

## The Birmingham Healthy City Planning Toolkit

### Public Consultation Feedback Summary October 2021

#### Overall

- Most responders strongly agree with the principle of having such a toolkit
- Most responders agree that all the indicators should be in the toolkit
- This is a timely and thoroughly considered proposal that has allowed the community to bring ideas forward and contribute on how planning can and should impact health positively

#### Concerns

- The non-binding status of the toolkit makes it not compulsory for planners to consider or implement
- The toolkit needs to be clearer, more specific and measurable on what exactly developers need to do
- Where will the cost and funding for this come from?
- Will it apply to every area or ward in the city?
- There is no reference to compliance to BS kitemark scheme, FENSA schemes etc

#### Areas of improvement

- Adopt it as planning policy
- Make it compliant with Environmental Protection Act
- Develop it into the Healthy Planning SPD, using existing BDP policy – TP37
- Add into city's validation criteria checklist for major planning applications

#### Possible Indicators to add

- Age friendly - support for elderly/vulnerable
- Stalled traffic affecting health
- Impacts of the effect of Air traffic across the city
- Development actively supports healthy activities, e.g. stairs inside the developments
- Change indicator 11: 'Climate Change' be changed to 'Climate Change and Resilience' – to capture extreme weather events
- In Indicator 5: Accessibility and Active Travel, change 'People with Disabilities to 'Disabled People'. Change the overview wording to 'Prioritisation of active and sustainable over car usage is critical for delivering sustainable communities, improving public health and achieving carbon net zero targets'
- Houses to be accessible to quality schools, public transport, health facilities, close to adequate healthy green spaces
- Include traffic management and speed reduction measures
- Mental Health considerations
- Intergenerational Living
- Healthy Ecosystems

## Public Consultation Feedback

### Full Report

#### General feedback

42.86% of people strongly agree with the principle of having such a toolkit

14.29% of people agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

4.76% strongly disagree

28.57% not answered

#### Why some agree

- The Planning Committee of Birmingham Civic Society consider this a timely and thoroughly considered proposal. We have found in assessing applications that many fail because of a lack of consideration of aspects of design within the Toolkit and having the facilities to assess design in this respect, and better still enforce better design, is very welcome. BCC are to be congratulated for such a thorough document at consultation stage.
- This is a positive initiative towards integrating health in planning but given the non-binding status of the toolkit effective implementation will be critical.
- BMHT (Housing Development) would like to be further consulted and talked to about the consultation some more, to talk through the issues raised in the toolkit.
- Sport England are also aware that the Leisure and Sport Service are shortly commissioning a new Sport and Physical Activity Strategy for the City. There is a significant opportunity here for Public Health to link this toolkit with the forthcoming strategy to promote a more co-ordinated approach to the benefits of sport and physical activity on physical and mental health and well-being within the City's communities.
- Healthy city is good if it is inclusive of areas of deprivation, it seems these areas are ignored continually.
- These proposals have been 10 years in the development and it is good to see them becoming more formally adopted and integrated into the planning processes.

#### Why some disagree

- It reads well but seems to happen in Certain areas of city whilst other areas are totally ignored.
- There are already numerous toolkits available across the country. We know what makes a healthy environment, and don't need a toolkit to tell us. What we need is to get developers to use the evidence that we've known about for many years, not create more guidance for people to ignore. This will not be a useful document. From experience it's unlikely to be used. You need overarching policy to hang an SPD on first, which should have been done first. Disappointed of Sutton Coldfield.

- The principal is fine. the difficulty stems from the myriad of toolkits and the lack of clarity around weighting, the ability to process and move forward things in appropriate/ effective timescales. We have currently concerns on BMHT about the ability, skills and capacity of public health to interact, and the clashes between political agendas.
- What are you going to do to reduce HMOs built by people purely for profit using retrospective planning approvals, who do not care for neighbours, green space or safety?
- I feel this document is pointless as it will have no influence within the planning system. There will be no requirement for developers to follow any of these principles, so I do not understand why you have put resources into this document.

23.81% strongly agree that the main principle is clear

23.81% agree that the main principle is clear

14.21% don't know if the main principle is clear

4.76% disagree

4.76% strongly disagree

28.57% not answered

#### Improvements to overall toolkit

- Deprived communities should be the focus to level them up with other neighbourhoods, communities in Birmingham are becoming more deprived.
- This needs to be adopted as planning policy for it to be of use in the planning process. Otherwise developers will ignore it.
- Consider how opportunities to improve environment can be grasped.
- Make It compliant with the Environmental Protection Act
- It should include reference to health and inequalities.
- Just work on specificity and measures. Without any targets to reach, it becomes a document easy for planners to write around.
- There are many faces of the principal and costs with each, the decision making is less clear
- In the future we can improve human health by improving disposal waste
- Could this toolkit further be developed further into a Healthy Planning SPD, using the existing BDP policies, particularly TP37, as the hook to the existing Development Plan? The toolkit could also form the basis of a new development plan policy when the Birmingham Development Plan is reviewed to require all major applications to submit a HIA using the toolkit. Is there an opportunity to add this to the City's validation criteria checklist for major planning applications? How does this relate with recent planning consultations for the City's new Design Guide and the Future City Plan? This is not clear from the consultation.
- As set out previously, the lack of any formal planning status for planning decision making will be a major constraint to getting this toolkit used widely for development proposals in the City. Could this be developed further into a Healthy Planning SPD, using the existing BDP policies, particularly TP37, as the hook to the existing Development Plan?
- The toolkit could also form the basis of a new development plan policy when the Birmingham Development Plan is reviewed to require all major applications to submit a HIA using the toolkit.

- Is there an opportunity to add this to the City's validation criteria checklist for major planning applications? How does this relate with recent planning consultations for the City's new Design Guide and the Future City Plan? This is not clear from the consultation.

The toolkit does create opportunities...

- Yes it gives the public a chance to say our bit.
- Yes, protect the environment, maintain the health & wellbeing of those living & working our city
- Opportunity to link into the City's thinking on 20 minute neighbourhoods as set out in the recent Future City Plan consultation.
- It creates opportunities for cross sector working, bridging council silos and delivering action which goes beyond statutory obligations and requirements.
- Better designed developments which result in a higher quality experience for residents, which is not otherwise tested in the planning system.

