

Local Development Framework for Bradford

Shopfront Design Guide

Supplementary Planning Document

Supporting Documents

Statement of Consultation

Statement of Sustainability Appraisal

October 2008



City of Bradford MDC

www.bradford.gov.uk

This document is one of a number that make up the Local Development Framework for the Bradford District. If you need the contents of this document to be interpreted or translated into one of the community languages or you require it in Braille, Large Print or on tape, please contact the Local Development Framework Group on (01274) 434050, (01274) 434544 or (01274) 434606.

આ દસ્તાવેજ ઘણાંમાં નો એક છે કે જે બ્રેડફોર્ડ ડિસ્ટ્રિક્ટ નાં સ્થાનિક વિકાસ ની રૂપરેખા બનાવે છે. જો તમને આ દસ્તાવેજનાં લખાણનું પ્રાદેશિક ભાષાઓમાં ભાષંતર કરાવવાની અથવા તેનો અર્થ સમજવાની જરૂર જણાય, અથવા તમને તેની જરૂર બ્રેઇલ, લાર્જ પ્રિન્ટ કે પછી ટેપ ઉપર હોય, તો મહેરબાની કરી લોકલ ડિવેલપમેન્ટ ફ્રેમવર્ક ગ્રુપનો (01274) 434050, (01274) 434544 અથવા (01274) 434606 પર સંપર્ક કરો.

यह दस्तावेज़ उन बहुत से दस्तावेज़ों में से एक है जिनसे मिलकर ब्रैडफोर्ड डिस्ट्रिक्ट का लोकल डिवेलपमेंट फ्रैमवर्क बनता है। यदि आप इस दस्तावेज़ की जानकारी का हिन्दी अनुवाद या इसे ब्रेल, बड़े अक्षरों या टेप पर प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं, तो कृपया लोकल डिवेलपमेंट फ्रैमवर्क ग्रुप से (01274) 434050, (01274) 434544 या (01274) 434606 पर सम्पर्क करें।

બ્રાડફોર્ડ ડિસ્ટ્રિક્ટ (Bradford District) એર લોકાલ ડેવેલોપમેન્ટ ફ્રેમવર્ક (Local Development Framework – સ્થાનીય ઉન્નયન કાર્ઠામો) એર અનેકગુલો કાગજપત્ર વા દલિલપત્રેર એકલિ હલો એઈ તથાપત્રલિ । એઈ તથાપત્રેર વિષયવસ્તુ કમિયુનિલિર લોકલ્દેર કોનો ભાષાય બુલાતે ઠાઈલે અથવા લિલિથિત અનુલાદ ઠાઈલે નલુવલા તા બ્રેઈલે (અક્કલિપિલે), મોલિ ઠરલે કિલ્લા ક્યાસેલે રેકર્ડ કરે ઠાઈલે, અનુલ્લહ કરે લોકાલ ડેવેલોપમેન્ટ ફ્રેમવર્ક ગ્રુપ (Local Development Framework Group)-કે (01274) 434050, (01274) 434544 વા (01274) 434606 નાલ્લારે ફોન કરલ્લ ।

یہ دستاویز بریڈفورڈ ڈسٹرکٹ کے مقامی ترقیاتی لائحہ عمل سے متعلقہ دستاویزات میں سے ایک ہے۔ اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا زبانی یا تحریری ترجمہ کسی بھی کمیونٹی زبان میں درکار ہو یا آپ اسے بریل، لارج پرنٹ یا ٹیپ میں چاہتے ہیں تو براہ مہربانی لوکل ڈیولپمنٹ فریم ورک گروپ سے ٹیلی فون نمبر: 01274 434050, 01274 434544 یا 01274 434606 پر رابطہ کریں۔

CONTENTS	PAGE
1.0 Statement of Consultation	1
2.0 Statement of Sustainability Appraisal	3
Appendices:	
Appendix 1: Notice of Deposit	5
Appendix 2: Summary of Representations to Draft SPD	6
Appendix 3: General comments: changes/amendments	26
Appendix 4: Summary of Representations to Sustainability Appraisal Report	27
Appendix 5: List of Other Consultees	29

