



*City of*  
**BRADFORD**  
METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Statement of Consultation (including Schedule of Changes)  
Shopfront Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document  
(SPD)

January 2026

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. List of respondents.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Summary of Representations &amp; Schedule of Responses .....</b>	<b>4</b>

This page is left intentionally blank

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Statement of Consultation has been prepared for the draft Shopfront Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 1.2 It is intended that the Shopfront Design Guide will be adopted as an SPD. Its purpose will be to provide the information necessary to enable planning officers and developers to prepare designs and assess and determine planning applications in relation to shopfronts. The SPD is in support of policies in the adopted Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan.
- 1.3 Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) require that before adopting an SPD Local Planning Authorities must allow anyone to make representations on the document for a period of not less than four weeks, and that they must prepare a statement setting out:
  - The people who were consulted.
  - A summary of the main issues raised.
  - How those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.4 The consultation process took place in two stages. The first stage involved early engagement with key stakeholders and groups. The second stage involved a formal four-week consultation period on the draft document. These are detailed below.

---

### Stage 1 – Early Engagement

- 1.5 Early engagement on the new SPD took place over several weeks involving key teams within the Planning Service including Development Management, Enforcement, Local Plan and Conservation. Views were also sought from interested parties including West Yorkshire Police, Bradford Civic Society, Historic England, Elected Members and Bradford Mobility Planning Group.

---

### Stage 2 Formal consultation

- 1.6 The formal four-week consultation period took place between Friday 14<sup>th</sup> November and Friday 12<sup>th</sup> December 2025 and allowed members of the wider public and other organisations to have input into the content of the draft design guide. The following documents were made available for public comment:
  - Shopfront Design Guide – Consultation Draft
  - Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) – Initial Screening Statement
  - Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) – Initial Screening

- Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) – Initial Screening Statement
- 1.7 Electronic versions of the consultation documents were published on the Council's website with a link provided from the homepage. Paper copies were placed in the relevant deposit locations listed below:
- Council offices at Britannia House, Bradford and Keighley Town Hall.
  - Main Council libraries at Bradford Local Studies Library, City Library, Shipley Library, Bingley Library, Keighley Library and Ilkley Library.
- 1.8 The Council's online consultation system (JDi OpusConsult) allowed people to read the document and directly comment against individual elements of the document online.
- 1.9 Notifications of the consultation and details on where to view the document were given in a consultation letter/e-mail, in the Local Plan e-newsletter and on the Council's website. The Council's 'Stay Connected' consultation database was used to send notification of the consultation to those people who have specifically signed up to receive information on the preparation of the Local Plan, including SPDs.
- 1.10 Representations were received during the consultation from a mix of individuals and organisations (a list is provided in Part Two of this document).
- 1.11 The comments received from the public consultation have been incorporated into the document as far as possible. Whilst there have been no significant changes to the content or purpose of the SPD, further detail has been added in relation the technical aspects and the context in which the SPD operates.
- 1.12 A summary of the issues raised, the Council's response to them and the recommended changes is set out in Part Three of this document.

## 2. List of respondents

- 2.1 The table below lists the respondents who commented on the draft SPD along with their own individual reference number. This can be used to cross-reference with the summary of responses and the recommended changes in Part 3.1 below which breaks down the submissions into individual comments.
- 2.2 In addition to these formal representations a number of comments on the draft SPD were received via meetings with key groups and from internal staff. The summary of these comments with recommended changes is provided in Part 3.2.