The toolkit does not create opportunities...

- We need to create opportunities with this toolkit, we can create an opportunity to engage in an open dialogue between developers and communities about issues that have an important impact on health & wellbeing.
- No. In fact I think it will do the opposite because people in public health will be frustrated because the tool doesn't change anything, which in turn will be a barrier to collaboration. I wonder why the planning officers did not highlight this earlier?
- I think it only highlights that it should be considered
- No, without clear direction it could lead to stagnation and an inability to meet expectation

The toolkit creates challenges because...

- In my view you may as well drop this project immediately. There are so many challenges that this tool will bring about. It is not a useful use of your resources and seems to show a disregard for the planning process, lack of communication, or misunderstanding of how the planning process works. It would be far better to wait for the new Birmingham Plan, get a useful policy in there and then hang this as an SPD afterwards. Don't waste your time doing it now.
- It puts the question and guidance only
- The lack of any status when used to determine planning decisions will be a major barrier to facilitating its use. If it is to have no bearing on decision making, it will be difficult to get developers to fully engage in the process of completing the HIA using the toolkit as they won't see the value/benefit of doing this.
- The main concern is the non-binding status of the tool kit regarding planning applications. Therefore robust mechanisms to incentivise implementation will be necessary.
- Many of the considerations are one we have to have in mind when moving forward schemes for housing and one size does not fit all. The time involved and the scale of challenge will add substantially to cost and not assist getting a balanced housing market for all.
- We need to consider the incentive to employ them - can this be a statutory requirement, to what degree is it a factor in approval of a development? Clarity on this is necessary, but also concrete benefits to using it or penalties for not using it.

The toolkit doesn't create challenges because...

- It is only a challenge if an organisation shows bias
- This will depend on the calibre of Public Health advice and political will to support planning officers
- To ensure developers, architects and planners to consider and assess the impact of their new developments have on the health and wellbeing of the population. Provide them with the Healthy City Planning Toolkit such that they support the creation of healthy communities and reduces the environmental impacts across the city.

Indicators or headline areas for consideration that are missing for this list

- Stalled traffic affecting the health of children especially those in pushchairs
- Make Birmingham an age friendly city - Support for elderly/vulnerable
- The impact of the effects of Air Traffic across the city
- I feel there is one element which appears to be missing which would relate to whether any development actively supports healthy activities. Element 5 highlights the need to encourage healthy forms of travel / access 'to' a development however it does not appear to relate to within a development. As an example, we often see shops, offices etc built with prominent lifts / escalators but stairs are discretely designed to be less prominent - as a result people use lifts / escalators rather than stairs. It would be helpful therefore to include an element that recognises that without reducing support for those less able, that developments are designed internally to positively encourage active movement options.
- We recommend that indicator 11 is changed to "Climate Change and Resilience" (to capture extreme weather events)
- Value for money, how do you get the best from schemes and expectation needs to be clear. The longer the process, the greater the intricacy, the greater is the delay and cost
- Mental Health, Intergenerational Living and Healthy Ecosystems (i.e. support for protected / other ecology which can be said to contribute to the environment). On Mental health the RTPi published very good planning guidance:  
<https://www.rtpi.org.uk/practice/2020/october/mental-health-and-town-planning/>

#### Indicator 1 Housing Quality and Design

42.86% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in this toolkit

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

38.10% not answered

#### Why some agree that this indicator should be included in this toolkit

- None stated

#### Why some disagree that this indicator should be included in this toolkit

- Certain urban communities will be overloaded, which will take up green spaces, Erdington a good example sold out part of local park in a deprived area

19.05% strongly agree with the overview that supports this indicator

28.57% agree

0% don't know

0% don't know

0% don't know

52.38% not answered

Why some agree with the overview that supports this indicator

- None stated

Why some disagree with the overview that supports this indicator

- Define sustainable location
- Inter-generational living could be reinforced.

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal meets the national technical standards

19.05% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly agree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

14.29% strongly agree that the proposal promotes good design

33.33% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal includes a range of housing types, sizes and tenures

23.81% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly agree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal contains homes that are highly energy efficient

28.57% agree

0% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% agree that the homes are in a sustainable location

14.29% agree

9.52% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

Why they agree with any of the above points

- I agree with the choices, but it's not specific or measurable enough "good design" "range of housing types" - this can be easily bypassed

Why they disagree with any of the above points

- The proposal on range of housing is flawed unless you can provide some local needs assessment that is not just a description of the current tenures available linked to another measure of household size. This type of analysis is too frail to be used.
- Care needs to be taken on 'good design' as often this becomes very personal around taste.
- There are no references to compliance to BS kitemark scheme , FENSA schemes etc

Things that should be added to this section

- Accessible by public transport at low cost.
- Accessible to quality schools.
- Yes give housing priority to those like myself to be considered as children settle in school not those who lie and get the housing they don't need
- The room sizes have been reducing in new houses over the last 15 years and this has a health impact on the residents
- Adequate healthy green spaces
- The push to number is affecting the balance of the housing market away from Social and affordable elements and needs balancing.

### What is important for us to know with reference to this indicator 1: housing quality and design

- Provide some local needs assessment that is not just a description of the current tenures available linked to another measure of household size. This type of analysis is too frail to be used.
- Use of brown sites
- Reduction of tower blocks
- Convenient access for value based shops
- Suitable for the right size of family right size of housing
- Housing Quality & Design should include solar panel installation to the roof. The installing of heat pump systems to reduce the environmental impacts of gas boilers. There is no reference to material selection. It's vitally important to ensure that materials have fire safety certificate compliance and have the ability to self-extinguish.
- It is good to have housing that is good quality and meets the need of the user. However, care needs to be taken about over - design which adds costs and reduces either S106 contributions or the ability to bring forward viable schemes.
- There needs to be clear discussion about the size of the housing scheme as it is only with larger schemes some of this should apply.
- The need for the installation of defibrillators to the outside wall with easy access to the community will save lives.

### Indicator 2: Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure

33.33% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

14.29% agree

4.78% don't know

4.76% disagree

42.86% not answered

#### Why some agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

- None mentioned

#### Why some disagree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

- It looks good on paper but people living in deprived areas just see it as another written exercise that looks good on paper but in reality is only applied in the more privileged areas of city.
- There needs to be clear discussion about the size of the housing scheme as it is only with larger schemes some of this should apply.

