

### Statement of Regulations

A summary of the main issues raised in the representations and how the issues have been addressed in the Retail Supplementary Planning Document

Representation ID	Name of respondent/organisation	Support/Object	Summary of response	Suggested Council response	Recommendation
01	The National Trust		No comments to make on the SPD.	Noted.	No action needed.
02	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society	Support	<p>Support the principle of the SPD and encourage the Council to adopt it.</p> <p>Would like to see the SPD control takeaways that are near schools to protect the health of pupils, who are the main users of these facilities. Reference should be made to the judicial review of Copeland v Tower Hamlets Council. This would support the existing street trading policy which bans sales near schools for health reasons.</p> <p>Key Principle 3 should reduce takeaways to 5% of total commercial units. This would then be in line with most other Local Authorities which have adopted similar policies.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The street trading policy relates to mobile take away units i.e. burger vans. However it is considered appropriate to include reference to health within the Key Principle.</p> <p>The SPD seeks that no more than 10% of the total commercial units be occupied by hot food takeaway uses. This is suggested as a balanced approach in that it would allow a retail focus alongside a range and mix of complementary non-retail uses, for example, banks, building societies, cafes, restaurants etc. Furthermore</p>	<p>Insert “ The potential impact upon the health of local residents where it can be demonstrated that the proposal will raise health issues” at the end of Key Principle 4</p> <p>No changes recommended to the SPD</p>

			<p>any proposal is not based solely on a numerical assessment and other criteria must be satisfied, for example, the location of other hot food take aways, impact on character and amenity.</p>	
		<p>Like to see Policy R19 applied to Ashby and Coalville. The SPD suggested that it only applies to other settlements. It is equally needed for Ashby and Coalville.</p>	<p>It is not the role of an SPD to amend existing policy or establish new policy. However Policy R4 of the Local Plan identifies the suitable uses for Coalville and Ashby subject to various considerations. Policy R19 does the same in the Local Centres.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p>
		<p>There are 9 additional premises in Market Street, Ashby, which are restaurants that also provide takeaway facilities.</p>	<p>A take away use ancillary to a restaurant may create similar issues to those associated with a sole take away use, e.g., car parking issues. Therefore suggest that future applications for a restaurant with an ancillary take away use are also assessed against the SPD. However if an existing restaurant use incorporates a take away use, planning permission is not always needed. This would depend on the scale of the take away use.</p>	<p>Future applications for restaurant uses to be assess against the SPD.</p> <p>Add "A restaurant use with an ancillary take away use may also exacerbate these issues. Therefore applications for this type of use should also be assessed against these Key Principles." at the end of Para 9.5</p>
		<p>Welcome Key Principle 5 that restricts further takeaways in Ashby.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No action needed.</p>
		<p>When this policy is adopted, request that the Licensing Environmental Health</p>	<p>The Development Control Team and the Environmental Health Team will</p>	<p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p>

			and Planning Officers, and Councillors utilise a consistent policy when determining licenses and planning applications. This would prevent the current ricketing of permission by playing one department off against the other.	have their own specific criteria against which to assess applications. However in order to ensure consistency in approach, both of these teams have been consulted on the preparation of the SPD.	
03	The Coal Authority		No specific comments to make on the document at this stage.	Noted.	No action needed.
04	Measham Parish Council		The jewellers at 39 High Street, Measham is not vacant and is still operational and is located on the upper floor of the building.	Noted.	Measham audit to be updated.  Add "(Ground Floor Vacant and Upper Floor in Use)" to the end of Appendix 5, South east side of High Street, 39 Jewellers (A1)
05	Civil Aviation Authority		No objections made to the SPD		No action needed.
06	English Heritage		No comments to make on the Draft Retail SPD but generally support the objective of maintaining the retail function of the towns, particularly the historic town of Ashy de la Zouch.  Question whether a full Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is required for a SPD and query whether the SA could be more focussed on the subject matter of the SPD,	Noted.  Noted.	No action needed.
07	Highway Agency		The issues covered by the draft SPD are not expected to have a material	Noted.	No action needed.