1.0 STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

- 1.1 The Shopfront Design Guide SPD sets out the Council's approach to the implementation of Policies D1, D9, D13 together with various Built Heritage policies of the Replacement UDP (2005).
- 1.2 This Statement of Consultation has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, and the summary of representations and the Council's response can be found in Appendix 3.
- 1.3 The draft SPD has been the subject of consultation, the period of which ran from 15 May to 26 June 2007.
- 1.4 In line with the Regulations, and the Statement of Community Involvement (as submitted), the draft SPD and accompanying documents:
- were made available at the Area Planning Offices in Bradford Shipley and Ilkley, and at the Keighley Information Centre;
 - were made available at Central Bradford, Shipley, Bingley and Ilkley libraries (Keighley being closed during the consultation period);
 - were available to download on the Council's website;
 - were posted to fifty-five statutory consultees, and a further 172 individuals/bodies were notified of the consultation period.

The consultation period was advertised in Bradford's local newspaper – Telegraph and Argus on 9 May 2007. The Legal Notice as advertised in the local press can be seen in Appendix 1.

- 1.4 The statutory consultees who received the draft SPD are listed below:

Addingham Parish Council	Cowling Parish Council
Borough of Pendle Council	Craven District Council
Bradleys Both Parish Council	Cullingworth Parish Council
British Telecom	Denholme Town Council
Burley in Wharfedale Parish Council	Denton Parish Council
Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council	Draughton Parish Council
City of Wakefield M D C	Drighlington Parish Council
Clayton Parish Council	English Heritage
Cononley Parish Council	Environment Agency

Farnhill Parish Council	North Yorkshire County Council
Gildersome Parish Council	Otley Town Council
Glusburn Parish Council	Oxenhope Parish Council
Government Office for Yorkshire & The Humber	Sandy Lane Parish Council
Harrogate District Council	Silsden Town Council
Haworth, Cross Roads & Stanbury Parish	Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council
Highways Agency	Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council
Ilkley Parish Council	Telewest Communications
Keighley Town Council	Transco (North of England)
Kirklees Metropolitan Council	Trawden Forest Parish Council
Lancashire County Council	Wadsworth Parish Council
Laneshaw Bridge Parish Council	Weston Parish Council
Leeds City Council	Wilsden Parish Council
Menston Parish Council	Wrose Parish Council
Middleton Parish Council	Yorkshire and Humber Assembly
Natural England	Yorkshire Electricity
Natural England (West Yorkshire Team)	Yorkshire Forward Regional Development Agency
Nesfield with Langbar Parish Council	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
Network Rail	

- 1.6 A full list of all the other consultees can be found in Appendix 5.
- 1.7 A total of thirteen representations were submitted to the Council; these are set out in Appendix 2 along with the Council's response and proposed changes, if appropriate. A number of other changes have also been made for clarity and correction.
- 1.8 There was a predominantly supportive response from the representations made, reflecting the diversity of interests of those responding. Where specific issues were raised, these have been considered and where deemed appropriate the document has been amended to reflect the comments made. Appendix 2 shows in which sections of the amended document the changes can be found.

2.0 Statement of Sustainability Appraisal

Introduction

- 2.1 Article 9 of the European Directive (2001/42/EC), known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) states that on adoption of a plan or programme (in this case a Supplementary Planning Document), a statement should be prepared setting out how environmental considerations have been integrated in to the Plan (the SPD). This is also reflected in the guidance document produced by the ODPM in 2006 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents', and the PPS12 Companion Guide. The statement should also include how the SPD has changed as a result of the appraisal process and the responses to the consultation; or why no changes were made. It should also include information on how the monitoring of the implementation of the document will be carried out.
- 2.2 This report satisfies the requirements of the European Directive and Government legislation and regulations as set out above.

Integration of Environmental Considerations

- 2.3 The Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process, and continual appraisal of the effects of the SPD enables identification of areas where the SPD can be strengthened to ensure it achieves the sustainability objectives.
- 2.4. The Sustainability Appraisal process was undertaken during preparation of the SPD, with only 1 representation received on both the draft SPD and the Sustainability Appraisal, which did not result in any changes to the amended SPD (as adopted).