28.57% strongly agree that the overview supports this indicator

14.29% agree

0% don't know



4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

Why some agree that the overview supports this indicator

- None mentioned

Why some disagree that the overview supports this indicator

- There needs to be a clear framework which at this stage isn't the case

28.57% strongly agree that the proposal retains or re-provides existing social infrastructure

19.05% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly agree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal provides for healthcare services

14.29% agree

9.52% don't know

0% strongly agree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

33.33% strongly agree that the proposal enhances accessibility

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal explores opportunities for shared community use

19.05% agree

0% don't know

14.29% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal contributes to meeting primary, secondary and post 18 educational needs

23.81% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why they agree with any of the above points

- None mentioned

Why they disagree/strongly disagree with any of the above points

- Communities that have become deprived because of lack of services, will probably still be ignored.
- The issues of planning and estate of NHS and education facilities are not the responsibility of the developer but evidence of an engagement should be. The NHS and education sector have a history of failing to engage or plan for provision. Both of these sectors are centrally funded.
- Does the proposal assess the demand for healthcare services, - this can only be determined by the health authority not housing professional though I believe that if there is opportunity to assist then this should be looked at.
- Does the proposal explore opportunities for shared community use. There is a risk around funding models and timelines besides time and available revenue.

Things that should be added to this section

- An agreement with NHS, education, and local authority social care planners on needs.
- I do not see the point of including Post-19 education as the catchment areas for this extend far wider than the 'development zones' stated within your introduction.
- Assess isn't enough contribute if impact is negative
- This Indicator should be expanded to more explicitly reference other social infrastructure including facilities for sport and physical activity, since facilities for sport and recreation form an important part of the network of community facilities within local communities.
- Access to retail is an important factor (for example a mini-super market).
- Consideration too of the impact of development on specific communities, for example whether development in the Gay Village is diluting that community or causing the loss of amenities.

What is important for us to know with reference to this indicator 2: access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure

- Health care should be a priority in deprived areas or roadside communities where pollution is harming health dramatically but ignored.
- You state, 'Does the proposal assess the demand for healthcare services and identify requirements and costs using the HUDU model?' - most consultants are unable to use this model due to licensing issues. Can you please confirm if other methods for understanding this data can be used?
- As per response to Q7, that the network of facilities for sport and physical activity is to be protected and enhanced to meet local needs.
- What funding can assist this and what floating support etc is around

Indicator 3 Access to open space and nature, heritage and culture

42.86% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

9.52% agree

0% don't know

14.29% disagree

0% Strongly disagree

33% not answered

Why some agree

- None mentioned

Why some disagree

- Living in an area that exceeds both noise and pollution levels, all that has been done is to increase these levels, remove trees and allow HGV into residential roads near schools
- This clashes or overlaps with other policy e.g. Future Parks and either needs inclusion while removing the duplication or needs leaving out from the process

19.05% strongly agree that the overview supports this indicator

19.05% agree

9.52% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

Why some agree that the overview supports this indicator

- None mentioned

Why some disagree that the overview supports this indicator

- Break it into wards and a clear picture emerges.
- This is an issue for the whole document but it just isn't specific or measurable enough. For example, "In areas of deficiency, does the proposal provide new open or natural space, or improve access (by foot, bicycle and public transport) to existing spaces?" someone could provide a foot of new open space or trim a bush on a cycle path and claim to improve access.
- It's not clear whether wildflower planting, tree preservation or planting is included in the open green spaces
- There is no reference to what facilities are being provided for adults and children e.g MUGA, or seating or picnic area. Secondly there is no mention of environmental facilities e.g ponds or flower meadows or woods or coppice etc. thirdly drainage to stop flooding and be nature friendly
- See answer to 2. The disagreement is not in the principal but the way often this is adopted or measured. Sport England and the City do not agree on the investment strategy and Planning will not at present stand up to the former, who they treat s a stat. objector even when technically not the case.

33.33% strongly agree that the proposal protects existing open and natural spaces

19.05% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

28.57% strongly agree that the proposal improves the provision, quality and access to green infrastructure

28.57% agree

0% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

28.57% strongly agree that in areas of deficiency, the proposal provides new open or natural space

19.05% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% Strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

33.33% strongly agree that the proposal provides safe, walkable links between open and natural spaces

19.05% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

38.10% strongly agree that the existing and new open and natural spaces, etc, safe and accessible for all

9.52% agree

9.52% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal set out how new open space and assets will be managed

19.05% agree

9.52% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% Strongly agree that the proposal connects people with nature

14.29% agree

9.52% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

Why they disagree/strongly disagree with any of the above points

- Consider places like Digbeth. They are areas of deficiency, yet it is very difficult for viability to suddenly give large pockets of open space. Furthermore, the canal is not counted as 'open space', however this is a big asset. Also very frustrating that the open space studies by BCC are VERY outdated, so the ability to know if an area is deficient is difficult. Also need to consider when applications are in outline, they won't have ideas on who will be managing the spaces yet. There needs to be consideration for the phase of the development.
- connect people with nature is spin... if you can walk through a wood it doesn't mean people will "connect".. whatever that is.. every site must be designed with by what local people would like then they will connect. No local people survey no permission!
- It is hard to argue v the principal, it is the mechanics that are the worry

#### Things that should be added to this section

- Consultation with residents, destroyed many open spaces, trees and left certain areas devoid of nature
- Access to more council information on the current open spaces in BCC.
- We need to plant more trees / foliage as part of any new proposal
- Money...how's it going to be built and to what standard? Access could be an ash path or tarmac or gravel 1 foot wide or 2 meters wide. For the football pitch, how often will it get mown. How does this fit BCC parks strategy?
- The indicator should be expanded to more explicitly reference the role of facilities for formal and informal sport and physical activity, both indoor (sports halls, swimming pools, community centres, gyms etc) and outdoor (playing fields and other outdoor sports facilities on land and water) for a broad range of activities from informal recreation to competitive play.
- Stop counting everything as POS when often it is poorly used, redundant or looking to replace like for like
- Features which improve biodiversity. Consideration of permeability - often in urban design this is at odds with Secured by Design but permeability is important to high quality living.