			<p>impact on the Strategic Road Network. As such the Highways Agency has no particular comments to make.</p>		
08	The Theatres Trust		<p>A balance needs to be found between the main function of the town centre as a shopping and employment destination, the amenity of the residential population and the opportunities to enjoy an evening out. Evening and night-time activities, including hot food take aways, are fundamental to urban renaissance as they ensure the vitality of an area beyond working hours. However too many licensed premise and take aways can harm the character and function of a town centre.</p> <p>Take away and licensed premise venues can be systemised to cater for the over 25's or for families. They can be sited next to cinemas and theatres with less of an emphasis on fun pubs.</p> <p>Table 1, page 16 does not list sui generis as a Use Class Order. This information should be added as there is a theatre in Ashby.</p>	<p>Both national and local policy recognises there needs to be an appropriate balance between the retail function of the District's centres and the range of other appropriate and complementary uses. Take away uses can contribute to a centre's attractiveness but it is also recognised that too many of these uses can be to the detriment of the area. The SPD seeks to address these concerns.</p> <p>Different take away uses will attract different customer profiles as suggested. However permission is not needed to change from one take away use to another take away use. Therefore the 'type' of take away use cannot be controlled once permission for a take away use has been granted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No action needed.</p> <p>No action needed.</p> <p>Appendix updated to include examples of sui generis uses.</p> <p>Insert at the end of Appendix 1- Use Classes Order "<b>Sui Generis</b>. There are many uses that are not categorised by the main use classes. These are classified as</p>

			Query whether the Venture Theatre been consulted?	The Draft SPD has been advertised on the Council's website and within a Press Release.	sui generis. For example, theatres, taxi hire.  No action needed.
09	Sport England		Supports the recognition in the document for the contribution that sport, leisure and recreation have in supporting the balance of town centres particularly with regard to the evening economy.  Sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the local economy and assist in regeneration.	Noted.  Noted. The SPD seeks to maintain an effective shopping role in the district's centres as well as providing a range of other appropriate and complementary uses, including leisure uses.	No action required.
10	Leicester City Council		No comments to make on the SPD at this stage.	Noted	No action required.
11 and 17	Castle Donington Parish Council		Sustainability Appraisal – document appears to address the issues associated with local centres and to have given consideration to the various policies and objectives.  SPD Document Concerned that the document will not currently form part of the development plan and not afforded 'full weight'. This could lead to mis-interpretation by officers making decisions under	Noted  The guidance will provide advice on the interpretation of Local Plan policy and will assist those involved in the application process. It will be a material consideration to be taken into	No action required.  No action required