Consultations

- 2.5 Consultation was carried out on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report in March 2007 with the statutory consultees and other interested parties.
- 2.6 Consultation on the draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal Report was carried out for six weeks between 15th May and 26th June 2007.
- 2.7 Thirteen representations were received on the draft SPD.
- 2.8 All comments have been analysed and the Council has provided a response to each one, as well as indicating any changes to the SPD.

- 2.9 Amendments were made to the SPD in response to comments made, but none were considered so great as to result in the document being reappraised. The principal amendments responded to concerns over accuracy and design aspects of advertisement control.

Selection of the Adopted SPD

- 2.10 During the production of the SPD and Sustainability Appraisal, two options were considered, the first was production of the SPD, and the second was the “business as usual” approach.
- 2.11 If the SPD was not prepared, those involved in the determination of planning applications, would have to rely on the generality of national, regional and local planning policy. The absence of an SPD would adversely affect the implementation of the policies in the Replacement UDP, offer less certainty of stakeholders, and potentially have adverse effects on the sustained protection and enhancement of the natural environment.
- 2.12 Adoption of the SPD would provide further information and guidance to all participants in the development control process and therefore help to implement the two policies of the Replacement UDP.

Monitoring

- 2.13 Monitoring of the implementation of the SPD will be incorporated into the Annual Monitoring Report as part of the Local Development Framework. This Report will give an indication of the performance of the SPD and contains core indicators such as completion of retail developments as an element of Local Services; however there is a need to establish monitoring arrangements for these indicators. It is anticipated that indicators/targets will be identified in the future. Effective monitoring will allow the Council to identify any issues with the SPD and will enable any work to improve the SPD to be carried out.

Conclusion

- 2.14 The Shopfront Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared and has developed simultaneously with the sustainability appraisal of the effects of implementing the SPD. It has been concluded that its implementation will, overall, have a positive impact on achieving the sustainability objectives. Monitoring of the effects of the SPD will highlight any areas where it is felt the SPD is not working properly and is resulting in negative effects, and where review of the document is needed.

CITY OF BRADFORD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COUNCIL**PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004****The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004****NOTICE OF DEPOSIT OF DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT****SHOPFRONT DESIGN GUIDE****LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE BRADFORD DISTRICT**

The City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council have published a draft Supplementary Planning Document called *Shopfront Design Guide* for public comment. The Supplementary Planning Document provides guidance on appropriate design and aesthetic considerations, together with security and advertisement matters in relation to all retail development. The document applies District wide.

Copies of the Draft Supplementary Planning Document are available for inspection at the Council's Planning Offices at:

- Jacobs Well, Manchester Road, Bradford BD1 5RW (Mon-Thurs 9am to 5pm, Fri 9am to 4.30pm)
- Keighley Information Centre, Town Hall, Bow Street, Keighley BD21 3PA (Mon-Thurs 9am to 5pm, Fri 9am to 4.30pm)
- Shipley Town Hall, Kirkgate, Shipley BD18 3EJ (Mon-Thurs 9am to 5pm, Fri 9am to 4.30pm)
- Ilkley Town Hall, Station Road, Ilkley (Mon-Thurs 9am to 12.30pm & 1.30pm to 5.00pm, Fri 9am to 12.30pm & 1.30pm to 4.30pm)

And at the following libraries:

- Bradford Central Library, Princess Way, Bradford BD1 1NN (Mon-Fri 9am to 7.30pm, Sat 9am to 5pm)
- Shipley Library, 2 Wellcroft, Shipley BD18 3QH (Mon-Fri 9am to 7pm, Sat 9am to 5pm)
- Bingley Library, Myrtle Walk, Bingley BD16 1AW (Mon-Fri 9am to 7pm, Sat 9am to 5pm)
- Ilkley Library, Station Road, Ilkley LS29 8HA (Mon-Fri 9am to 7pm, Sat 9am to 5pm)

And on the Council's web site at www.bradford.gov.uk/shopfront

Also available for inspection are the Council's Sustainability Appraisal Report and Consultation Statement.