#### Things we should know with reference to Indicator 3: access to open space and nature, heritage and culture

- Equality
- Ensure adequate provision of children's play areas.
- BCC has a reputation for ripping down heritage...now you want others to save it. how will you look after it once they have saved it? Local people must be involved. Access for all to all nature is not always what is needed sometimes nature should be undisturbed.
- As Q7, to reference the need to protect and enhance informal and formal facilities for sport and physical activity.
- Care needs to be taken this does not become the defence for Nimbyism and protectionism
- This indicator clashes or overlaps with other policy e.g. Future Parks and either needs inclusion while removing the duplication or needs leaving out from the process

#### Indicator 4: Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity

42.86% strongly agree that the indicator should be included in the toolkit

9.52% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly agree

38.10% not answered

#### Why some agree

- None mentioned

#### Why some disagree

- Sadly, Gravelly area, that exceeds pollution levels has had traffic rerouted including emergency services even though the road is classed as a noise mapping road. The whole community has suffered from illegal businesses that has had an environmental impact on whole community.
- While the principal is good, the detail you are asking for comes at planning stage but also beyond with traffic plans, detailed design etc and therefore may not be possible unless more work is done pre-planning but that can heighten risk, increase costs and if something happens post planning lead to cost over-runs and delays potentially.

23.81% strongly agree with the overview that supports this toolkit

14.29% agree

4.78% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

#### Why some agree

- None mentioned

#### Why some disagree

- Transparency and community involvement NIL, which has resulted in a dangerous community. Why would you turn a community that suffers with pollution illnesses into a industrialised area. So the above seems a bit hypocritical.
- Again, needs more specificity and measures - e.g. for noise, time limits, decibel measures, 25% reduction on average noise pollution, etc. Without any measures, someone could tick all the measures but not have anything specific to hold them accountable.
- We agree with the overall sentiment of this indicator but want to introduce the issue of personal exposure to air quality as a significant risk not picked up in the overview. Good design and the separation of land uses can lessen the impact of air quality. The indicator requires consideration for geographical and demographic context (e.g. level of deprivation, existing health inequity). Reference: Ferranti, E.J.S., MacKenzie, A.R., Levine, J.G., Ashworth K., and Hewitt C.N. 2019. First Steps in Urban Air Quality. Second Edition. A Trees and Design Action Group (TDAG) Guidance Document. UK: London. Available from: <http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/3069/>. Trees and Design Action Group:www.tdag.org.uk

- Not with the overview, but mechanics, priorities are lacking

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal minimises construction impacts

23.81% agree

9.52% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal minimises air pollution

14.29% agree

4.52% don't know

4.76 % disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal minimises noise pollution

14.29% agree

9.52% don't know

0 % disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal considers how green infrastructure could assist

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why you responded disagree or strongly disagree to the any of the above points



- We recommend that the air pollution assessment criteria be split into a. emissions reduction and b. exposure reduction given that these have different respective metrics and outcomes.
- In order to improve air quality there is a serious omission with no reference to the national clean air strategy (DEFRA 2019) including the population-based targets for PM2.5 exposure reduction. Furthermore, there is no consideration for existing compliance with health based ambient air quality guidelines (currently under WHO review).
- There is also no consideration of future changes to air quality driven by the development.
- The role of green infrastructure (GI) needs to be more clearly articulated and an assessment of potential benefits carried out. References: DEFRA, 2019. Clean air strategy 2019. DEFRA, London. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/clean-air-strategy-2019>. Ferranti, E.J.S., MacKenzie, A.R., Levine, J.G., Ashworth K., and Hewitt C.N. 2019. First Steps in Urban Air Quality. Second Edition. A Trees and Design Action Group (TDAG) Guidance Document. UK: London. Available from: <http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/3069/>. Greater London Authority 2019. Using green infrastructure to protect people from air pollution. Greater London Authority, London. Available from: <https://www.london.gov.uk/WHAT-WE-DO/environment/environment-publications/using-green-infrastructure-protect-people-air-pollution>
- This is very unclear, and the answer could be across all the points on all the above. What is the baseline? There are no perimeters so because of this while I support the principal I probably disagree on the inclusion.

#### What else would you like to see added to this section

- Neighbours and children suffer pollution health issues as the air quality get worse long term residents suffering breathing and sleeping difficulties. There is also lots of dust in the area that covers you when waiting at bus stops.
- The health Impacts of Air and Noise Pollution across the city
- We recommend that this is more robustly worded. For example, an assessment criterion could be "will the proposal contribute to an exceedance of WHO limits?" if so, there must be robust consideration of health impacts and relevant evidence-based mitigation measures.
- Is accommodation flexible to meet changing need and technology
- Does the development have sufficient acoustic insulation to protect residents from existing uses which they might consider a nuisance, such as night clubs?

#### Anything important for us know with reference to indicator 4: Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity

- Since industrialisation of gravelly, pedestrians have become third class citizens as HGV invade neighbourhood. When catching buses, you are forced into the road as cars park outside business and leave limited footpath space. In addition, planning has not accessed the impact on community. In addition, the businesses that are allowed to operate illegally next to residential properties are a fire risk.
- That all construction programmes, shall comply with the Environmental Protection Act & the Noise Act.
- More streets close to motorised traffic are designed with flower planters in mind to begin with trial e.g. as in kings' heath trial
- We recommend additional consideration is given to the impact of air quality for mental health and cognitive development especially for vulnerable groups. Reference: Royal College

of Physicians. Every breath we take: the lifelong impact of air pollution. Report of a working party. London: RCP, 2016.

- Would suggest liaising with Environmental protection regarding siting of developments in terms of exposure to air pollution and canyon effects of building design in terms of location and surrounding buildings.
- Wondering whether construction/delivery should be an entirely separate indicator? Particularly for large developments there are numerous health impacts at construction phase whether air quality, noise, or transport disruption/ loss of cycling and walking routes etc... ideally this should tie in with comms plans to ensure public awareness of major impacts (particularly transport ones).