**Table 2.1: List of respondents**

Respondent ID	Organisation	Name / Position
7711		Nigel Kenyon
1974		Liz Ripard
1509	Canal and River Trust	Simon Tucker
4772	National Highways	Simon Jones Esq.
94	Coal Authority	Melanie Lindsay

7323	Natural England	Sharon Jenkins
1091	Friends of Keighley's Carmegie Library	Jane Lee
7783	West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service	David Williams
7784 / 45	Ilkley Town Council	Sally Emery
7790 / 19	Historic England	Lisa Kinch
1217		Suzanne Hewitson

### 3. Summary of Representations & Schedule of Responses

**Table 3.1: Representations and Responses on the Draft Shopfront Design Guide SPD**

Comment ID	Respondent ID	Comment	Council Response
30548	7711	I was concerned that measures might seek to appeal to "nostalgia" (like the nauseatingly sentimental latest version of "All Creatures Great & Small") turning the area into a third-rate version of Beamish theme park. BUT the guidance includes best examples of modern practice, too, and if fully implemented would prevent the garish plastic fronts that have infected Bradford city centre, so I fully support the plans.	Support noted. The guide very much seeks to encourage high quality, contemporary shopfront design in Bradford City Centre and across the district.  <b>Recommended change:</b> None
30551	1974	The guidelines are fine but it is essential to enforce them. I hope there will be retrospective application of these guidelines. A visit to Keighley, where historic buildings on North Street, and Cavendish Street and in the town centre have been vandalised and clearly infringe these (and probably current) guidelines, should be an early target for implementation.	Alongside the publication of the final guide the Council will consider potential options for working with business owners and other parties to implement the guidelines in key centres and historic areas.  <b>Recommended change:</b> No change proposed to the document.
30554	1509	We have reviewed the document/policies contained within the document and based on the information available we have no comment to make.	Comment noted.  <b>Recommended change:</b> None
30555	4772	I can confirm that the Secretary of State for Transport [SoST] has no formal comments to make in relation to these topic areas	Comment noted.  <b>Recommended change:</b> None
30556	94	It is noted that this consultation relates to a Shopfront Design SPD and I can confirm that the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no comments to make on this.	Comment noted.  <b>Recommended change:</b> None
30560	7323	Whilst we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not	Comment noted.

Comment ID	Respondent ID	Comment	Council Response
		appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment.	<b>Recommended change:</b> None
30568	1091	A very good document but as with most rules they're only of use if they're vigorously Enforced and Keighley is littered with offending and offensive shopfronts in its Conservation Areas and elsewhere, on heritage assets and cherished streetscenes, none of which are pursued or rectification sought. So I suggest that, before accepting the new code Bradford Council should assist Keighley Town Council and their partners, Keighley Civic Society, with the help perhaps of Keighley and District Local History Society to carry out a survey of all existing offending shopfronts and to progress their rectification 'in short order'. Otherwise Keighley Council Tax payers will rightly feel insult is being added to the existing injury to our town's built, historic and cultural heritage .	The support for the document is noted. Alongside the publication of the final guide the Council will consider potential options for working with business owners and other parties to implement the guidelines in key centres and historic areas.  <b>Recommended change:</b> No change proposed to the document.
30581	7783	We welcome the document's strong emphasis on "Quality and Craftsmanship" and the "Retain, Repair, Restore" approach. However, as an archaeological consultee, we note that while the document focuses on the preservation of physical assets, it does not currently address the procedure for mitigation by record when preservation is not possible. Shopfronts are significant social and architectural documents of the District's past; where their loss is accepted, they must be archaeologically recorded.	Support for document's approach is noted. Changes are proposed to the document to reflect the need for archaeological recording of shopfronts where it is not possible to preserve them. See comments 30582 to 30585 below for detailed responses.  <b>Recommended change:</b> See comments 30582 to 30585 below.
30582	7783	<u>Historic Building Recording</u> <b>Section 4.2 (Retain, Repair, Restore) and Design Principle A.</b> The draft states that "Replacement (partial or total) of a historic shopfront will generally only be supported where... demonstrably beyond repair".	Agree that it would be beneficial to add text in support of historic building recording.  <b>Recommended change:</b> Add text to Section 4.2/Design Principle A consistent with that suggested by the respondent.

