HILLINGON LBC - LOCAL PLAN PART 2 REVISED PROPOSED SUBMISSION - PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATIONS

WRITTEN STATEMENT TO THE INQUIRY

POLICY DHMB 13 AND APPENDIX B PAGE 75 – MAIN MODIFICATIONS PAGES 78-79

In response to our earlier representations (letter of 30 October 2015, much of which remains as objection), the Council have submitted a list of Proposed Main Modifications.

The proposed Modifications do little to meet our fundamental objections. Some rearrangement is welcome (although the problems remain with Appendix B); but the text of both the proposed new policy and supporting text remains unsound and, in part, unlawful.

In the new policy to be inserted after DMBH 13, we agree that advertisements should be appropriate to their surroundings. But this is not solely restricted to the age and character of the buildings. Advertisements should also be appropriate to the particular shopfront on which they are to be displayed. Modern shopfronts have often been inserted into much older buildings. But a "traditional" wooden fascia signboard above a wholly modern shopfront would still look out of place even though it may reflect the "age and character" of the overall building and those around it. We suggest that "age" be deleted and replaced with "appearance". This is what really counts, ie visual amenity on which all decisions must be based as required by the Control of Advertisements Regulations 2007.

In the second proposed new paragraph, reference is made to Policy DMBH12 criterion (c). But, according to the preamble in the Modifications schedule, this part of Policy DMBH12 is to be removed!. But this paragraph only states the reverse of the first paragraph and can be totally deleted without detracting from the effectiveness of the new policy.

If it is to be retained, we continue to object to Appendix B for the reasons in our letter of 30 October 2015. The excessive prescription and detail in this Appendix is wholly unsuitable for inclusion in a Local Plan. We suggest that Appendix B be totally removed from the Plan and produced as supplementary guidance, if necessary.

In the draft Policy DMBH X itself:

In A(iii), the words "preserve or" should be inserted after "they" to reflect the requirements of the legislation;

In B, we object to this unwarranted prescription. Policy A(i) requires advertisements to respect the design of the building (which will include the shopfront). This is sufficient for the consideration of the visual relationship of any proposed sign with its host building. Further, the suggestion that the advertisements should contain the shop name only is contrary to the stipulation in Regulation 3(4) which states:

"Unless it appears to the local planning authority to be required in the interests of amenity or public safety, an express consent for the display of advertisements shall not contain any limitation or restriction relating to the subject matter, content or design of what is to be displayed."

To restrict content by general prohibition is not permitted by the Regulations. What is acceptable in terms of visual amenity and public safety must be determined in the individual circumstances of each particular site.

In C, we agree that illumination to shopfronts should avoid light pollution and intrusion to nearby residents. But this does not justify the proposed ban on all flashing and internally illuminated "box lights". Again, each proposal must be considered on merit (and I do not for a second believe that there are no internally illuminated "box lights" displayed on bus shelters in the Borough with the Council's approval). Again, each case must be determined on individual merit, as required by the Regulations. And A(vi) is adequate to control illumination as necessary.

We therefore consider that proposed Policy DMBH X A(iii) should be amended to reflect the law. We further consider that parts B and C of this proposed policy are contrary to the law and unsound; and that they should be entirely deleted.

Chris ThomasFor British Sign & Graphics Association