#### Indicator 5: Accessibility and Active Travel

42.86% strongly agree that this indicator should be in the toolkit

14.29% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

38.10% not answered

#### Why some agree

- None mentioned

#### Why some disagree

- Because walking in a community that is polluted, cars given priority and speed of vehicles is dangerous. Street clutter flooded and damaged footpaths filth noise and dirt is the reality

23.81% strongly agree that this overview supports this indicator

19.05% agree

0% don't know

14.29% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

#### Why some disagree that this overview supports this indicator

- I can tick the boxes below to indicate what would be good for this area, but being deprived, it seems like a tick box exercise where this will be applied will be in the areas that are already quite safe. The accidents and speed of vehicles does not make this a safe area to walk.
- The wording could be improved:- 'Disabled people' (with a capital 'D') rather than 'people with disabilities'. and 'providing opportunities for walking, cycling, and wheeling' (using a wheelchair, scooting etc)
- The wording of this indicator requires modification –facilitating active travel is an absolute necessity. It is essential for achieving carbon zero targets and for tackling the physical inactivity crisis; this is not reflected in the overview which suggests a focus upon convenience. We suggest changing the overview wording to 'Prioritisation of active and

sustainable over car usage is critical for delivering sustainable communities, improving public health and achieving carbon net zero targets'. Active travel is also a key mechanism for addressing health inequalities, recognising that the lowest income households have higher levels of non-car ownership, with 40% of the poorest households having no car access (Government Office for Science, 2019).

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/784685/future\\_of\\_mobility\\_access.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/784685/future_of_mobility_access.pdf)

- I think it is good and important to adhere to the basic principles but do not believe this can be applied to small schemes in its entirety.

38.10% strongly agree that the proposal prioritises and encourages walking

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

14.29% disagree

0% strongly disagree

33.33% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

38.10% strongly agree that the proposal prioritises and encourages cycling

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

33.33% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

38.10% strongly agree that the proposal connects public realms and internal routes to local and strategic cycle and walking networks

14.29% agree

14.29% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

33.33% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

42.86% strongly agree that the proposal includes traffic management and speed reduction measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries

14.29% agree

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

33.33% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

38.10% strongly agree that the proposal well connected to public transport, local services and facilities

19.05% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

33.33% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

38.10% strongly agree that the proposal minimises transport emissions and discourages car use

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly agree

38.10% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

33.33% strongly agree that the proposal provides parking/charging facilities for low emissions

19.05% agree

9.52% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

38.10% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

38.10% strongly agree that the proposal allows people with mobility problems or disabilities to access buildings and places

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

38.10% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why some responded disagree or strongly agree to any of the above points

- Questions re-promoting walking and cycling should include 'enable' - many people would cycle but cannot do so due to inaccessible infrastructure. An additional question on wheeling should also be included.
- The final question on 'people with mobility problems' should be rephrased as 'Does the proposal allow Disabled people or people with mobility impairments to access buildings, public spaces, and places, whether on foot, wheeling, or cycling?' Specifying the varied ways in which a Disabled person may wish to move through a space or into a building highlights the different needs of different Disabled people, and the need to expand accessibility beyond just having a ramp into a building (e.g. smooth pavements for wheeling, clearly delineated road and pavement spaces, sufficient width of cycle lanes and pavements, clearly marked crossings)
- Walking & cycle route often just stop at a busy road. These need to be part of an integrated walking /cycle scheme across the city
- Does the proposal prioritise and encourage walking? – Disagree – the issues for consideration need extending to include surface materials and durability.
- Does the proposal prioritise and encourage cycling? – Disagree – all cycling infrastructure must be accessible and in accordance with LTN 1/20 (DfT, 2020)  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120>
- Does the proposal include traffic management and speed reduction measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries? – Disagree
- 20mph speed limits should be introduced in residential areas (even without traffic calming measures) in accordance with existing public health evidence and NICE Guidance  
<https://evidence.nihr.ac.uk/alert/twenty-mph-speed-zones-reduce-the-danger-to-pedestrians-and-cyclists/>
- Does the proposal allow people with mobility problems or a disability to access buildings and places? – Disagree
- This needs to also consider accessibility to routes between places (e.g., avoidance of barrier construction) in accordance with LTN 1/20
- The proposal does not prioritise or encourage walking because the issues for consideration need extending to include surface materials and durability

What would you like to see added to this section?

- Lower pollution in areas that are really polluted
- Ensure that walking & cycling routes are safely away from vehicle traffic
- The health impact section should also include mental health benefits associated with active travel.
- Does the development provide protection, where there are low levels of parking provision, that prevent residents parking on adjacent streets and reducing provision elsewhere? Where there are low levels of provision of parking on site, this must also be 'tied' to the provision of other amenities. For example, it would seem acceptable to have low parking where there are good amenities, but essential to have a car when amenities are poor.

- The appendix with resources for Accessibility and Active Travel should include the DfT's LTN 1/20. With regard to inclusive cycling, Wheels for Wellbeing's Guide to Inclusive Cycling is freely available online

#### What is important for us to know with reference to indicator 5: Accessibility and Active Travel

- Put pedestrians first in areas like this, plant greenery and stop removing trees in areas of real pollution.
- It is critical that active travel is not an 'add on' or 'nice to have' but is of fundamental importance within the planning proposal. Adherence with current local and national guidance is critical and the broader context of network links should be considered at pre-application stage.
- The proposal does not include traffic management and speed reduction measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries because 20mph speed limits should be introduced in residential areas (even without traffic calming measures) in accordance with existing public health evidence and NICE Guidance
- There would be instances where we would discourage all types of parking, even ULEV charging bays - particularly in the city centre (please see Parking SPD). Electric cars are part of the solution, but must still be seen as creating congestion and particulate issues and reducing active travel.
- Transport impacts should be a key consideration during construction phase (particularly air quality, noise and disruption of active travel routes). Would suggest a separate construction indicator but if not, should be added in here too please.