Any person may make representations about the Supplementary Planning Document. Representations must be made in writing and submitted by either email to:

ldf.consultation@bradford.gov.uk or by letter to Local Development Framework Group, Plans and Performance Service, 8th Floor, Jacobs Well, Manchester Road, Bradford BD1 5RW. The closing date for comments is Tuesday 26 June 2007. Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document.

Dated this 9th day of May 2007

Alan Mainwaring
Strategic Director (Regeneration)
Jacobs Well
Bradford BD1 5RW

APPENDIX 2: SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS TO DRAFT SHOPFRONT DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
1.0 Bingley Civic Trust	1.1	This is a well-produced illustrative guide – wide ranging, yet concise and easy to understand – which we hope will become a welcome and immediately accessible reference for designers at an early stage of design/development control. The principal benefit of the Guide is its illustrative content – “pictures” (and relevant captions) being much more persuasive and memorable than “words”. The Trust is pleased to see that all of the Guide’s illustrations are available on the LPA website, which is likely to prove the most accessible reference for designers and shopfitters etc.	<i>Accepted</i>	No change

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	1.2	<p>in respect of updating the Guide in order to retain its future relevance as a continuing design influence, might it be possible to have:</p> <p>i) the possibility of inserting additional “photos+captions”, appropriately referenced via date of insertion, but without the necessity of having to submit such later insertions through a process of public consultation? (say after page 36 in the printed Guide, and also on the website).</p> <p>ii) incorporating in the above pages photographs which illustrate that all “retail street frontages” (ie, not only retail shopfronts, but also examples of banks/building societies/financial advisers/estate agents/public houses/bistros/restaurants etc) equally have an important visual contribution to make at street level.</p> <p>iii) good examples included of features or details which all property owners located on a retail street might directly and individually be responsible for implementing e.g. canopies, external planters, ATMs, feature lighting, external stalls (flowers and greengroceries), bistro seating etc? (as distinct from communal enhancement projects)</p>	<p><i>Agree. The Guide will be reviewed at regular intervals and changes to images considered at this time. There may be scope to develop an image directory on the website associated with the SPD and this will be investigated.</i></p>	<p>No change at present.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
<p>2.0 Bradford District Chamber of Trade</p>	2.1	<p>We have no objections to the LDF Planning Brief setting out preferred options as outlined in the circulated booklet highlighted under Appendix 1 (page 31) – starting with sub-heading Principle Policies UDP3, and continuing on to Page 33, - sub-heading Policy BH13, as they indeed very eloquently set out what could be achievable in an ideal world.</p> <p>Unfortunately we do not live in an ideal world, and rather than Shopfront “Design”, we feel we will have to acknowledge that we need Shopfront “Security”, which unfortunately is not the same thing, and will inevitably mean that we will have to compromise on preferred design to achieve security.</p>	<p><i>Disagree. The Planning Authority will, when offered the opportunity, always consider all available alternatives to achieve the best solution in terms of appearance and practicality. Both Police and Insurers have acknowledged that shutters invariably perpetuate the problems of crime.</i></p> <p><i>Grant funding is beyond the scope of this Planning Document and would be addressed within local or regional regeneration programmes.</i></p>	<p>No change.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>We do however support attempts to make new build shopfronts totally blend in with their adjacent surroundings, our problems invariably occur when an existing business needs to adapt their premises to take account of a bad crime history, increased security which their insurance company has stipulated, and/or a change to the goods sold to a high risk category from a previously lower, less costly (and therefore less desirable) category. At this point businesses are very much left in limbo as they find themselves in conflict with the local authority as they are prevented from introducing adequate security measures to enable them to continue to trade.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		We are thinking mainly of “shutters” which usually do not fit the criteria of an acceptable design to receive approval from the local authority, and this is where we feel some compromise is necessary and should be achievable. So much so we believe that where a business is applying fro a solid shutter (which is usually non-desirable to the Council) the business should be encouraged to change to a more acceptable design, but the local authority should, <u>in all instances</u> be able to offer a grant facility to pay for the difference between the 2 designs.		
3.0 Bradford Civic Society	3.1	Having read the entire contents of the document may I congratulate you on your efforts. Your quest to ensure that shopfront design standards are upheld and improved throughout the Bradford District is fully supported by the Society.	<i>Noted</i>	No change
4.0 Burley Parish Council	4.1	No comments	<i>Noted</i>	No change