		<p>delegated powers – it will be one persons view.</p> <p>A public consultation was undertaken in Ashby with reference to hot food takeaways. If a similar consultation in Castle Donington were carried out, a similar response would be received. The central area of Caste Donington has a high level of residential properties and therefore the issues associated with take aways such as litter, anti-social behaviour and inappropriate parking, have a major impact. Parish Council would want the strict controls being implied in Ashby to be applied in Castle Donington.</p> <p>It is hoped that the assessment of A3, A4 and A5 applications will be to a standard level as the potential to allow a piece-meal approach to development has a detrimental affect on the community in the long-term.</p> <p>It is considered that within the 'Evidence Section' of the document the wording is done in a way to favour a particular area – some areas are addressed in a more positive manner than others, for example, Ashby.</p> <p>Do not agree with the statement that no non retail use dominates the local centre of Castle Donington, as it is felt that there is a proliferation of take</p>	<p>account when determining applications.</p> <p>Evidence collected for Castle Donington with regard to the proportion and clustering of take away uses indicates that Castle Donington does not experience the same issues as Ashby,. However the situation will be kept under review, through monitoring, and the SPD can be amended if necessary.</p> <p>The SPD will provide advice to be used in the consideration of such applications.</p> <p>The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the current situation of each of the centres.</p> <p>A comparison store is that which sells high value non-food goods, for example, clothes, furniture. Hairdressers fall within the retail use</p>	<p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>aways and hairdressers. Request explanation of what a 'comparison store' is.</p> <p>Policy R19 should address the above issues but it is felt that the interpretation and lack of local knowledge creates decisions not fully considered in respect of local amenities of residents and the area.</p> <p>Key Principle 1 – Retail Balance: Parish Council supports this principle for Castle Donington.</p> <p>Key Principle 2 – To maintain an appropriate balance between shopping and non-shopping is defined by Key Principle 1. However who makes this decision and will monitoring take place to ensure that the overall view of the centre is considered. Although the principle of utilising vacant premises is good, the impact of a change of use on</p>	<p>class and permission is not needed to change from one retail use to another. Recent survey work indicates that over half of the units are occupied by retail uses. This work also shows than no one particular non-retail uses dominates. For example, financial and professional uses account for approximately 10% of commercial uses, restaurants account for 9%, public houses for 5% and take aways for 5%.</p> <p>Evidence suggests that over 50% of the units with Castle Donington comprise retail uses. There is also a good variety in comparison stores. Therefore on the basis of this evidence, non-retail uses do not dominate this local centre.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The decision will be made by the Council, when determining planning applications either as delegated decision or by Planning Committee. Monitoring will take place to keep survey work up to date. This principle allows consideration to be given to vacancy issues but not at the expense of the impact of on character</p>	<p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>amenity and locality should also be considered.</p> <p>Key Principle 3 –Reference to no more than two A5 adjacent units needs clarification. For example, if a property becomes dual classed could this comply with this principle.</p> <p>Key Principle 4 – What is “the immediate area” and how are “clusters” defined? Is this within an area/street and is it open to misinterpretation. Who decides if a traffic issue is unresolved? Are local views considered? Different people can have different views? More definition is needed.</p> <p>If it is not possible to provide a litter bin within the curtilage of the take away premises, a contribution should be made towards additional litter bins within the highway.</p>	<p>or locality.</p> <p>There may be instances when a use class may not fit solely into one planning use class but it is not considered practical for the SPD to cover every scenario or eventuality. Therefore when the principles of the SPD are applied, consideration would be given to the nature of that particular use, for example, its impact on local character and local amenity and whether it would raise the same issues as a sole A5 use.</p> <p>The ‘immediate area’ and ‘clusters’ will depend on the scale and nature of the centre, or even the street within which the application site is located. The suggested wording allows each case to be judged on its merits, in that particular location and at that moment in time. Advise reference traffic issues will be sought from the Highway County Authority. Neighbours and local views will be sought through the planning application process through notification and publicity of the application.</p> <p>There is no objection in principle to seeking a contribution, where relevant, for the provision of a litter bin.</p>	<p>Future applications for dual uses to be assessed against the SPD.</p> <p>Insert “It is also appreciated that there will be instances when a use may not fit comfortably within one of the main use classes. In these cases, the principles of the SPD will be applied, with regard given to the nature and potential impact of the use.” At the end of Para 9.1</p> <p>Insert at end of the last criteria in Key Principle 4 “Where a litterbin cannot be provided within the curtilage of the premises, a commuted sum will be sought towards the provision of a litterbin within the locality.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---



			<p>Key Principle 5 – This Ashby principle should also be applied to Castle Donington, in particular to hot food takeaways, financial and professional services and hairdressers. There are major concerns about the detrimental affects of the smells generated by the close proximity of takeaways and associated parking issues when there is limited off-street parking.</p> <p>Key Principle 6 – This should relate to Castle Donington, in some form, as the concentration of hot food takeaways exacerbates the detrimental impacts on amenity.</p> <p>Monitoring of the principles of the SPD should be on a more frequent basis as well as include representation and comments from the local representatives, in particular, in relation to affects on Conservation Areas.</p>	<p>Evidence collected with regard to the proportion and clustering of take away uses indicates that Castle Donington does not experience the same issues as Ashby. However the situation will be kept under review, through monitoring, and the SPD can be amended if necessary.</p> <p>This principle specifically relates to Ibstock. Evidence collected does not indicate that Caste Donington experiences the same issues as Ibstock. Take away uses account for 19% of the commercial units in Ibstock. It is suggested that Key Principle 1 and 2 provide adequate guidance for the protection of Castle Donington’s existing retail function and protection from the potential detrimental impacts of hot food takeaways. However the situation will be kept under review, through monitoring, and the SPD can be amended if necessary.</p> <p>The audit will be updated throughout the monitoring year, if permission is granted for a change of use. Site visits will be made to application sites as well as the locality, in order to assess any change of use applications that are received.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p> <p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p> <p>Insert “Para 10.3 Updated survey work will also be sought through site visits to proposal sites” after Para 10.2</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

