

| Resident | Comment   | Support Document Y/N  | Support Boundary Y/N | Support Article 4 Direction Y/N | Officer Response  |
|----------|---|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 1        | <p>I refer to your letter of 9<sup>th</sup> august 2021 to Southbourne Close of which I am the owner with my husband as well as being members of the Lakeside Selly Park Management Company.</p> <p>I note the proposed article 4 direction wherein it is proposed, amongst other matters to include Southbourne Close within a revised boundary to the Selly Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>I refer to the consultation document which states</p> <p><b><i>'The conservation area is proposed to be redrawn to be as far as possible consistent with the covenanted area. On these grounds as well as the representative nature of their houses it is suggested that the following areas be included in the Conservation Area</i></b><br/> <b><i>East end of Upland Rd</i></b><br/> <b><i>Eastern side of Bournbrook Rd .....</i></b></p> <p><b><i>In addition there are two private estates of good quality houses in landscaped areas that merit inclusion. Built in the 1980's in what had been the grounds of Highfield House The Stables has 9 houses and Southbourne Close has 12. The residents of Southbourne Close own and manage the</i></b></p> | Y but with amendments | N/objection          | Y/objection                     | <p>Point 1: It is not proposed for Southbourne Close to be included in the new Article 4 Direction. Some permitted development rights have already been removed through a planning condition of the development.</p> <p>Point 2: Text in document amended from 12 to 10 houses and to reflect reason for proposed inclusion.</p> <p>Point 3: It is acknowledged that covenants are not planning matters however part of the reasons for including covenanted areas within the conservation area boundary are to allow for a more cohesive overall management of the conservation area.</p> <p>Point 4: With regard to legislation and Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, whilst it is acknowledged that the houses of Southbourne Close are modern they are</p> |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p><b><i>surrounding lake and woods which are already part of the Conservation Area.'</i></b></p> <p>As a matter of record and from your own plans Southbourne Close contains 10 not 12 houses.</p> <p>Dealing with the proposal itself to amend the boundary, it appears that the proposal itself is based on tidying up the boundary to align land under the Selly Park Covenant. As far as I am aware matters such as covenants of this nature are not a planning matter and I therefore struggle to see how this carries weight without other criteria. The proposal as far as I can see contains no reason within the legislation under s69 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas ) Act 1990. The houses within Southbourne Close are build by Clarke Homes a Midlands builder which was bought by Westbury Homes which in itself was bought by Persimmon Homes in 2006. The houses were built around 1986 and are typical standard house builder, house types which would have been placed in many different locations. They were not ostensibly designed for the location, these house types will have been repeated on Clarke Homes sites throughout the Midlands. The houses have no specific features and again use standard elevational treatments mixed through the development with some render, timber boarding and hanging tiles. The windows are plastic and most properties have had additions to them ranging from single story to two story extensions. The perimeters are secured by a</p> |  |  |  | <p>characteristic of the area in that they are good-sized detached properties of varying forms built in a traditional design of brick and tile with pitched roofs and gables. This central part of Selly Park is an integral part of the area and holds historic interest. The development is set in a landscaped area which includes the historic area of Selly Manor Moat and was formerly part of the historic grounds of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Highfield House (now demolished). There are a number of mature trees within the development, characteristic of the leafy suburban feel of the area. The aspirations of the local community to include Southbourne Close in the conservation area is supported by the LPA and by Historic England whose comments state:</p> <p><i>“There is a clear articulation of how the conservation area evolved through a combination of architectural styles that span a range of periods with a sustained contribution made by open spaces, trees and other vegetation and important views. There is also a succinct and</i></p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>mixture of mainly timber fencing with some brick walls. All the trees within the development are covered under a separate TPO therefore conservation area status will offer no additional protection to these. The development is secured by a gate and offers no access to the public and no opportunity is apparent to view all but a fleeting glance of 2 or 3 properties from the public highway. I therefore so not see how a 1980's standard estate development with no public access and a mixture of standard elevational treatments with various additions can add anything at all to the conservation area. There is no merit to include the Close within the new area.</p> <p>The is a reference to 'good quality housing' what does this mean, surely this statement carries little or no weight in the planning balance of the decision ? Without specific reasons it would be difficult for a decision maker to form a positive view on the proposal. There does not seem to be any planning matters that have been set out in relation to the inclusion of Southbourne Close in the conservation area and I therefore wonder if this would leave the process open to a legal challenge should a decision be made to include it</p> <p>The document to my mind needs to set out the reasons why the areas proposed were not included in the first designation and what has changed from then to now to include them. A conservation area is meant to have definite</p> |  |  |  | <p><i>insightful analysis as to how all of this currently contributes to the areas special interest, character and appearance. The conservation area boundary changes suggested have equally clearly been arrived at after thoughtful analysis."</i></p> <p>Point 5: the reference in the document to "good-quality housing" is descriptive in nature within the context of the appraisal document. Planning decisions affecting properties in conservation areas are based on the legislative requirements of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|