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
5.0 Chris Thomas Ltd. on behalf of the British Sign and Graphics Association	5.1	<p>We must first question the statement in paragraph 1.2 that the SPD will be used to support policies in the LDF. Whilst we accept that the Guide may support saved policies in the UDP, how can it support policies in the LDF which are not yet known? We do not consider that the SPD can support these policies in advance of their formulation and adoption; and that, therefore the Guide would have to undergo further consultation when the LDF policies are set. In the meantime, the SPD can only function as supplementary guidance to the UDP.</p>	<p><i>Noted. The SPD will support saved policies of the UDP which are taken forward to the LDF. New policies within the LDF may be supported by the SPD and appropriate consultation and adaptations will be undertaken when necessary.</i></p>	No change

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.2	<p>Section 5 – signs There is no reference in the SPD to PPG19 which must be the overriding guidance for any advice on advertisements. I would draw your attention to the advice about advertisement control policies and design guidance in paragraph 17 of PPG19 which states:</p> <p>“Design guidance should allow for flexibility in design, avoiding excessive prescription and detail, and concentrating rather on the broad framework within which advertisement proposals will be considered.”</p>	<p><i>Noted. The Council does not consider the SPD to be overtly prescriptive, as PPG19 itself notes an overarching emphasis to contribute positively to the appearance of an attractive and cared-for environment...” All applications will be considered on their own merits, but with the acceptance that amenity includes visual amenity.</i></p>	<p>Amend text adding paragraph referring to PPG19 in introduction to Section 5</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.2 cont	<p>And to the advice on advertisements in Conservation Areas in paragraph 22 of PPG19 which states:</p> <p>“Many conservation areas are thriving commercial centres where the normal range of advertisements on commercial premises is to be expected, provided they do not detract from visual amenity.”</p> <p>Taking the cue from this advice much of the detail in section 5 of the SPD would appear to be excessively detailed and prescriptive and pay scant attention to the advice in PPG19. The blanket restriction on certain types of advertisements in conservation areas and on listed buildings also does not accord with paragraph 9 of PPG19 which states:</p> <p>“...the display of outdoor advertisements can only be controlled in the interests of “amenity” and “public safety”.”</p> <p>As such, while it is reasonable to impose more exacting standards of advertisement control in conservation areas and on listed buildings, it is contended that any advertisement would be acceptable if it was not detrimental to amenity or public safety.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.3	<p>Section 5.1 “What to avoid” – the use of plastic fascia signs in conservation areas or on listed buildings may be appropriate. All will depend on the appearance and character of the shopfront with which the sign will be seen. A plastic sign may be wholly appropriate when seen in conjunction with a modern glazed shopfront and in surroundings where other similar signs set the character of the street.</p>	<i>Noted</i>	<p>Section 5.1 Text amended from “not” to “rarely” appropriate.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.4	<p>“If the premises are not a listed building, then signage can be changed...” the reference to planning permission is incorrect. Advertisements, by themselves, never require a separate grant of planning permission. Provided they are displayed in accordance with the Control of Advertisements Regulations, then they have deemed planning permission through section 222 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. And illumination may be added without “planning permission” (Should read advertisement consent). Certain illuminated signs may be displayed with deemed consent under the Advertisements Regulations. In all, this paragraph may be totally misleading. It is a complex area and it is suggested that the paragraph be deleted and that the advice should be to seek guidance from the Council.</p>	<p><i>Noted. References to planning permission were incorrect.</i></p>	<p>Text amended changing references to planning permission to advertisement consent.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.5	<p>Section 5.2 “Internally illuminated box signs...”</p> <p>Such signs will not always require consent. Provided only the lettering and logo illuminate, they may well be displayed with deemed consent under Class 4B in Schedule 3 of the Regulations (and Class 5 if they are for medical or veterinary purposes). The description of these signs as having a “strident visual impact” implies that all such signs are strident. This is not so. Provided they are carefully designed, sited and illuminated, they are commonly acceptable on most shopfronts within commercial areas. And the advice in paragraph 22 of PPG19 suggests that there should be no such blanket prescription against such signs in conservation areas.</p>	<p><i>Noted but the existing wording is considered appropriate.</i></p>	<p>No change</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.6	<p>As to signs on listed buildings, paragraph 24 of PPG19 states:</p> <p>“Special care is essential to ensure that any advertisement displayed on, or close to a listed building or scheduled monument does not detract from the building’s interest, historical character or structure, and does not spoil or compromise its setting.”</p> <p>Again, this advises that all proposals should be treated on individual merit. For example, where a listed building contains a wholly modern shopfront, then an internally illuminated box sign, carefully designed and located, may be wholly acceptable.</p>	<i>Noted.</i>	No change
	5.7	<p>Section 5.3 “Where evidence exists in the form of brackets...” – why should any “evidence” need to exist? If the sign is acceptable on visual amenity grounds, there need be no historical evidence to justify it.</p>	<i>Noted</i>	Text amended to read “if appropriate in terms of visual amenity”