Comment ID	Respondent ID	Comment	Council Response
		<p>Comment: Where the Council accepts that a shopfront (or element thereof) is beyond repair and grants permission for its removal, the loss of that heritage asset must be mitigated.</p> <p>Recommendation: We would advise adding a clause to Design Principle A and Design Principle B stating: "Where the loss of historic fabric (including joinery, ironwork, tiling, or signage) is justified, the applicant will be required to undertake an appropriately scaled programme of historic building recording (photographic and descriptive) prior to removal. This ensures a permanent record of the asset is preserved in the Historic Environment Record."</p>	
30583	7783	<p><u>Hidden Archaeological Features ("Ghost Signs")</u>  <b>Section 4 (Traditional Shopfronts)</b>  The document correctly notes that "there may be original features hidden beneath modern cladding".</p> <p>Comment: The removal of modern fascias often reveals earlier phases of the building's history, such as "ghost signs" (painted signage on masonry/timber), original lintels, or evidence of former stall riser heights. These are archaeological features that reveal the building's social history.</p> <p>Recommendation: The guidance could explicitly encourage the photographic recording of any such features revealed during the stripping-out works, even if they are to be covered over again by the new proposal.</p>	<p>Agree that it would be beneficial to add text in support of the photographic recording of hidden archaeological features.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Add text to Section 4 consistent with that suggested by the respondent.</p>
30584	7783	<p><b>Design Principles and Planning Requirements Section 10.1 (Listed Building Consent).</b>  The document mentions that proposals must "respect the special architectural or historic significance".</p>	<p>Comment noted.  Not sure if a response is needed.</p>

Comment ID	Respondent ID	Comment	Council Response
		<p>Comment: This section should remind applicants that for Listed Buildings and significant assets in Conservation Areas, a condition of consent may be applied requiring a Level 1 or Level 2 Historic Building Record (in accordance with Historic England guidance) before works commence.</p> <p>Recommendation: Could a reference to the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (HER) as a source of information for applicants to understand the significance of their building before designing their shopfront.</p>	<p><b>Recommended change:</b> Add reference in the section 10 Planning Requirements to the Historic Building Record and the HER.</p>
30585	7783	<p>Advise that the final SPD includes a clear protocol for recording historic fabric that is scheduled for removal and this is clearly detailed in any planning application. This ensures that the District does not lose the evidence of its architectural evolution, even if the physical fabric can no longer be retained.</p>	<p>As above changes are proposed to the document to require historic building recording.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> No further changes.</p>
30586	7784	<p>We welcome the updated document. We look forward to receiving hard copies of the final Shopfront Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and we look forward to its implementation, particularly in local conservation areas. In addition, it would be beneficial and supportive of the guide to see enforcement and adherence of the regulations including those properties that need to be considered retrospectively.</p>	<p>The support for the document is noted. Alongside the publication of the final guide the Council will consider potential options for working with business owners and other parties to implement the guidelines in key centres and historic areas.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> No change to the document.</p>
30615	7790	<p>If shutters have to be external we recommend bar or chain-link ('jewellers') grill shutters. That allows visibility into the shop space. They same style can be used internally to conserve the shopfront appearance, and they can also be used across recessed doorways.</p>	<p>The comments appear consistent and supportive of the approach taken in section 8.3 External Security and provide suggestions of further detail to be included in the guidance which could be useful.</p>

Comment ID	Respondent ID	Comment	Council Response
		<p>The argument for roller shutters often comes down to the expense of insuring large plate-glass windows. We therefore also recommend more traditional patterns of glazing subdivided by mullions/glazing bar and transoms, normally informed by the historic shopfront appearance. Using more robust materials for the glazing bars can provide further protection. That may also enable installation of a raised (solid) stall-riser, providing protection against vehicle impact and ram raiding.</p> <p>If it has to be external, the box/mechanism for the roller shutter/grill should be hidden within the fascia and guide channels on either side of the shopfront painted to match the pilasters.</p>	<p><b>Recommended change:</b> Modifications where necessary to the text in Section 7.1 Windows &amp; Doors and 8.3 External Security to reflect the comments about shutters, sub-dividing glazing, using robust materials and painting the mechanism to match the pilasters.</p>
30616	7790	<p>First impressions are positive and how heritage is addressed, and the use of lots of relevant images with descriptions. Like that it refers to other guidance like the Bradford HAZ.</p>	<p>Support for the document is noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
30617	7790	<p>Add that Listed Building Consent is required at the end of Principle J2/Section 8.3 on external security.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Add reference at the end of Section 8.3 that all external security measures will require planning permission (and Listed Building Consent if the building is listed), even if replacing an existing shutter.</p>
30618	7790	<p>Make clear that illuminated box signs are not acceptable in conservation areas.</p>	<p>Reference is made to this is made in the guide in Section 7.3.1 Illumination.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> No further changes</p>
30619	7790	<p>Add something about maintenance? So that the shopfront doesn't fall apart. The HAZ guide includes some content on this.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Add reference to maintenance in the Traditional Shopfronts section.</p>