|   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | <p>architectural quality or historic interest to merit designation. The consultation document in no way sets this out or provides even a hint as to which if not both is being proposed to designate Southbourne Close under. The areas of historic interest which were not demolished are the lake and folly which are included already, there is no historic interest in a 1980's estate, to my knowledge no one spectacular has lived here and the architectural quality is well covered above. I therefore object to Southbourne Close being included in the strongest manner and request that these views are taken into account in the decision making process and that at the very least the errors that are apparent in the document are addressed ahead of any decision</p> |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | <p>Thanks for the updated documents, especially the new overview document. Fortunately I have a large screen on my desktop and was able to read the document with the font at a reasonable size. I suspect many people in private homes will not have large screens and will have difficulty viewing a document like this in landscape format on laptops, tablets, and small desktop screens. But having the extra information about what's going on is a real improvement.</p>  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | <p>I refer to your letter dated 9th August 2021 to Southbourne close B29 7LU which me and my wife own. I note the article 4 direction whereby Southbourne close has been included within</p>   |  |  |  | <p>Southbourne Close is not proposed for inclusion in the new Article 4 Direction.</p> |

|   |  |                 |                |              |   |
|---|--|-----------------|----------------|--------------|---|
|   | <p>the revised boundary for the Selly park conservation area.</p> <p>We object to Southbourne close being included in the conservation area, the reasons for this objection include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The houses were built in the 1980's and thus do not represent any historic appearances etc. related to the other older houses in this area. Our houses are classed as modern and have no architectural relevance in comparison to other properties in the area.</li> <li>- The houses are not in view of any public and reside in a privately owned close managed independently by Lakeside Selly Park Management Company.</li> <li>- There is no public access to the Southbourne close and none of the houses are in direct view of any public passers by.</li> </ul> |                 |                |              | <p>The proposed inclusion of Southbourne Close in the conservation area is based on the historic interest of the grounds being the site of Selly Manor Moat and former grounds of Highfield House and landscape features such as mature trees which contribute to the prevailing green and verdant character of the area. Trees, hedges, boundaries and street greenery are important elements of the conservation area, and applies not only in public places, but on private land as well.</p> <p>Historic England are supportive of the proposed boundary amendments, stating in their comments: "<i>The conservation area boundary changes suggested have equally clearly been arrived at after thoughtful analysis</i>".</p> |
| 4 | <p>1. Yes, I approve of all that is mentioned in the Management Plan (CAAMP) &amp; I think it should be submitted as it is &amp; not changed. Obviously, a lot of thought has been put into compiling the Plan. I disagree with the gentleman who thought there should be no mention of highways, roads etc. If it's included you'll be able to take the appropriate action in the future.</p>   | Y/ no objection | Y/no objection | Y/ objection |   |

|   |   |                 |                 |                 |  |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
|   | <p>2. Yes, I agree with the Proposed Boundary amendments. I live in The Stables &amp; feel strongly that the character of the houses in The Stables &amp; the rest of the Conversation Area should maintain their individual character, appropriate for the era in which they were built.</p> <p>3. Yes, I agree with the new Article 4 Direction for the Selly Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>The meeting yesterday at St. Stephen's Church was very helpful &amp; informative. Thank you for all your efforts &amp; I feel reassured that Selly Park will retain its charm &amp; character.</p>                       |                 |                 |                 |  |
| 5 | <p>As the owner/occupier of Oakfield Road Selly Park Birmingham I write to thank you for the opportunity afforded residents by last night's public drop-in event at St. Stephens Church. Those present gave a very clear explanation of the process.</p> <p>I support the views and intentions outlined in The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.</p> <p>I support and indeed welcome the proposed boundary amendments to the designation. I further support the new Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>Thank you for the work you have done, and will continue to do, for the Selly Park Conservation Area.</p> | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection |  |