12	Roger Etchells, Roger Etchells & Company		<p>Experience at dealing with proposals for non-retail uses in shopping areas and have been involved in a large number of successful planning appeals. Comments are as a trader and use of Ashby town centre.</p> <p>The guidance uses the number of units as a way of assessing the non-retail content. Suggest that this is the least reliable approach, for example, large units are given the same value as smaller units and does not provide a sound basis for such an assessment, as has been found by Inspectors on appeal. Ideally floor area would be used for such an assessment, however it is accepted that this is unrealistic. Therefore suggest that the frontage is the most reliable and practical way of making such an assessment.</p> <p>Para 8.2 refers to 'surveyed frontages', however the Key Principle refers to 'defined areas'. Unless the figure for the defined area is known, which is not, it is impossible to consider whether 50% minimum retail figure is reasonable. Approach of comparing 'surveyed frontages' and 'defined centre' is fundamentally flawed. The 'surveyed frontages' do not include all the 'retail' type frontages. For example, shops in</p>	<p>Acknowledge that there are various ways of assessing the retail content of a centre and that floor space is probably the most accurate approach. However, as accepted by the objector this approach is unrealistic and impractical as it would be difficult to collect this information. Therefore the suggested approach of recording the number of units is considered to give a truer impression of the mix of uses rather than using frontage measurements. A measure of the mix of commercial units provides an impression of a centre's vitality and viability.</p> <p>Para 6.8 identifies the area of Ashby town centre to which the SPD applies. This area, as defined in para 6.8, is that which has been surveyed and is contained within the Appendix of the SPD. However in light of this representation, it has become apparent that more clarity is needed, both in the written text and the accompanying Ashby town centre maps. The surveyed frontage is the</p>	<p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p> <p>Provide greater clarification within the SPD.</p> <p>Delete all text in Para 6.8 and replace with " With regard to Ashby de la Zouch the SPD applies to the following parts of its Core Shopping Area (as defined in the Local Plan) - Market Street, Bath Street, Kilwardby Street, Derby Road, Brook Street and</p>

			<p>the Green and North Street have not been surveyed although they are in the defined centre. An unworkable policy without consideration of the whole 'defined centre' which needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>Key Principle 2: Query the relevance of fixing a minimum period of marketing to assess the acceptability of the use. In making a decision on a change of use</p>	<p>area to which the Key Principles 1, 2, 3 and 4 apply. This area was identified as making up the main shopping and commercial streets of Ashby. Green and North Street are not within the area that to which the SPD applies.</p> <p>This principle provides a range of issues that regard should be had to for a change of use application that</p>	<p>courtyards to the rear. These streets are considered to form the main shopping and commercial streets of Ashby. (Appendix 2). With regard to the centres of Castle Donington, Ibstock, Measham and Kegworth, the SPD applies to their local centre boundaries as defined in the Local Plan (Appendices 3-6)</p> <p>Amend Key Principle 1.</p> <p>Insert "In the town centre of Ashby de la Zouch, shopping uses should represent no less than 50% of all commercial uses within the main shopping and commercial streets. Delete 'town and' and "Ashby de la Zouch" from the now second sentence.</p> <p>Amend Key Principle 3</p> <p>Delete "Within the defined town and local centres, subject to this SPD" and replace with "In the main shopping and commercial streets of Ashby de la Zouch and the defined local centres of Castle Donington, Ibstock, Measham and Kegworth"</p> <p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