Comment ID	Respondent ID	Comment	Council Response
30620	7790	Can the SPD include the need for applicants to appoint heritage accredited consultants?	<p>It's agreed that it would be beneficial for applicants to use consultants with appropriate heritage skills where relevant. Whilst this has been considered for inclusion in the guide it's felt that endorsing certain consultants or requiring applicants to use them would be beyond the remit of the design guide.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> No further changes</p>
30621	7790	Note that all the images are from Bradford which is good in a way – but are we open to including examples from other cities?	<p>A search for further images to use in the document is ongoing and the final version may include examples from other cities.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> As above.</p>
30552	1217	All shop fronts need to be screened for their impact on local communities! In Baildon a fish and chip shop has an awful frontage totally alien to the environment! However a florist on Market Street in Bradford centre is wonderful , use them as advisers.	<p>It's agreed that the florist on Market Street is an excellent example of a shopfront. A photo of it is included on page 3 of the guide to help inform and inspire other shopfront improvements in the district.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> No further changes</p>

**Table 3.2: Additional comments from meetings/workshops with key groups and from internal staff not listed in the formal comments in Table 3.1**

Comment	Council Response
<p>City Centre streets like Ivegate need tidying up. The shopfronts are in a state.</p>	<p>Alongside the publication of the final guide the Council will consider potential options for working with business owners and other parties to implement the guidelines in key centres and historic areas.</p> <p>In addition the Council will be working with shopkeepers and offering grant assistance to secure shopfront improvements in Bradford City Centre including on Ivegate as part of the new Heritage Action Zone programme in partnership with Historic England.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>Need a high standard for the city centre and town centres – but not a one-size fits all approach – outside of centres can take a different approach. Don't apply to all main routes.</p>	<p>The guide aims to avoid a one size fits all approach. Parts (e.g. design principle J2) seek to set high standards for centres whilst allowing potential for different approaches elsewhere subject to certain criteria.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>Planning are too stringent in some areas. Not enough discussion with shopkeepers to find a solution first.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The new guide seeks to encourage early discussion between planners, shopkeepers and other stakeholders like the police to find solutions.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>Internal shutters can be really poor design – e.g. manky bare metal shutters – but they are still policy compliant. They can look worse than external shutters done well.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> add additional text in Section 8.2 Internal Glazing (after the paragraph on listed buildings) saying that the design and colour of grilles should be coordinated with the character of the shopfront.</p>
<p>Agree that visual openness of shutters is good so that you can see what is happening on the inside.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>Concern that shops without external shutters are more prone to vandalism – example of a property on Leeds Road which is all glass and has had vandalism problems.</p>	<p>The new guide seeks to introduce a more responsive approach to external shutters where justified by evidence of crime risk.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>The current policy on roller shutters hasn't worked in areas like Oak Lane and it will just continue to</p>	<p>As above the new guide seeks to introduce a more responsive approach to external shutters where</p>

