



To be Retained by BSGA

Consultation Period: None at this stage **To:**
Development Plan: City Plan 2016-2031 - Submission for Examination 20//11/20
District: Gloucester CC
Relevant Policies: Policy D4
Or Narrative (refs): Paragraphs 3.4.28-3.4.29

Background: This City Plan (combined with the adopted Core Strategy) will supersede the old 1983 local plan and finally complete Gloucester's planning policies. Policy D4 "Shopfronts, shutters and signs" states only that proposals for advertisements "will be supported" where the signage is sympathetic to its surroundings, not visually dominant or create clutter; is halo illuminated; is a hanging sign (timber on metal bracket); and is of a colour which is "sympathetic" to the character of an area or building – "very bright" and garish colours should be avoided.

All proposals should "accord with" the guidance in the "Shopfronts, Shutters and Signage Design Guidelines" SPD and any subsequent amendments.

We objected to the pointlessness of picking out just two types of sign as being "supported" (what about all the other signs which are seen in shopping areas and are most likely "supportable"?); to the reference to "very bright" colours (too subjective); and to the reference to the Shopfronts SPD. The Shopfronts SPD was subject to a separate consultation in November 2016 and we objected to much (most) of it. But our representations were effectively ignored. The SPD was adopted (without even informing us) in November 2017. This document is wholly unacceptable. It is beyond reality as any short visit to Gloucester will confirm. See forms and representations in separate documents relating to the SPD

The Council have now formally submitted the plan for independent examination. They have made no significant changes. Their response to our objections is stated as: "the policy reflects what is considered appropriate signage by the Council. Signage that is sympathetic to its surroundings is considered acceptable"; and "All comments to the SPD were duly considered and the correct process followed".

Comment: The Council's comments are drivel and untrue – they cannot possibly have considered our comments on their SPD and still produced it with the many factual errors which we pointed out (as well as our substantive objections to principles). They have also failed to comprehend that, as it stands, the City Plan attempts to give additional authority to a document which has never been independently examined. Our objections are duly made and continue to be so. The submitted plan together with our objections will now go forward for independent examination by an Inspector.

Date sent to Council: No comment permitted at this stage

Development Plan Monitoring