

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

WIGAN COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) SHOP FRONT DESIGN GUIDE

Statement of Representation

This statement sets out the measures undertaken by Wigan Council to involve the community and other stakeholders in the production of the SPD.

A public consultation exercise was carried out over a four-week period from 18th July 2005 to 15th August 2005 inviting comments on the draft SPD, which included the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Notification letters, in some cases with the SPD attached, were sent to:

- Statutory consultation bodies,
- local groups/organisations taken from our Community Engagement Database,
- members of the Development Control and Building Control Service Users Forum,
- all members of the Council,
- other appropriate Council Officers,
- and other appropriate Council departments.

Copies of the draft SPD including the SA were available for inspection and collection during office hours from the Planning and Regeneration Department's office at Civic Buildings, and at Wigan and Leigh Town Halls. Copies were also available for inspections in all of the Borough's libraries, where opening times varied and from the Council website.

The SPD and the consultation exercise were published by a public notice in the Wigan Evening Post and Leigh Journal on the 14th July 2005. In addition, the SPD and the consultation exercise were also given prominent positioning on the Department's website from where the SPD and SA could be downloaded.

A total of 165 individuals/groups/organisations were consulted and 11 representations were received. Following careful consideration of the comments received, the SPD was amended accordingly.

The following table provides a summary of the main issues raised and the Council's response to the issues.

Summary of main issues raised on the consultation draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Shop Front Design Guide (July – August 2005)

Respondent	Summary of Main Issues	Action Taken and Justification
English Nature	No specific comments	Noted
Lancashire County Council	<p>General – very thorough and well presented document.</p> <p>Photograph of Corbel on page 13 – the corbel appears to be unsupported by a pilaster. It may be better to replace the photograph with one showing a corbel supported by a pilaster.</p>	<p>Noted No change - supporting comments</p> <p>Noted Agree - Photograph replaced with a more suitable image.</p>
Environment Agency	No specific comments	Noted
GM Fire and Rescue Service	<p>Overall satisfied with the proposed document.</p> <p>However would like to see some additional guidance,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The available clear width of entrance/exit doors, for means of escape purposes, is directly related to the potential occupant capacity of the premises. 2. Only approved type exit door furniture should be used on doors required for means of escape purposes. 3. Article 14 (2) (e) of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 states that sliding or revolving doors must be used for exits intended as emergency exits. These regulations come into force on 1st April 2006. 4. Reference should be made regarding the provisions of exit signage. 5. Advice regarding fire safety matters can be obtained from the Fire Safety (enforcement) Department at Wigan Fire Station on 01942 650110. 	<p>No change Supporting comments</p> <p>Noted Agree - Inserted additional new guidance, which appears in the document under a new section heading '1.6 Fire Safety Requirement'.</p>
Government Office North	The document needs to make clear whether it is based on the adopted	Agree Amended section 1.2 and

West	and/or the emerging UDP. If only based on emerging UDP then the SPD can only be adopted once the replacement UDP has been formally adopted which is April 2006.	1.4 to clarify that the document is based on the adopted and emerging, draft replacement UDP policies. Therefore ensuring that the SPD is supported by both sets of UDP policies.
North West Regional Assembly	Suggested it would be helpful to mention how SPD links to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) in order to show the strategic link between SPD and RSS.	Disagree No change - The SPD links to the adopted UDP, which is a plan of 'saved' policies under the new planning system and also supports the emerging, draft Replacement UDP. It is the UDP that provides the direct link to the RSS therefore unnecessary to duplicate the strategic link.
Councillor C Sweeney	<p>Overall welcomes the document.</p> <p>Not sure the layout of document is that easy to follow. More colour contrast between sections.</p> <p>Very little consideration at the start of document on conservation areas.</p>	<p>Noted No change - supporting comments</p> <p>Noted The presentation of the document has been improved and amended where appropriate.</p> <p>Noted</p>
Councillor F B Walker	<p>5.5 - The suggestion that 'solid type shutters' are unacceptable and it is unrealistic as a blanket decision.</p> <p>Concerned that the public may consider the alternative shutter types, for example perforated as less 'rugged' than the solid shutter type.</p> <p>Concerned with the issue of how solid shutters create dead frontages when</p>	<p>Disagree. No change - The guidance provided is in accordance with the adopted UDP policy EN7C, and the emerging, draft Replacement UDP, EV3C.</p> <p>Noted. However this is not the case - the alternative shutter types still provide effective security measures and there are many examples across the borough where perforated, lattice and grille types have been successfully used.</p> <p>Noted. The comments have been</p>

	they are rolled down. Suggests a better start might be to enforce the removal of graffiti from the shutters.	referred to the Director of Engineering Services, Street Scene Group.
Councillor G Wilkes	Page 15 (3.4) Materials and colours – should be more specific. Offer a range of colours from the British Standard	<p>Disagree. No change - The guidance provided is in accordance with the adopted UDP policy EN7C, clause A and the emerging, draft Replacement UDP, EV3C, clause A which both state ‘use materials and a design in sympathy with the whole façade of the building or, where appropriate, satisfactory surrounding premises.’</p> <p>In most cases it may be inappropriate to specify a particular colour, the exception to the rule is if the building is listed, located within conservation areas and/or is a building of special interest.</p>
Chris Thomas, Outdoor Advertising Consultants, Comments have been submitted on behalf of the British Sign and Graphics Association (BSGA)	<p>1.3 and 7.1 – not correct to say that all illuminated signs in Conservation Areas require express consent. Medical, Vets, Opticians etc are examples where consent is not needed.</p> <p>3.2C No reason given as to why stallriser should not be seen as suitable for advertising. Suggest that the sentence should be rephrased as “The stallriser is not generally an appropriate surface for advertising.”</p> <p>6.1 Should this read “As a general rule, one <u>fascia</u> sign per shop...”</p> <p>The limit to “one sign” and one hanging sign is unrealistic. Argues that there are many examples where restricting to one fascia sign is unrealistic.</p>	<p>Agree. Changed text to include this exception to the rule. Section 1.3, paragraph 6 and section 7.1, paragraph 1.</p> <p>Noted After further consideration the sentence has been deleted.</p> <p>Noted Change made in section 6.1, paragraph 1.</p> <p>Disagree No change - The guidance is in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992, Schedule 3, Class 4A – (3)</p>