Comment	Council Response
deteriorate. With a different approach we could soon get a big improvement.	<p>justified by evidence of crime risk, linked to wider enhancements to the shopfront to secure overall improvements to high streets.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
Design Principle I (Glazing/Internal Security) – is it any different to the existing policy? The wording is important – don't use 'must'. 'Encourage' or 'consider' could be ok. (But concern with saying 'should consider' is that planners will just say 'oh well, we've considered it and it's still a no'. Every time.	<p>The preference is that where shutters are required they are fitted internally behind the glazing. In most situations this is likely to be an appropriate solution. The wording of the new guidance is different to the existing in this respect. It says that shopkeepers 'should consider' internal security measures as the first preference, compared to the existing which says they 'must demonstrate' why internal security measures are unsuitable. It's felt that this strikes the right balance.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
Should estate agents/letting agents be engaged? And shutter companies?	<p>Alongside the publication of the final guide the Council will consider potential options for working with business owners and other parties to implement the guidelines, which could include shutter companies.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
Is a different, better image needed showing an open lattice type shutter with small solid section at the bottom?	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> New images/diagrams to be included in the document in support of Section 8.3.</p>
Solid shutters – does it really always need to be a no? Or should it be more about considering the right approach based on the setting and crime evidence? Concern it is too rigid.	<p>Where shutters are required the strong preference is for them to be of visually permeable construction rather than solid or perforated types for the reasons set out in Section 8.3 of the guide.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Potential to slightly amend the wording of Principle J1 to say that solid types of shutter will not normally be supported unless the specific site context and crime evidence indicate otherwise.</p>
Centres (Principle J2) – does this include every local centre? Probably only needs to be city/town centres. Many local centres are covered by conservation areas anyway. Need a list of what centres it applies to.	<p>Comment noted. Page 47 does make reference to it applying to the city centre and town centres but could benefit from being made clearer.</p>

Comment	Council Response
	<p><b>Recommended change:</b> On page 47 amend to say: 'unlikely to be suitable in <b>Bradford</b> city centre, <b>the</b> town centres <b>of Keighley, Ilkley, Bingley and Shipley</b>, and conservation areas and listed buildings.</p> <p>Under Principle J2 (page 49) amend to say 'In <b>the city centre, town</b> centres, conservation areas and listed buildings...'</p>
<p>Crime Impact Statement – will there be a cost to this for business owners? Important we don't make it too strict or onerous, that it's something they can do themselves without having to pay consultants.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> On page 45 add that the requirement for a CIS is not intended to be overly onerous and in most cases it should be something shopkeepers can prepare themselves without seeking specialist expertise.</p>
<p>Principles J1 and J2 –generally support the approach and wording and think it strikes the right balance and the need for flexibility.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>Opening doors can be a problem for people in wheelchairs – they can be too stiff or heavy, making it difficult to coordinate movement. Same for people with pushchairs and the elderly.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The guide aims to ensure this on page 56 stating that: 'Doors should be operable by people with limited strength or mobility. Automatic and power-assisted doorways are preferable. Manual doors should be lightweight and fitted with accessible handles.'</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>Query if the absolute minimum width allowed for doorways of 77.5cm (?) is too narrow. Sometimes doorways are too narrow to wheel myself in – no space for my hands at the side so someone has to push me in.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The quoted minimum 77.5cm is from the national Building Regulations (and is only applicable in certain exemptions). The guide cannot change this. However the guide does not refer to this absolute minimum, only to the more general minimum opening width of 100cm in Building Regs which should always be the aim.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>Will this apply to Leeds Road? – shop access is too tight.</p>	<p>Yes – the guide will apply to shopfront proposals across Bradford district including Leeds Road.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>Steps are a big problem – acknowledge the challenges of the district's hilly topography and heritage buildings but would like to see that all attempts are made to find a solution when opportunities arise.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Add captions to examples of Halifax Bank</p>