#### Indicator 6: Crime Reduction and Community Safety

28.57% strongly agree that this indicator should be in the toolkit

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

#### Why some agree

- None mentioned

#### Why some disagree

- The council has allowed the overcapacity of HMOs in many of the diverse areas of this city. This has caused violence fear gangs which has had a major impact on these areas. It has also seen an increase in racial attacks and graffiti which we have never seen in this community but has become a daily occurrence.
- The last point is likely to be the sticking point as most do not want new development in their back yards unless they get a lot with it which means may well be priced out. Consultation needs to be real and focussed not based on unreal expectation

23.81% agree with the overview that supports this indicator

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly agree

61.90% not answered

Why some disagree with the overview supporting this indicator

- None mentioned

28.57% strongly agree that the proposal follows the five underlying principles of crime prevention through environmental design (cpted)

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal incorporates other elements to help design out crime

14.29% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal incorporates design techniques to help people feel secure

14.29% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal includes well designed, multi-use public spaces

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

26.57% strongly agree that the proposal clearly indicate the intended use of any public spaces or buildings

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal creates any areas of ambiguous space where conflicting interests may occur

14.29% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% has or will authentic engagement and consultation been/be carried out with the local community

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

4.76% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

Why did you disagree or strongly disagree with any of the above points?

- There is never any meaningful consultation held with residents in certain areas, there is a great divide.
- There are instances where "designing out crime" in practice results in spaces which are "easy to police" which has a detrimental impact on the quality of living in those spaces. The



Secured by Design guidance sometimes reads as if all citizens are opportunistic criminals, which is not the case. Permeability is beneficial but is often defeated by the desire to "design out crime" which discourages paths accessible by people but not by (police) cars for example. There needs to be some balance with the application of such standards.

What would you like to see added to this section?

- Equality of services across the board
- Does the proposal need to be considered in terms of impact on population: police ratio?
- The use of well-lit area in the design layout and security cameras in less frequented areas

What is important for us to know with reference to indicator 6: Crime reduction and community safety?

- The council have allowed crime to flourish in these areas from drugs to speeding to illegal business and residents have had no say unlike our neighbours who enjoy safer streets
- 'Authentic' community engagement should have further definitions. It should also specify, is this engagement meant to be specific to crime?
- Need to look at schemes against a background of prevailing crime and not creating a prison
- Does the proposal need to be considered in terms of impact on population: police ratio - A well thought out plan for the development and the West Midlands Police Service, should be involved in this programme?
- Perhaps worth mentioning that permeability for walking and cycling is a positive thing, if it is designed in a safe way (wary of discouraging walking routes, alleyways etc on the grounds of crime prevention)

Indicator 7: Access to Healthy Food

28.57% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

42.86% not answered

Why some agree

- None mentioned

Why some disagree

- We had Erdington high street, but the council failed to complete a form correctly, this is now a drug violent and no longer a place where many visit even though it has a lot of natural cultural food shops but area to dangerous
- Impossible to measure in large part, impossible to predict how people will operate
- Assuming supermarkets sell healthy food or there is the ability to hang social partnerships on the back of these is not always born out

19.05% strongly agree with the overview that supports this indicator

19.05% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

Why some disagree with the overview that supports this indicator

- Seems more personal than having a defined and set base. Is this more applicable commercially?

14.29% strongly agree that the proposal facilitates the supply, delivery and self-sufficiency growing of local food

23.81% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

4.76% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

33.33% strongly agree that there is a range of retail uses, including food stores and smaller affordable shops

9.52% agree

9.52% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

28.57% strongly agree that the proposal avoids contributing toward an over-concentration of hot food takeaways

19.05% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal allows for large vehicle access to properties for the purpose of home deliveries and accessibility

19.05% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why have you responded disagree or strongly disagreed to any of the above points?

- The allotment question is very rarely able to be answered with a 'yes'. Unless there are greenfield developments (which are few and far between) it is unreasonable to have this included. Growing local food is important and should be supported, but it is unrealistic for many authorities and is a waste of time including it. The other questions included link back to the same theme of promoting healthy eating and accessibility to this. Within these, applicants can add the details of allotments, rather than have it as a standalone question.

What else would you like to see added to this section?

- Income and education are important

What is important for us to know with reference to indicator 7: Access to healthy food?

- A community needs to feel safe; this is no longer applicable to residents living here

Indicator 8: Access to Work and Training

14.29% strongly agree that this indicator should be in the toolkit

23.81% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

Why some agree

- None mentioned

Why some disagree

- This is an overlap with what we do anyway

14.29% strongly agree with the overview that supports this indicator

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

Why some disagree with the overview that supports this indicator

- Partially, job creation is important and training but the third point I think is less to do with housing than a commercial scheme

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal provides access to local employment, training, etc?

19.05% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

9.52% strongly agree that the proposal link skills development with technology and services

23.81% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

4.76% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

14.29% strongly agree that the proposal includes managed and affordable workspace for local businesses

23.81% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

14.29% strongly agree that the proposal includes access to training, work experience, apprenticeships and jobs for local people

19.05% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why some disagree/strongly disagree with any of the above points

- The developer has no influence on the working opportunities. This is a weak section to enforce and support with evidence of impact in this way, despite the evidence that good work enhances health & wellbeing
- I cannot understand what is meant by 'Does the proposal link skills development with technology and services that will help manage our relationship with the natural environment into the future?' - more guidance on this needs to be given as it is not clear. It also needs to be asked how a development can contribute to this. There is little control over what programmes can be offered in many cases. You will likely get no valuable responses, unless it is relevant to a very targeted development.
- Workspaces is the most contentious point

Is there anything else that should be added to this section?

- None mentioned

Is there anything else that is important for us to know with reference to indicator 8: Access to work and training?

- None mentioned

Indicator 9: Social Cohesion and Lifetime Neighbourhoods

33.33% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

47.62% not answered

Why some agree

- None mentioned

Why some disagree

- Erdington has been damaged beyond repair unless proposals include areas like this as priority.
- Would need to see more about how this will be judged

23.81% strongly agree with the overview that supports this indicator

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

Why some disagree with the overview that supports this indicator

- A proper consultation is needed
- Broadly support but again scheme size is a defining factor as may not be possible to have any worthwhile measurement.