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.10	<p>Section 5.4 – Projecting internally illuminated signs. Please see the above comments. In accordance with the advice in PPG19, there is no reason why suitably designed and located internally illuminated projecting signs should not be displayed on listed buildings and in conservation areas. All will depend on their relationship with the premises on which they are set and the character and appearance of their surroundings. And whilst they may be suitably located on a pilaster or column, they may equally be suitably located on the fascia panel itself, particularly where there is no pilaster or column or the pilaster is decorated or has a console bracket at fascia level.</p>	<i>Noted</i>	<p>Text amended to read “such signs may conflict with the visual amenity of listed buildings and conservation areas, and frequently do not accord with the special qualities of these assets which heritage policies seek to protect.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.8	<p>“The sign should be of traditional timber...” – there is no reason why the sign should not be of metal (commonly historically used) or plastic. Visually, modern materials can look exactly like painted timber, and they have the added advantage of durability.</p>	<i>Noted</i>	<p>Text amended removing reference to signs being of traditional timber and plastic rarely being acceptable.</p>
	5.9	<p>“Lighting should be by means of a slim strip light” – why should not suitably located spotlights not be similarly acceptable?</p>	<p><i>Disagree – integral strip lighting is invariably a neater solution, but each application will be considered on its merits.</i></p>	<p>No change</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.6	<p>As to signs on listed buildings, paragraph 24 of PPG19 states:</p> <p>“Special care is essential to ensure that any advertisement displayed on, or close to a listed building or scheduled monument does not detract from the building’s interest, historical character or structure, and does not spoil or compromise its setting.”</p> <p>Again, this advises that all proposals should be treated on individual merit. For example, where a listed building contains a wholly modern shopfront, then an internally illuminated box sign, carefully designed and located, may be wholly acceptable.</p>	<i>Noted.</i>	No change
	5.7	<p>Section 5.3 “Where evidence exists in the form of brackets...” – why should any “evidence” need to exist? If the sign is acceptable on visual amenity grounds, there need be no historical evidence to justify it.</p>	<i>Noted</i>	Text amended to read “if appropriate in terms of visual amenity”