Comment	Council Response
	(page 57) and City Vaults (p55) to highlight solutions to achieving inclusive access to heritage buildings on sloping streets.
Noted that the guide has to be consistent with the mandatory requirements in Building Regs but can include additional good practice over and above the minimums.	Comment noted. The guide seeks to do this and more changes are proposed – see above and below.  <b>Recommended change:</b> None
Can we look at internal layouts too? E.g. in big shops/supermarkets at the far end of the store there might be some steps to a different level but no ramp – it makes getting around within the shop difficult.	Whilst the guide is principally concerned with shopfronts it could add that the general principles of access should not stop there and should apply within the shop as well.  <b>Recommended change:</b> Add general reference in Section 9 as per above.
The types of cooler units that have doors which open out into the aisle (e.g. Tesco, Ilkley) are more difficult for people. Sliding front doors are better.	Comment noted. Unfortunately, the detail of internal fittings like cooler units lies beyond the scope of the guide and what can be controlled through the planning process.  <b>Recommended change:</b> None
The display of items outside of shops can obscure and obstruct entrances. A-boards too (e.g. Ivegate).	Whilst some of this lies beyond the scope of the guide and what can be controlled through the planning process, a general reference to it could be provided.  <b>Recommended change:</b> Add general reference to avoid the display of items outside of shops obscuring and obstructing entrances.
Use contrasting colours to denote entrances/handles for visually impaired people. Need to make entrances as easy as possible visually.	Comment noted.  <b>Recommended change:</b> Add reference to this under ‘Entrances and Doorways’ in Section 9.
Glass walls/large areas of glazing need indicators – people walk into them. They can cause confusion and disorientation in and out of the shop, including reflections – need to be more neurodivergent/dementia aware. What’s the answer to this (large glazed areas)? A white line on the glass? Need to include examples.	Comment noted.  <b>Recommended change:</b> Include photo/s in Section 9 showing visual example of markings on large areas of glass.
Frosted glass – avoid.	Comment noted. The guide notes in Section 9 that all large areas of glazing must include contrasting markings or colours to aid those with visual impairments.  <b>Recommended change:</b> No further changes.

Comment	Council Response
Adjusted lighting (dimmed?) at certain times can help people with social anxiety.	<p>Comment noted. Whilst this generally lies beyond the scope of the guide and what can be controlled through the planning process, the principle of providing low level lighting and adjustable/dimmable fittings is supported, including for a creating an attractive nighttime appearance.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> add reference in the document to encouraging the use of dimmable lighting as per the above.</p>
Automatic doors on a sensor are more preferable to a button – it can be difficult to find a button.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Add reference to ‘Automatic doors on a sensor’ under ‘Entrances and Doorways’ (third bullet point) in Section 9.</p>
Self-service checkouts are sometimes not easy to use.	<p>Comment noted. Unfortunately, the detail of internal fittings like self-service checkouts lies beyond the scope of the guide and what can be controlled through the planning process.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> None</p>
<p>The draft SPD says that all applications for roller shutters will need a Crime Impact Assessment (CIA) (p.45). You have given this a whole page to explain this. I think that is great.</p> <p>However - all planning applications and listed consent applications for roller shutters in a conservation area and/or on listed building will need to be supported by a Heritage Statement. Same validation requirement as a CIA.</p> <p>I am wondering if the SPD needs a similar page as the CIA (p.45) for a Heritage Statement. As I read it, it appears that the SPD focuses on the CIA and is completely silent on the need for a heritage statement. (also you would discuss the crime issues in a heritage statement to back up your reasoning for the harm).</p> <p>This in turn might link better with the J2 design principles as you can cross reference it.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Add short description of a Heritage Statement in Section 10.</p>
The guide needs to include examples of suitable shutters to point shopkeepers towards (and manufacturers if we can?). Probably need to be looking outside of the district for examples from elsewhere (of suitable shutters).	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Additional visual examples of suitable shutters will be provided in the final version of the guide.</p>

Comment	Council Response
<p>The example of the retractable grille in Queensbury only works with certain types of shopfronts, e.g. some historic shopfronts. It's not really a general solution to point shopkeepers towards.</p>	<p>As acknowledged the example works with certain types of shopfronts so will be retained in the guide, but as above it will be supplemented with additional examples of shutters suitable for shopfronts more widely.</p> <p><b>Recommended change:</b> Additional visual examples of suitable shutters will be provided in the final version of the guide.</p>