28.57% strongly agree that the design of the public realm maximises opportunities for social interaction

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

28.57% strongly agree that the proposal includes a mix of uses and a range of community facilities

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

28.57% strongly agree that the proposal includes provision of communal areas facilities within multi-dwelling buildings, etc

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that proposal addresses the principles of lifetime neighbourhoods

9.52% agree

9.52% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

52.38% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why some responded disagree or strongly disagree to any of the above points

- Lifetime neighbourhoods presupposes that we know what supports this and that there will not be any socio-economic changes locally or globally that might change this. Therefore, not sure it can be answered honestly and could be removed
- A degree of caution is needed here, and it may not be applicable as the scheme is not of an appropriate size. Needs clarity
- There are different socio-economic changes that take place locally and globally that may affect lifetime neighbourhoods. This makes it hard to agree or disagree that the proposal addresses the principles of lifetime neighbourhoods

Is there anything else that you would like to see added to this section?

- Focus on communities that are so deprived that between neighbourhoods of a few miles one can have lifespan decrease of several years. Council focus seems to be in certain areas whilst other Certain areas have been turned into a dangerous environment
- Development should make sure that all age ranges are catered for especially with layout pavement surfaces

Is there anything important for us to know with reference to indicator 9: Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods?

- Lifetime neighbourhoods are the white areas that have greenery, no pollution, safer streets it's a very divided city of have and have not and the have not areas have become worse
- There should be more definitions, less concentration on water, but more on other utilities
- This indicator should aim to focus and ask questions on deprived communities instead of more developed areas in Birmingham

Indicator 10: Minimising the Use of Resources

23.81% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

14.29% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

#### Why some agree

- None mentioned

#### Why some disagree

- This really seems like questions for the more privileged areas of Birmingham
- However there needs to be a lot more definition, less concentration on water, more on other utilities

19.05% strongly agree with the overview that supports this indicator

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

66.67% not answered

#### Why some disagree with the overview that supports this indicator

- In deprived areas, green spaces no longer exist, in polluted areas trees are removed. it's very hard to comment on proposals when these things that once existed have been destroyed and replaced by damaging industries.

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal makes best use of existing land, green and natural spaces, waterways and natural resources

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

#### No reason for either response was asked to be given

28.57% strongly agree that the proposal encourages recycling, including building materials and food waste

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

#### No reason for either response was asked to be given



19.05% strongly agree that the proposal allows for future waste collection and promote minimalisation on site

14.29% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal incorporates sustainable design and construction techniques

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal makes effective use of water minimalisation techniques

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why some responded disagree/strongly disagree with any of the above points

- Does the proposal make best use of existing land, green and natural spaces, waterways and natural resources? This is contentious and rarely will this be agreed upon, especially as different interests will take diametrically opposed views.

Is there anything else that should be added to this section?

- Ensure as part of the Design and construction that the use of recycling of material has the highest priority

What is important for us to know with reference to indicator 10: minimising the use of resources?

- As we go forward in the short term we are faced with the import of more elements and materials which initially work against the savings. This needs to be considered

#### Indicator 11: Climate Change

23.81% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

#### Why some agree

- None mentioned

#### Why some disagree

- None mentioned

19.05% strongly agree that the overview supports this indicator

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

66.67% not answered

#### Why some disagree that the overview supports this indicator

- None mentioned

21.31% strongly agree that the proposal maximises energy efficiency

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly agree

61.90% not answered

#### No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal incorporates low and zero energy generation

9.52% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal conserves water

4.76% agree

9.52% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal considers the type and sources of the materials used

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

14.29% strongly agree that the proposal is flexible and adaptable to future occupier needs

19.05% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree#

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that where relevant, the development aims to achieve Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method

14.29% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal encourages the use of waste as a resource

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal promotes sustainable transport

4.76% agree

9.52% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal ensures that the buildings and public spaces are designed to respond to winter and summer temperatures

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal maintains or enhances nature conservation

14.29% agree

4.76% don't know

0% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal reduces surface water flood risk through sustainable urban drainage systems

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.981% strongly agree that the proposal takes account of natural features of a site to minimise energy use

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76%

Disagree

0% strongly agree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why some disagree or strongly disagree to any of the above points

- Energy generation, this needs to start at recycling and fabric first. The word maximise has no room with costs. could consider aim to maximise efficiency and potential generation. NB unless storage benefits are substantially less.

Is there anything else that you would like to see added to this section?

- Many in roadside communities have already seen their health damaged, and clearly understand the need to be green
- The addition of Heat pump technology to reduce the use of gas boilers.
- The addition of Triple glazing windows to reduce the energy use in the buildings.

Is there anything else that is important for us to know with reference to indicator 11: climate change?

- The use of resin drive surfaces, which trap the water in the surface, while tarmac surfaces, have 100% water run-off, causing flooding.
- We recommend that indicator 11 is changed to "Climate Change and Resilience" (to capture extreme weather events).

Indicator 12: Digital Technology

19.05% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

Why some agree

- None mentioned

Why some disagree

- Street lighting next to busy road causes light pollution in bedrooms on roads
- Too complicated, presumes to large development and loaded with costs. Who is paying for it?

14.29% strongly agree with the overview that supports this indicator

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

66.67% not answered

Why some disagree with the overview that supports this indicator

- In part, I agree with the competition element but this is loaded with costs that have wider but not necessarily development driven costs

23.81% strongly agree that there is a telecommunication/connectivity plan submitted as part of the proposals

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

14.29% strongly agree that the proposal provides for a digital model or 3D visualisation of the development

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

14.29% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that there is adequate provision of internet and broadband available within the proposal from multiple providers

9.52% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

14.29% strongly agree that the proposal makes provisions for digital assets, enablement and legacy

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal ensures that the build design minimised the barriers to cellular network penetration

9.52% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the technology embedded in this proposal enables users to control their environmental quality

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that there are provisions for free public WiFi in communal areas or in open spaces across the development

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% 0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

Why some responded disagree/strongly disagree to any of the above points

- Free Public WiFi and digital assets fall outside of the developer's control into the future, given that we cannot be certain about the shape of the future of the technology and the space becomes communally owned.
- Not all developments (ie. a development just over the 'major threshold') can feasibly produce 3D models.
- What is meant by digital assets? This makes no sense - more explanation needed.
- Using technology as a tool has some good points but also maintenance is often more complicated and maintenance costly
- 3d models etc, not cheap and unnecessary on smaller developments

Is there anything you would like to see added to this section?

- Care is needed that signals do not affect the young and education needed against overuse

Is there anything important for us to know with reference to this toolkit?