|   |  |                 |                 |                 |  |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 6 | <p><i>Document</i><br/>Comprehensive and well set out. Some pictures for whole pages were pixellated from being over enlarged. A fair description of the area and why it needs preservation.</p> <p><i>Changes</i><br/>The changes are relatively minor with a recognition of newer, quality developments. There is a sensible realigning of the area with the Selly Park Covenants.</p> <p><i>Future</i><br/>We are still waiting for a parking scheme. An annual inspection on foot by a competent planning officer should quickly notice any inappropriate changes, but enforcement seems to lack consequences.<br/>I am very positive about Selly Park and I expect the area to improve with upgraded frontages, the backing of conservation measures and improved highways.</p> | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection |  |
| 7 | <p>Thank you for your letter of 9<sup>th</sup> August 2021 and the subsequent meeting in Selly Park on the evening of Tuesday Sept 7<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>You asked us three questions. I give my responses below.</p> <p><b>Approval of the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Area Management Plan.</b></p> <p>I approve of this document, subject to any minor corrections of facts or typos that you may have received from others.</p>  | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection |  |

|   |   |                 |                 |                 |  |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
|   | <p><b>Proposed boundary amendments to the designation.</b><br/>I strongly approve of the proposed changes as laid out on Selly Park CAAMP Boundary Plan 1.</p> <p><b>Application of Article 4 Direction.</b><br/>I strongly support the application of Article 4 where possible.</p>  |                 |                 |                 |  |
| 8 | <p>I wish to express my support for the proposed inclusion of part of Bournbrook Road into the Selly Park Conservation Area. I have lived in Bournbrook Road since 1983. I have seen many changes in that time, some of which have been detrimental to the appearance and structure of solid, spacious, family homes built c1931. It would be great to think that at last the road could be afforded some protection from the ravages of deregulated development.</p> <p>Bournbrook is a mixed neighbourhood at the interface between the heavily student populated area of Selly Oak and the existing conservation area of Selly Park. The significant number of HMOs has had an effect on the appearance of many previously attractive family houses and upon the quality of amenities. On a positive note the majority still retain many original features and recently some properties such as 83 and 105 have reverted to family use from multiple occupation. The designation of conservation area could help to further foster the reestablishment of a more balanced community and sustainable neighbourhood.</p> | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection |  |

|    |  |                 |                 |                 |  |
|----|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
|    | <p>The 8 houses 81-85 Bournbrook Rd are unique in that they adjoin a piece of land approximately 1 hectare in area. This is a beautiful and biodiverse area of mixed woodland with a lake. A covenant determines that the 8 households are responsible for the maintenance and stocking of this 'pleasure garden' as it is described in the deeds. I have taken a special interest in this area over the years, carrying out maintenance and observing the wildlife. I have logged 52 species of birds; there is an active badger set and Birmingham University have carried out bat surveys. In 1990 the area was designated a Site of Local Interest to Nature Conservation SLINC. (BM094)</p> <p>I have always been fearful of the overdevelopment of these houses and the potential heavy use of pesticides/herbicides etc and the felling of mature trees which could have a devastating effect upon this established but fragile ecosystem. Being part of a conservation area may attract residents who would be interested in conserving this gem on the edge of the city centre.</p> |                 |                 |                 |  |
| 9  | I would like to register my approval regarding the extension of the conservation area and robust application of article 4.   | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection |  |
| 10 | I write in connection with the proposals set out in the draft CAAMP - New Article 4 Direction for the designation of the Selly Park Conservation Area.   | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection | Y/ no objection |  |

|    |  |             |             |             |   |
|----|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|
|    | <p>As a long-standing resident of Selly Park with a property designated within the conservation area, I am pleased to approve all the recommendations made within the draft CAAMP. I welcome the proposals (long overdue) to ensure the appropriate protection and safeguarding of this area of significant cultural and historic importance.</p> <p>I trust the conditions will be rigorously applied when future planning applications are considered.</p>   |             |             |             |   |
| 11 | <p>It was good to chat to you at the meeting. Please find below my comments on the public consultation questions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAAMP - I DO NOT agree with the document and particularly the statement that multiple occupation conversion often leads to houses in poor repair, taking my recently inherited property specifically (69 Bournbrook Rd) it is currently in very poor repair as a family home as the previous owner lacked funds to maintain it. Recent multiple occupancy homes in the road have been converted to a very high standard and are a credit to the road.</li> <li>• Boundary Amendments - I DO NOT agree with the boundary amendments, particularly for Selly Park West as there are no houses of particular architectural merit.</li> </ul> | N/objection | N/objection | N/objection | <p>Text regarding HMO's amended in document.</p> <p>SPPOA's committee unanimously concluded that, although there was some deterioration in the quality of the Pershore Road end of Upland, Kensington Road and Selly Park Roads, their inclusion in the conservation area would allow the community to monitor and limit further deterioration and, where possible, to press for restoration. The city council are supportive of these aspirations and where planning permission is required have a statutory duty to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> |