	<p>6.2 No reason given why a sign should be at least 2.5 metres above ground.</p> <p>6.3 “Requirement” for sign written letter using light coloured or gilded letters on a dark fascia board is overly restrictive. Suggest “For traditional shopfronts in the most sensitive areas, sign written letters or individual lettering applied direct to the fascia board may be the most appropriate solution.”</p> <p>6.5.2 The recommended size of any hanging or projecting sign is not necessary. Overall the sign must in proportion to the fascia and shopfront and whole building.</p> <p>6.5.3 Fascias box signs are not “invariably” bulky and out of keeping.</p> <p>6.5.4 No reason is given why business nameplates may not be illuminated. Discreet illumination should be wholly acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted After further consideration the sentence has been deleted.</p> <p>Noted Changes made as suggested shown in section 6.3, paragraph 4.</p> <p>Noted Changes made as suggested shown in section 6.5.2, paragraph 4.</p> <p>Noted Changed text to clarify the point in section 6.5.3, paragraph 1.</p> <p>Noted Text has been amended to recognise illumination of a business nameplate could be considered acceptable. Section 6.5.4, paragraph 2.</p>
<p>Peter Sargeant, Golborne</p> <p>Interested Resident</p>	<p>Consultation Process:</p> <p>Questioned why they were not advised of the consultation or sent a copy of the document at the outset.</p> <p>Downloading the document from the web is considered to be unsatisfactory because of the length of the document, the background colour and illustrations. Going to the library would also be unsuitable due the length and technical nature of the document.</p>	<p>A Press Release appeared in the Wigan Evening Post and the Leigh Journal on the 14th July 2005 publicising the document and the consultation period.</p> <p>The document was tested to help assess the practicalities of downloading both with a colour and black and white printer.</p> <p>The blue background colour and the inclusion of the photographs provided no difficulties. In the case of the black and white printer, the blue background colour</p>

	<p>In breach of the 6 weeks consultation period as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)</p> <p>Presentation and language:</p> <p>A detailed analysis was provided about the use of inappropriate language, spelling, punctuation, hyphens, textual errors and the use of capitals and jargon. Numerous suggestions were provided.</p> <p>Questions the periodic use of the royal 'we'. Who is speaking?</p> <p>Content:</p> <p>The correct expression is not 'Advertisement Consent' but 'Express Consent'.</p>	<p>did not cause a problem, as is the case if you were to photocopy the document, the document would print off with a light grey background.</p> <p>The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, Regulation 18 (3) states that the period for any person to make representations on a SPD "must be a period of not less than 4 weeks or more than 6 weeks". In the SCI figure 4 reflects this. Also paragraph 6.5 makes a commitment to allow the maximum permissible time on each occasion.</p> <p>Noted The SPD went through a rigorous Plain English review undertaken by trained staff.</p> <p>Numerous changes have now been made to the text and presentation of the SPD for the purposes of clarity and consistency.</p> <p>Noted No change - 'We' is referring to the Council. The use of this term complies with the Council's Plain English approach.</p> <p>Noted No change - The document has been written for a wide audience and as a result needs to use clear and understandable terms. This</p>
--	--	--

	<p>1.4 – Fails to make clear that it is referring to the Replacement UDP. Also the case for Appendix B.</p> <p>1.6 leads to two Appendix A's and B's</p> <p>3.4 What are metal works?</p> <p>3.5 Is the Council giving grants?</p> <p>4.3 heading does not refer to satellite dishes but the text does.</p> <p>Is the Council saying alarm and junction boxes, in their own right, require permission? Is it saying satellite dishes do not, irrespective of size and location? What is it saying?</p> <p>7.1 The reference to exceptions for 'limited illumination of lettering' is obscure. Illuminated signs do not require planning permission, they generally require Express Consent</p> <p>Appendix A1 – the only outside agency is the Police what about Planning AID, CAB and The Local Ombudsman?</p>	<p>approach also complies with the Council's approach to use Plain English.</p> <p>Noted Changes have been made within section 1.2, 1.4 and Appendix B1 – Planning policies.</p> <p>Noted Changes have been made to the Contents page and to the appendix headings.</p> <p>Metal works include shop front building items for example doors, windows, hinges and closers. After further consideration this phrase has been deleted.</p> <p>Noted Where resources permit, grants could become available depending on the availability of funds and/or the success on bidding for future external funding.</p> <p>Noted The heading has been changed to say '4.3 - External security and telecommunication equipment.'</p> <p>Noted Changes have been made to clarify the points in Section 4.3, paragraphs 3 and 4.</p> <p>Agree Changes have been made to section 7.1, paragraph 1.</p> <p>Noted At the time of production there was only one relevant outside agency listed</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Appendix B1 – quoting policies as EV3, EV3C is wrong in law.</p>	<p>however this list has been extended to include all relevant bodies for example, GM Fire and Rescue Service.</p> <p>Disagree No change - Referring to the planning policy reference letter/numbers does have a legal status.</p>
--	---	---