- None mentioned

Indicator 13: Child Friendly Development

23.81% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

Why some agree

- None mentioned

Why some disagree

- NONE of this is applicable as Erdington has become an area with high levels of sickness caused by actions of others and authority. This area is not child friendly as it once was.
- This is indeed an important driver of future health & wellbeing but the evidence base of what makes an impact or what is achievable in planning the built environment, is not yet well developed or robust enough to be able to recognise or measure these proposals. I



would rather not include it to reduce any weakening of what is otherwise an important approach in this toolkit

- The relevance lies also in safety, overlaps with health

19.05% strongly agree with the overview that supports this indicator

9.52% agree

0.00% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

Why some disagree with the overview that supports this toolkit

- The evidence base is not yet strong enough concerning the impact and benefit this approach can have
- Not sure where this fits in prioritisation

23.81% strongly agree that the development promotes the rights of children to gather, play and participate

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

14.29% strongly agree that the development recognises children as a distinct group of inhabitants of the development

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

14.29% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the development focuses on achieving child friendly outcomes

9.52% agree

0% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.91% strongly agree that the proposal enhances links between the development and early years, childcare, play and education

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal provide affordable childcare and training facilities

4.76% agree

0% don't know

19.05% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

Why some responded disagree or strongly disagree

- What about aged care or commercial developments? This isn't entirely relevant
- Also - many developments cannot provide childcare facilities and many would not have enough demand for this anyway. These developments should not be criticized for this. Furthermore, what do you mean in terms of 'training'?
- Messy and divisive, hard to treat separately as an entity and this goes way beyond access and safety. overcomplicated and expensive.

Is there anything you would like to see added to this section?

- I would omit it at present
- More children play areas
- This indicator needs to link to education, sport recreation and supervised activity for its relevance to make sense.
- Could we add a consideration regarding safe and sustainable access to school and green space/leisure facilities - encouraging safe walking and cycling routes and considering proximity? Consideration for children as a particularly vulnerable road-user group (refer to Road Safety Strategy).

Is there anything for us to know with reference to indicator 13: child friendly developments?

- You are focused on development but the chaos in communities needs to be addressed
- Children's play area should be a safe space

#### Indicator 14: Impact Upon Equalities: Protected Characteristics

23.81% strongly agree that this indicator should be included in the toolkit

4.76% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

#### Why some agree

- None mentioned

#### Why some disagree

- Birmingham seems to be a city of inequality and getting worse. Crime ,speeding, violence pollution, noise, drugs, gangs ,inequality of planning process has had a major impact on community, these are seen as priority by many.
- This is a core part of an inequality, impact that is already statutory and difficult enough to enforce. I would rather not include it to reduce any weakening of what an important approach in this toolkit is otherwise.
- There is some merit but not in the form that it is, I think this is additionality if it is better than neutral

14.29% strongly agree with the overview that supports this indicator

9.52% agree

4.76% don't know

9.52% disagree

0% strongly disagree

61.90% not answered

#### Why some disagree that the overview that supports this indicator

- It should explicitly state that local organisations/communities/stakeholders from different protected characteristics should be consulted, and proactive steps to engage them from the first design stages should be taken. Consultations should be fully accessible (e.g. not simply online; compatible with accessibility software; multiple languages; audio; easy read ...)
- There needs to be the consideration of this and no scheme should have a negative impact. But this whole thing depends on harder form and the softer side which is where the difficulty comes in

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal fosters good relations between persons

14.29% agree

0% don't know

4.76% disagree

4.76% strongly agree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

23.81% strongly agree that the proposal contributes to inequalities of access to the development

4.76% agree

9.52% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

No reason for either response was asked to be given

19.05% strongly agree that the proposal advances equality of opportunity between persons

9.52% agree

9.52% don't know

4.76% disagree

0% strongly disagree

57.14% not answered

Why some responded disagree or strongly disagree with any of the above points

- Development needs to level up areas that have been levelled down by authorities
- Suggest that 'contribute to inequalities of access' should be rephrased as 'promote and enable equitable access'.
- There should also be additional questions, asking whether an Equality Impact Assessment has been done, and whether communities with protected characteristics had been consulted and involved in the design/implementation
- Not sure on the last point on how measurable and deliverable. On the first point good design can help, but no one can claim in its own right it can foster good relations as people are all different.

Is there anything else you would like to see added to this section?

- Tackle real air pollution and noise, the biggest environmental dangers to human life. This does not refer to CAZ as there are no main roads running through the city centre, the roads on out skirts are more polluted and exceeds safe levels.
- Lifetime homes, single level access

- Protection for communities which have a protected characteristic, for example considering housing development in the Gay Village, or where there is a particular ethnic group, and ensuring that they are not impacted by development or gentrification.

Is there anything important for us to know with reference to indicator 14: Protected characteristics?

- Look at allocation system and ability to access housing

#### References of those who referenced their points

Government Office for Science, 2019

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/784685/future\\_of\\_mobility\\_access.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/784685/future_of_mobility_access.pdf)

DfT, 2020 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120>

NICE Guidance <https://evidence.nihr.ac.uk/alert/twenty-mph-speed-zones-reduce-the-danger-to-pedestrians-and-cyclists/>

Ferranti, E.J.S., MacKenzie, A.R., Levine, J.G., Ashworth K., and Hewitt C.N. 2019. First Steps in Urban Air Quality. Second Edition. A Trees and Design Action Group (TDAG) Guidance Document. UK: London. Available from: <http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/3069/>. Trees and Design Action Group :www.tdag.org.uk

DEFRA, 2019. Clean air strategy 2019. DEFRA, London. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/clean-air-strategy-2019>.

Ferranti, E.J.S., MacKenzie, A.R., Levine, J.G., Ashworth K., and Hewitt C.N. 2019. First Steps in Urban Air Quality. Second Edition. A Trees and Design Action Group (TDAG) Guidance Document. UK: London. Available from: <http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/3069/>.

Greater London Authority 2019. Using green infrastructure to protect people from air pollution. Greater London Authority, London. Available from: <https://www.london.gov.uk/WHAT-WE-DO/environment/environment-publications/using-green-infrastructure-protect-people-air-pollution>

Royal College of Physicians. Every breath we take: the lifelong impact of air pollution. Report of a working party. London: RCP, 2016.