|    |   |                |             |                |  |
|----|---|----------------|-------------|----------------|--|
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article 4 - The area is already covered by the city wide article 4 from June 2020 therefore I DO NOT agree that this should be included specifically in the Selly Park Conservation Area as well</li> </ul>  |                |             |                | <p>The city-wide Article 4(1) Direction removes permitted development for HMO conversion and does not relate to other planning matters. The new Article 4(2) Direction for Selly Park would be extended to cover those properties proposed for inclusion in the conservation area on Bournbrook Road only. It is not proposed to include other areas proposed for inclusion in the conservation area in the new article 4 direction at this time.</p>  |
| 12 | <p>I received your letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> August regarding the proposed changes in the conservation area in Selly Park Area. My property is out of the present conservation area, but as per your proposal it will be included therein. I have following concerns related to this proposals:</p> <p>We have noticed that many passer from Selly Park Road walk in to our drive and check our parked cars and other items in the drive with the intention of possible theft. We wish to install gates on both the entries of our drive and metal railing on the wall of the drive. We wish to enclose our drive to stop unauthorised people to enter into our drive without our permission. My concern is will I be allowed to install the gate and the metal railing on the wall after my property is included into conservation area.</p> | Y/no objection | N/objection | Y/no objection | <p>The effect of inclusion of a property in the conservation area will mean that where planning permission is required the local planning authority will require an application to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. This is done on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>SPPOA's committee unanimously concluded that, although there was some deterioration in the quality of the Pershore Road end of Upland, Kensington Road and Selly Park Roads, their inclusion in the conservation area would allow the community to monitor and limit further deterioration</p> |

|  |   |  |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>I purchased this property very recently. This property was in the market for very long period. At the moment all the windows (Front and Back) and the Porch area have very small wooden panels with very thin or no double glazing. This cause very high loss of heating and our energy bills are very high. With the current rising energy bills beyond any proportion we will have to replace our windows and Porch area with new double glazed windows. This will change the front and back appearance of our house. My concern is will I be allowed to do this when my house is included into the conservation area.</p> <p>Other than these issues how my property would be affected when it is included into the conservation area. I would also like to understand what benefit we will have once we are moved into the conservation area. Can I also ask you the reason or need to change the present boundaries of conservation area. How would it benefit the whole area in general? At the moment Selly Park Area is a developing area and is in demand and attracts more and more people to purchase properties in this area because of relatively less restriction. If the conservation boundaries are increased and more restriction are put in to place then it would affect the price of the properties in this area.</p> <p>I would appreciate it if you could consider my apprehensions related to these proposed changes and take a decision which would be</p> |  |  |  | <p>and, where possible, to press for restoration. The city council are supportive of these aspirations and where planning permission is required have a statutory duty to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|

|    |   |                |             |                |  |
|----|---|----------------|-------------|----------------|--|
|    | acceptable to and appreciated by all the residents of the area.   |                |             |                |  |
| 13 | <p>I am writing to say that I do not support the proposed boundary changes to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>I do not consider that the additional areas have sufficient architectural or historic interest to justify their inclusion.</p> <p>The reduction in the consistent quality of the existing Conservation Area is not outweighed by any administrative benefits of this 'tidying up exercise'.</p> | Y/no objection | N/objection | Y/no objection | <p>The areas proposed for inclusion are considered to have a number of characteristics of the conservation area, whether this be through architectural interest of the properties, characteristic boundary treatments or landscape features.</p> <p>SPPOA's committee unanimously concluded that, although there was some deterioration in the quality of the Pershore Road end of Upland, Kensington Road and Selly Park Roads, their inclusion in the conservation area would allow the community to monitor and limit further deterioration and, where possible, to press for restoration. The city council are supportive of these aspirations and where planning permission is required have a statutory duty to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Historic England are supportive of the proposed boundary amendments, stating in their</p> |