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	5.12	<p>Section 8 “illuminated signage requires planning permission” – please see comments above. This is incorrect. Advertisements do not require separate planning permission.</p> <p>“Control of Advertisements Regulations 1992” – with effect from 6 April 2007, the 1992 Regulations were revoked. Reference should be to the 2007 Regulations.</p>	<p><i>Noted. During the period of preparation of the SPD the new regulations came into force.</i></p>	<p>Text amended to remove the reference in bullet point 2 to illuminated signage requiring planning permission, and to recognise the new Regulations.</p>
	5.13	<p>Section 8.2 “internally illuminated signs...will be resisted in conservation areas” – please see above comments. There is no justification for this advice which should be deleted.</p>	<p><i>Disagree. The presumption will be against illuminated box signs in these areas in accordance with Policies BH6 and BH13 of the RUDP.</i></p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>6.0 Craven District Council</p>	6.1	<p>No comments</p>	<p><i>Noted</i></p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>7.0 English Heritage</p>	7.1	<p>We welcome the production of this Supplementary Planning Document which sets out a clear and robust framework for the design of new shopfronts within the District. The Guide fully accords with the Government’s agenda regarding the promotion of good design and the reinforcement of local distinctiveness and should help to deliver the</p>	<p><i>Noted</i></p>	<p>No change</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		Vision and Objectives of the emerging strategy of the Local Development Framework. The guidance will help to safeguard and indeed enhance the character of Bradford's Conservation Areas and historic buildings.		
8.0 Highways Agency for Yorkshire and the Humber	8.1	No comment	<i>Noted</i>	No change
9.0 Ilkley Design Statement Group	9.1	The illustrations – would like the examples to say either whether they are acceptable or not or ask the question, as it is not always clear which they are illustrating.	<i>Noted</i>	Minor changes to captions to improve clarity
	9.2	Introduction – the Group would like to see a further bullet point for ACCESS	<i>Noted – the reference already exists</i>	No change
	9.3	Policy 2d – should state that the fascia should also be divided	<i>Noted – the wording already reflects this.</i>	No change
	9.4	Colour section: a) Heritage area should be defined b) Remove the initial 'Traditional' to cover all shopfronts.	<i>Noted. No change considered necessary.</i>	No change

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	9.5	Illumination of signs: Mention should be made to refuse flashing window signs. (There was a case in Ilkley where a shop had a flashing sign going all day and night).	<i>Disagree – this is outside planning control.</i>	No change
	9.6	Canopies: thinking of Ilkley are there any grants available to help preserve/maintain canopies?	<i>Not within the scope of SPD.</i>	No change
	9.7	Policy 3 uses the word ‘Advertisements’ but it would appear to refer mainly to ‘signage’. Is this the same in planning speak?	<i>Advertisements is the wording used in the Regulations and covers all aspects.</i>	No change
	9.8	Security: Like the suggestion that stallrisers should be strengthened without it being visible.	<i>Noted</i>	No change
	9.9	Shutters: Would like Paragraph 3 to state ‘The Council will not allow’ rather than ‘resist’. Gives more power.	<i>Disagree – each case will be considered on its merits, and resist infers adequate weight to intent.</i>	No change
	9.10	Mesh grilles should not usually be acceptable if they are the ones that look like bedsteads. This needs clarifying.	<i>Noted – current wording considered appropriate.</i>	No change
	9.11	First line of External shutters – ‘type’ omitted after polycarbonate?	<i>Noted – error rectified</i>	Text amended to correct grammar.
	9.12	External Roller Shutters para(e). Reaction to this is that Ilkley is not a high risk area. Does this need specifying anywhere?	<i>Noted. The document is not specifically aimed at one location, and definition is not appropriate within the SPD.</i>	No change

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	9.13	Policy 5 – delete. Policy 4 should apply to all shopfronts.	<i>Disagree – circumstances and location may dictate that external shutters are acceptable in some cases.</i>	No change
10.0 Lancashire County Council	10.1	No comments	<i>Noted</i>	No change
11.0 The Theatres Trust	11.1	No comments	<i>Noted</i>	No change
12.0 Yorkshire Forward	12.1	The Agency broadly supports the 6 Design Principles detailed within the document as retaining and improving traditional shopfronts which will contribute towards improving the image of the District. We specifically welcome Design Principles 1 and 2 which will contribute towards the delivery of the urban renaissance programme supported by Yorkshire Forward. Objective 6b (i) of the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) seeks to deliver 'high quality integrated renaissance programmes in all of our major cities and towns', and enable Bradford to 'keep its best landmark buildings and bring them to the fore' (RES paragraph 3.137). Yorkshire Forward supports the focus upon	<i>Noted</i>	No change

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		improving security and reducing crime against retailers. This complements Objective 1c (iv) of the RES which seeks 'to tackle crime against business, especially in areas with a deficit of businesses'.		
13.0 Yorkshire & Humber Assembly	13.1	No comments	<i>Noted</i>	No change

**APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES/AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT SHOPFRONT DESIGN GUIDE
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

Shopfront Design Guide SPD Document	Proposed Changes to Shopfront Design Guide SPD	Reason for Proposed Change	Outcome
All Documents	Correction of spelling / grammatical errors	For accuracy of text.	Various minor changes to spelling and grammar throughout document.

