which need resolving if the Church is to make way for new development.</td>
<td>1. Reference to the church as one of the existing uses on the site was unintentionally omitted. 2. The plans are for diagrammatic illustration only, to show the types of heights of buildings which could be achieved on the road frontages, and does not represent a definite site layout. 3. The purpose of the Brief is to outline the Planning and Design Guidance which should be applied to any future development. Discussions will need to be had when any development comes forward. Legal issues will need to be resolved at that time.</td>
<td>1. Reference to the Church as one of the existing uses within the site, will be included within the Site Description. 2. New plans will be incorporated within the final document. Text will be included to clarify that they are diagrammatic only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>