|    |  |                |                |                |  |
|----|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
|    |  |                |                |                | comments: <i>"The conservation area boundary changes suggested have equally clearly been arrived at after thoughtful analysis"</i> . |
| 14 | <p>In response to the meeting which your department organised at St Stephens Church earlier this month, I would like to say how informative and helpful it was. It is always good to have the opportunity to meet the human beings who are involved and to be able to ask questions.</p> <p>There were three questions for us in Selly Park to answer, I think.</p> <p>One was about our opinion of the glossy booklet you had produced for us. I found it clear and with some very useful details in general in the end sections. It was only sad that there were not more copies, as many residents would probably not get access to it, especially non-computerised residents. Apparently two of the six copies disappeared during the meeting. Thank you for producing it.</p> <p>The second question was about the changes to the boundary of your plans. In my opinion they make sense. I realise that some properties are perhaps not up to standard in the new bits, but at least the control of being in a conservation area should stop any further deterioration.</p> <p>The third question was about our opinion on Article 4. I support the aims of Article 4 in general. I was surprised to learn that the</p> | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Y/no objection |  |

|    |  |                |                |                |   |
|----|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|---|
|    | <p>roadscape (highway) is not included in the plans because it can have quite a visual influence on an area. There are many cracked paving stones around due to bad parking by lorries etc. I realise this is more of a topic for a ward meeting than a conservation meeting, but if it became part of the whole plan, perhaps (a big perhaps) people might take more care of them. They are in a way part of the heritage of an area.</p> <p>I look forward to the completion of your work on our unique area.</p>  |                |                |                |   |
| 15 | <p>I am generally in favour of the proposal to widen the conservation area envelope but would comment on the inclusion of some dwellings in Upland Road between Pershore Road and Eastern Road. Fairly recent planning permissions have been granted resulting in the loss of spacious plots with space between the houses being lost which is an overriding feature of Selly Park. (Upland Road nos. 10-14)</p> <p>It is an excellent document which contains good guidance and acknowledges the vast amount of work by Selly Park residents who spent a considerable amount of time in its production.</p> | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Y/no objection |   |
| 16 | <p>I assume that you were seeking comments from residents so I would ask you to add these:</p> <p><u>I support</u> the proposed changes to the conservation boundary</p>   | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | The new Article 4 Direction, as consulted on, is proposed for properties on Bournbrook Road only, subject to their inclusion in the conservation area boundary. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>I could not see any changes to the proposed Direction so <u>I am in agreement</u> with that. I think that the draft CAAMP is generally excellent <u>and support it</u>; I am aware that others are providing detailed feedback and I have fed into comments that Richard Batley is sending to you.</p> <p>I have looked with interest at the guidance section. Guidance is helpful and I note that an annual review will take place; however, within the CAAMP is there merit in explicitly encouraging more local vigilance and reporting? If BCC is serious about taking “appropriate action when it is in the public interest to do so” it may be useful to gain the support of the local community by (for example) a dedicated email address for the conservation area enforcement team. Could the CAAMP document be more specific by describing examples of when action might be taken? After all the good effort to produce the proposed CAAMP and changes, it would be disappointing if the local residents were left with the impression that the initiative lacks the drive or “teeth” to make sure guidance to comply becomes action.</p> <p>The CAAMP refers to the non-building aspects of the area, current examples of concern are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Boundary trees and hedgerows.</li><li>b. Driveways and front gardens</li><li>c. Gates and high fences</li></ul> |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Boundary trees and hedges. It is good to note the comment on page 46 that the protection of trees and border hedges is important, my concern is to how this will be done. The commitment to retaining trees and hedges should be emphasised in the clearest possible terms. The Council website sets out requirements within conservation areas for work on trees but there does not appear to be guidance related to hedges and small trees (less than 75mm diameter). If hedges are characteristic to Selly Park where should guidance to protect them be set out?</p> <p>Driveways and front gardens. Page 38 refers to such matters and the pressures arising. Although the proposed Article 4(2) direction refers to hard surfaces does the document set out sufficient guidance as to what is expected and permitted? I think not. In the area there is evidence of:</p> <p>Parking of "transit" style vans on "garden land"<br/>Increased size of driveways etc e.g. 103 Selly Park Road, 54 Selly Wick Road and at St Edwards Church the removal of flower beds to increase the "hard standing" surface. These examples may be reasonable but if they require permission in the conservation area it would be useful to have a section of the document that makes it clear. It appears that applications for planning permission often focus on the building, do not address the surrounding area of land and occupiers make changes without permission.</p> |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Gates and high fences. The document on page 42 and 43 refers to a presumption in favour of retaining traditional boundary treatments and for developments to demonstrate adequate regard for the character of the area. In my view it is characteristic of this area that properties have front gardens with low walls, fences, gates etc. There has been a tendency for high boundary fences/gates to be constructed, some with electrically controlled gates. Such boundaries create barriers within the street scene and for the community and it would be helpful if these were specifically addressed within the document.</p> <p>Points of detail</p> <p>In the boundary description there is reference to a primary school next to St Edward's Church; this is no longer true the old school site is used as a day-care nursery</p> <p>In that same description it says that church and school are "included in the boundary" this phrase is also used earlier in the boundary description. Is it accurate to state that the boundary includes properties? Perhaps simply "included".</p> <p>The properties listed in the schedule relating to the Direction do not appear to include the properties to be added in Kensington Road, Selly Park Rd, Upland Rd nor the dwelling house next to St Edwards Church (93 Raddlebarn Road).</p> |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|    |  |                |   |                |  |
|----|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| 17 | <p>Dear consultation officer,<br/>I was delighted to attend the meeting at St.Stephens, and was reassured by the officers present.<br/>I would like to make some comments about the three items</p> <p>1) The CAAMP is a well-researched and presented document, which includes the history and importance of the area. This is of local significance and should be maintained to reduce the impact of HMO and University housing issues. The parking issues are a problem, however, with the implementation of the clean air zone, increasing parked cars in residential streets. The charging at the Dental Hospital and new Private Hospital, along with issues with reduced spaces at the MAC and parking charges have a serious impact on many patients attending dental appointments. My worry is that patients cannot get to the dental practice, and despite having a cycle rack and limited parking on site - we are having patients late for appointments and stressed especially those wheelchair bound and unsteady elderly people. Some appointments are 2-3 hours long, so future changes to parking cannot impact further on the business.</p> <p>2) The boundary alteration should not affect us as we would have to undergo planning application as per any business premises, and due to the increased demand post COVID-19 we need to be flexible with future plans. I would like a written assurance that the proposed changes would not negatively impact</p> | Y/no objection | Y/no objection subject to no additional planning restrictions | Y/no objection | <p>There is no evidence to suggest that inclusion in the conservation area would negatively impact the value of the premises based on the assumption that planning permission would be less difficult to obtain. As a commercial premises, the Practice does not have the same permitted development rights as residential properties and therefore no additional restrictions would apply. The additional effect of designation would require that any application preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>As a commercial property the Practice does not have permitted developments rights for certain types of development. The requirement for planning permission will not alter through inclusion in the designation and no Article 4 Direction is proposed.</p> |
|----|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

