

Shop fronts and advertisements SPD

Summary of public consultation responses

General support

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
Member of the public Plantagenet Way Ashby de la Zouch	Considered the shop front guidance to be "well crafted" and "well thought through". Considered that the guidance would provide the necessary "strong planning steer on the design of shop fronts". Strongly supported the advertisement guidance.	Noted.
Parish Cllr Steve Palmer Donington le Heath	Generally considered the guidance to be "well written and well detailed". Considered the shop front and advertisement guidance to be "excellent". Strongly supported the advertisement guidance.	Noted.
Member of the public Wood Street Ashby de la Zouch	Considered the shop front guidance to be "clear and explanatory".	Noted.
Kegworth Parish Council	"Wholeheartedly accepted" the proposed guidance. Considered the guidance "extremely beneficial ... as it covers a lot of what they would like to see".	Noted.
Castle Donington Parish Council	Supported the shop front guidance, as it would "strengthen" the relevant Local Plan policy.	Noted.
Measham Parish Council	Supported the shop front guidance "fully".	Noted.

General support (continued)

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
Chairman Ashby Civic Society	Generally considered that the local planning authority "has done a good job here". Considered the shop front guidance to be "excellent and comprehensive". Looked forward to the prompt adoption and "active use" of the SPD. Please note the chairman's detailed advice below.	Noted.
Vice Chairman Ashby Civic Society	Supported the shop front guidance generally, noting the "good content". Please note the vice chairman's detailed advice below.	Noted.

Responses: General

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
Chairman Ashby Civic Society	Asked whether "any points raised in the Ashby neighbourhood plan ... may be relevant".	Accepted. Please refer to additional paragraph 1a and the select bibliography.
Vice Chairman Ashby Civic Society	The society noted the "trend to totally obliterate the shop window with full size ... adverts", which they consider "unacceptable".	Accepted. Please refer to additional paragraph 37a.
Senior Development Control Officer (NWLDC)	<p>Recommended that we should clarify why cancelled planning policies are relevant.</p> <p>Noted the content of paragraph 68 ("It is reasonable to expect that more exacting standards of advertisement control will prevail in conservation areas") and recommended that this should be "phrased more simply".</p> <p>Recommended that paragraph 6 should be amended to read "other [shop fronts] could be improved with just a little effort".</p> <p>Recommended that paragraphs 9ff ("The shop front, piece by piece") "would be better placed on the same page as the [glossary] images above".</p>	<p>Accepted. Paragraph 2 has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>Accepted. The phrase "it is reasonable to expect that" has been omitted.</p> <p>Not accepted. The wording reflects the content of the existing (2007) planning guidance.</p> <p>Not accepted. When the SPD is printed 'double sided' the relevant paragraphs appear alongside the glossary images.</p>

Responses: Inconsistent wording

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
<p>Vice Chairman Ashby Civic Society</p> <p>Senior Development Control Officer (NWLDC)</p>	<p>The society was unsure which elements are “firm policy” and which elements are guidance.</p> <p>Noted that paragraph 47 describes ‘Dutch’ plastic canopies as “not acceptable” while paragraph 48 describes external steel roller shutters as “unlikely to be suitable”. Recommended that these features are “both equally unacceptable”.</p>	<p>Accepted. The draft SPD has been reviewed; as a result the following features “are rarely acceptable”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern materials such as plastics (38); • ‘Dutch’ plastic canopies (47); • External steel roller shutters (48); • Internally illuminated signs (10 and 79); • ‘Swan neck’ lights (79). <p>The following features “should be avoided”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timber pedestals (14); • Timber stall risers (15 and 39); • Standard corporate shop fronts (34).
<p>Ashby Town Council</p>	<p>Recommended that paragraph 79 should be amended as follows:</p> <p>“Internally illuminated fascia boxes or signs are seldom not appropriate in historic contexts.”</p> <p>“For preference ‘swan neck’ lights and other projecting lights should also be avoided in historic contexts.”</p>	<p>Not accepted. The revised SPD describes five features that are “rarely acceptable” but each feature may be acceptable in exception circumstances.</p> <p>Accepted. Paragraph 79 has been amended accordingly.</p>

Responses: Images

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
<p>Member of the public Glebe Road Thringstone</p> <p>Senior Development Control Officer (NWLDC)</p>	<p>Considered the draft guidance “very compact and not very illustrative” compared to the existing guidance, which is “very comprehensive” and contains “good illustrative examples”.</p> <p>Noted that the draft guidance contains “lots of text” and recommended that it “needs more images”.</p>	<p>Accepted. Additional images have been inserted to accompany paragraphs 38ff (“materials and finishes”), 47ff (“ancillary features”) and 69ff (“the importance of signage”). Officers have prepared an annex of <i>traditional shop front details</i> to accompany the SPD.</p>
<p>Senior Development Control Officer (NWLDC)</p>	<p>Noted the “bad example” image that accompanies paragraphs 35ff and recommended that we should “show [a] good example too”.</p> <p>Recommended that paragraphs 38ff (“Materials and finishes”) would be “better if accompanied by images”.</p> <p>Recommended that paragraphs 43ff (“Shop fronts and ‘good architecture’”) would be “better if accompanied by images”.</p> <p>Recommended that paragraphs 69ff (“The importance of signage”) should be accompanied by “images to illustrate these points”.</p>	<p>Not accepted. This section of the SPD contains three paragraphs and an additional image would not be proportionate.</p> <p>Accepted. An image has been inserted alongside paragraphs 40 to 42.</p> <p>Not accepted. These paragraphs are already accompanied by an image.</p> <p>Accepted. An image has been inserted alongside paragraphs 73 to 74.</p>