**APPENDIX 4: SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS TO SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT FOR THE
SHOPFRONT DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Sustainability Appraisal Report		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
1.0 Bingley Civic Trust	1.1	This appears to be comprehensive in terms of planning policy, and there is little of material consequence that the Trust feels able to add.	<i>Noted.</i>	No change
2.0 English Heritage	2.1	<p>As you will be aware, we considered that the Scoping Report identified the main issues insofar as the historic environment is concerned and felt that it set out the basis for the development of an appropriate framework for assessing the impact which the SPD might have upon these assets. We considered that the Scoping Report had correctly documented the relevant policies, plans and programmes which are likely to be of relevance to the particular SPD that is being developed.</p> <p>Given the nature of the SPD being assessed, we would broadly concur with the conclusions regarding the likely effects which the implementation of the Policies in this document would be likely to have on the historic environment.</p>	<i>Noted.</i>	No change

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Sustainability Appraisal Report		Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
3.0 Yorkshire Forward	3.1	<p>It is important that the appraisal process is balanced and takes appropriate account of environmental, economic and social objectives. Therefore, it may be helpful if the Local Authority were to increase the number of Economic Objectives to recognise the aims and objectives of the Sub Regional Investment Plan., which seeks to 'Develop skills to create wealth and better employment opportunities. Improve knowledge creation in public, private and vol/com sectors. Promote innovation in manufacturing and service sectors. Promote e-commerce, new technology, financial services, cultural industries, and revitalise established employment base.</p>	<i>Noted</i>	No change

APPENDIX 5: LIST OF OTHER CONSULTEES

Bradford Councillors	Eric Barraclough
Bradford MP's and MEP's	Eric Breare Design Associates
	F & W Drawing Services
A A Planning Services	Future Energy Yorkshire
A Khawaja Architectural Services Ltd	Garbe Real Estate Ltd
Allison & MacRae	George Wimpey Northern Yorkshire Ltd
Ancient Monuments Society	Goldfinch Estates Ltd
Baildon Community Link	G R Morris Town Planning Consultant
Barton Willmore Planning	Halliday Clark
Beckwith Design Associates	How Planning
Ben Bailey Homes	Indigo Planning
Ben Rhydding Action Group/Save Us Pub	Indigo Planning Ltd
Bingley Civic Trust	Inland Waterways Association
Bradford Community Housing Trust	J C Redmile
Bradford District Chamber of Trade	J O Steel Consulting
Bradford Retail Action Group	J R Wharton Architect
Brewster Bye Architects	Land & Development Practice
British Wind Energy Association	Leith Planning Ltd
Burnett Planning & Development	Littman Robeson
Calder Architectural Services Ltd	Mr T Bendrien
Campaign For Real Ale	Mrs B Smith
Carter Jonas	North Country Homes Group Ltd
CB Richard Ellis Ltd	Npower Renewables
Chris Thomas Ltd	Nuttall Yarwood & Partners
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment	P M Coote
Council for British Archaeology	Peacock and Smith
Countryside Properties (Northern) Ltd	Penny Trepka
Dacre Son & Hartley Ilkley	Planning Potential
Dacre Son & Hartley Leeds	Planning Prospects Ltd
Depol Associates	Plot of Gold Ltd
DevPlan UK	Reverend John Nowell
Dialogue Communicating Planning	Reverend Sarah Groves
DPDS Consulting Group	Robinson Architects
Eddisons	RPS
	Sanderson & Weatherall

Society for the Protection of Ancient
Buildings
St Aidan's Presbytery
The Abbeyfield Society
The Co-operative Group Ltd
The Emerson Group
The Garden History Society
The Georgian Group
The Theatres Trust
The Twentieth Century Society
The Victorian Society
VJ Associates
Vincent and Gorbing Ltd
Walton & Co
West Yorkshire Police Architectural Liaison
Officer
Woodhall Planning & Conservation

Produced by the
City of Bradford Metropolitan
District Council

Local Development
Framework Group

October 2008