|   |   |                    |                   |                   |   |
|---|---|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
|   | <p>the value of the premises as planning permission would be no less difficult to obtain. If it does, I would vehemently oppose the extension to include the dental practice, as we have undergone so many recent setbacks with the uncertain financial climate, and I would be forced to sell or close the practice, having a negative impact on the dental health of the local population.</p> <p>3) The Article 4 direction only applies to residential buildings and would not have any change if we needed to alter the facade, replace windows etc., it would be useful to have a written response that this would not have any bearing on the commercial property, as I was led to understand</p>    |                    |                   |                   |   |
| 18<br>Selly Park<br>Property<br>Owners<br>Association | <p>I am writing on behalf of the Selly Park Property Owners (SPPOA). The committee met on 27th September and wish to confirm the acceptance of the draft CAAMP document. We consider that it will be a very useful document. The management plan will enable us to uphold and improve the quality of the area, it's identity and heritage as a unique and valued asset within Selly Park.</p> <p>In response to the three questions asked at the public consultation event:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We think the document is well put together and informative, it is a good representation of the area we live in and gives SPPOA a sound baseline to represent the area.</li> </ol> | Y/ no<br>objection | Y/no<br>objection | Y/no<br>objection | <p>The new Article 4 Direction, as consulted on, is proposed to cover the properties on Bournbrook Road, subject to their inclusion in the conservation area boundary. No other additional areas are being proposed for an Article 4 Direction as part of this consultation.</p> <p>Subject to approval of the inclusion of the additional proposed areas within the conservation area boundary, consideration can be given to an Article 4 Direction to cover additional areas. Any such</p> |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>2. We are in agreement with the extension of the conservation area. It makes sense to have the covenanted area coterminous with the conservation area and to bring in the areas outlined in the map.</p> <p>3. In respect of Article 4 we remain unclear on whether the Article 4 direction will be extended to all or only parts of the extended conservation area. We wonder what are the criteria for deciding whether all or part of a conservation area are covered by Article 4 and what are the implications of being covered or not. We agreed to leave this issue for the Council's decision. .At the public meeting Andrew Fuller said that "... none, part or all of a designated conservation area can be covered by an Article 4 direction depending on the degree and quality of surviving fabric"</p> <p>Thank you for your help and support during the process of producing this very impressive document.</p> <p>There are four reasons why it is useful for the covenant and conservation areas to coincide:</p> <p>Although covenants are not referred to by local planning authorities, they are relevant to planning issues such as the use of land only for dwelling houses, the minimum size of plots,</p> |  |  |  | <p>proposal will be consulted on at that time.</p> <p>There are no plans to propose an Article 4 Direction on the properties of The Stables or Southbourne Close. The Stables already has permitted development rights removed for extensions and outbuildings and Southbourne Close for boundary alterations.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>fences, the set-back distance of houses from roads etc</p> <p>Covenants are recognised by the national Lands Tribunal (now known as the Upper Tribunal of the Lands Chamber). SPPOA has successfully appealed to the Tribunal in the past.</p> <p>It is useful for community organizations and residents to consider these two sources of authority (covenant and conservation rules) together in deciding which can best be used for particular purposes. The cross-referencing of these two sources of authority in the same document is useful to residents and perhaps also to the City Council.</p> <p>At present, the covenanted and conservation areas make up a confusing patchwork. For the most part they overlap - in other words they both apply to most of the area. Where this is so they mutually reinforce each other. However, there are some confusing non-overlaps:</p> <p>The whole of Southbourne Close, lake and woods is in the covenanted area but the conservation area only applies to the woodland and not the houses</p> |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|

|                     |   |                |                |                |   |
|---------------------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|---|
|                     | <p>The Pershore Road ends of Upland, Selly Park and Kensington roads are in the covenanted but not the conservation area</p> <p>The Stables are neither covenanted nor conserved.</p> <p>SPPOA's committee unanimously concluded that, although there was some deterioration in the quality of the Pershore Road end of Upland, Kensington and Selly Park Roads, their inclusion in the conservation area would allow the community to monitor and limit further deterioration and, where possible, to press for restoration. This is surely what a conservation area is for.</p> |                |                |                |   |
| 19                  | <p>Many thanks for all your work for our area and for running a drop in consultation evening.</p> <p>We are writing in support of the three proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- for the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan</li> <li>- for the proposed boundary amendments (to include our road and house, in Bournbrook Road)</li> <li>- for Article 4 Direction</li> </ul>   | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Support from residents of Bournbrook Road for inclusion |
| 20 Historic England | <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above draft appraisal. Whilst recognizing that the local planning authority is responsible for conservation area designation you may</p>  | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Y/no objection |   |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>wish to note the following observations.</p> <p>The Appraisal follows a logical format that is fully in line with national guidance. There is a clear articulation of how the conservation area evolved through a combination of architectural styles that span a range of periods with a sustained contribution made by open spaces, trees and other vegetation and important views.</p> <p>There is also a succinct and insightful analysis as to how all of this currently contributes to the areas special interest, character and appearance. The conservation area boundary changes suggested have equally clearly been arrived at after thoughtful analysis.</p> <p>Both positive aspects of the conservation area and a range of actual and potential negative changes to its condition over time are carefully itemized and clear prescriptions for future management are suggested that Historic England supports.</p> <p>In this context the role played by Selly Park Property Owners' Association (SPPOA) is to be thoroughly applauded both as regards the production of the Appraisal and in relation to assisting in the positive management of the conservation area going forwards.</p> |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |   |                           |   |                           |   |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| <p>21<br/>Birmingham<br/>Civic<br/>Society</p> | <p>Many thanks for giving us the opportunity to comment on the draft CAAMP for Selly Park Conservation Area. Our comments as follows;</p> <p>Whilst we understand the term 'Bauhaus architecture' (p.32) has been used as shorthand for the white stucco faced, flat roof modernist buildings, this is a little misleading since they weren't designed by anyone associated with the Bauhaus (to our knowledge). This is clarified a little (p.34) to locate the style of the houses in the wider Bauhaus movement. No. 102 Selly Park Road was by <a href="#">Sjölander da Cruz</a>, not Sjölander de la Cruz (p.24).</p> <p>We query why Seymour Close has been omitted from the red line boundary - this appears to be a thoughtfully designed post-war housing development of blocks in landscaped grounds with mature trees, as good as those built on the Calthorpe estate by John Madin. There is also an interesting modernist bungalow no. 68 on the entrance to the Close, with a split roof form and sympathetic brick work. We would argue for their inclusion since they contribute to the layered architectural character of the area and continue the tradition of architectural innovation seen in the modernist houses of Kensington Road (as well as the cosmopolitan intent of the Isokon project). We feel that if the Stables and Southbourne Road are to be added there is a worthy case for Seymour Close.</p> | <p>Y/no<br/>objection</p> | <p>Y/no<br/>objection but<br/>propose<br/>further areas</p> | <p>y/no<br/>objection</p> | <p>Text amended in document to reflect comments.</p> <p>It is recommended at this time that no further inclusions, beyond those currently recommended, are pursued. Any future reviews of the conservation area can assess further areas for inclusion at that time.</p> <p>The bungalows on Kensington Road are proposed for inclusion within the boundary as per proposed boundary amendments map.</p> <p>The grade II listed properties on Pershore Road are not considered to be reflective of the over-riding character of the conservation area and are afforded protection through their grade II listed status.</p> |
|--|---|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|

|                      |  |                |                |                |  |
|----------------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
|                      | <p>It is interesting to note that Philip Sergeant Florence brought forward plans for an Isokon project on the grounds to his house Highfield (128 Selly Park Road), not built due to the restrictive covenants. Some outline details <a href="#">here</a>. This attention underlines the value of modernist development in the CA.</p> <p>We also query why having identified the architectural merit of the National Welsh Slate Quarry bungalows on Kensington Road, they are excluded. Again, we would argue that they contribute the historical and architectural character of this street, built on only one side. There is also a bungalow of particular architectural merit at no.18 Kensington Road.</p> <p>There are three Grade 2 listed buildings, 663-667 Pershore Road/2 Selly Wick Road, 679-681 Pershore Road and 683-685 Pershore Road directly adjacent to the Conservation Area, has any consideration been given to including these properties in the Conservation Area? These of course already enjoy statutory protection.</p> <p>We hope that the boundary of the conservation area would not limit the possibility of a tram line on Pershore Road if this was ever to be restored.</p> |                |                |                |  |
| 22 Victorian Society | I can confirm that we discussed the Selly Park CAAMP at our casework meeting last week, and that we don't have any specific comments to make, other than to register our support for the proposed boundary changes.  | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Y/no objection |  |

|    |   |                |                |                |   |
|----|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|---|
| 23 | <p>Omission: It was identified during the public consultation meeting on 7 September 2021 that a photograph of St Edwards Catholic Church was omitted from the CAAMP document and it was agreed that this should be included.<br/>Text: to supplement/ replace text on Development history on section 16.</p> <p>“St Edwards Roman Catholic church is located on Raddlebarn Road near the junction of the old roman icknield way at the highest point of Selly Park Conservation area. The building is an imposing early twentieth century Gothic Revival church which is faced in red brick with stone dressings, and the steeply pitched roof is laid with Westmorland slates with coped verges and the glazing is of leaded stained glass.</p> <p>Henry Thomas Sandy of Stafford and G. B. Cox were commissioned to design the building and this was built in three phases by William Bishop of King's Heath with the church and the nave opened on 13 October 1902 by Edward Ilsley, Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham and Samuel Webster Allen, Roman Catholic Bishop of Shrewsbury.<br/>The sanctuary and side chapels were built between 1925 and 1926 according to a George Bernard Cox design, of Harrison and Cox. The builders were John Bowen and Sons of Balsall Heath and the western end of the church was completed in 1936”.</p> | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Y/no objection | Text amended and photograph of St. Edward's now included in the document. |
|    |   |                |                |                |   |