			<p>consideration should be given to whether a proposal would be harmful to vitality and viability. A specific and extended period of vacancy should not be a precondition to the grant of planning permission although a period of vacancy may be relevant in general terms on occasions.</p> <p>The nature of premises is also of relevance with some units more suited to retail uses. Premises with conventional shop fronts are more suited to retail uses than those with restricted shop windows. These are more suited to non-retail uses.</p> <p>Key Principle 3 – ignores that fact that many class A3 uses quite legitimately have an ancillary take away element. These affect the character of the eastern end of Market Street in conjunction with the existing Class A5 uses. Suggest a condition is attached to any new Class A3 use (eastern end of Market Street) to prevent take away sales in locations where this would exacerbate existing problems. This approach is not necessary for applications away from the eastern end of Market Street.</p>	<p>would involve loss of retail, including impact character and function of the centre, as well as the balance between retail and non-retail uses. The criteria relating to vacancy issues allows this issue to be considered and assessment to be made as to whether it would be preferential for a property that is vacant and has been for a period of time, to have a user although it may result in the loss of a retail use.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that this may be the case in some instances, but in others works can be carried out to a premise in order for it to be more suited to retail uses.</p> <p>A take away use ancillary to a restaurant may create similar issues to those associated with a sole take away use, e.g., car parking issues. Therefore suggest that future applications for a restaurant with an ancillary take away use are also assessed against the SPD. However if an existing restaurant use incorporates a take away use, planning permission is not always needed. This would depend on the scale of the take away use.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p> <p>Future applications for restaurant uses to be assess against the SPD.</p> <p>Add “A restaurant use with an ancillary take away use may also exacerbate these issues. Therefore applications for this type of use should also be assessed against these Key Principles.” At the end of Para 9.5</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

			<p>Key Principle 5 – amounts to an embargo on further take away uses within the defined Market Street frontage of Ashby and prevents applications being considered on their merits. A better approach would be for a principle to resist further A5 uses in this area if they exacerbate the adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the shopping area or are likely to result in increased adverse impact on the amenity of the area.</p>	<p>It is suggested that the Key Principle is amended to allow some flexibility for applications to be considered on their merits. This principle will still seek to retain a retail focus in Market Street with no less than 50% of the commercial units to be occupied by shops. However the restriction on additional take away uses will apply to only the eastern end of Market Street, as this is where the existing take aways uses are clustered.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the second round of consultation an Appeal Decision for 59 Market Street has been published. A change of use from restaurant to take away use was allowed. The Inspector concluded that this take away use would not lead to a concentration of such uses and that this part of Market Street is dominated by shop uses. Therefore having had regard to this representation and recent appeal decision changes to Key Principle 5 are proposed, as detailed. Applications for take away uses elsewhere in Market Street will be considered on its merits taking into account the principles of the SPD.</p>	<p>Amend Key Principle 5.</p> <p>Delete text to Key Principle 5 and replace with:</p> <p>Within the defined Market Street frontage of Nos 11 to 89, and Nos 6 to 108 (Appendix A), the Council will ensure that no less than 50% of the commercial frontages are occupied by shops.</p> <p>Within the defined Market Street frontage of Nos 67 to 89, and Nos 76 and 108 (Appendix 2), the Council will ensure that no new additional take aways are granted planning permission over and above those in existence or permitted at the time of the adoption of this SPD.</p> <p>Delete Para 9.9</p>
13	Packington Parish Council		<p>Agree that the document is needed. Query whether the restriction will only apply to the mentioned Ashby, Ibstock and Kegworth or will it become a general measure for all towns and</p>	<p>The SPD will apply to development in the specified area of Ashby Town Centre and the Local Centres of Castle Donington, Ibstock, Measham and Kegworth.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to the SPD.</p>

			villages in the district.		
14	North West Leicestershire District Council – Internal Consultees		Overall, the SPD needs to be clear of its purpose and when it means Class A1 (Shops) in both the text and the policy.	Noted	<p>Delete from Paragraph 2.1 ‘aims to provide information to those who wish to submit a planning application that affects both retail uses (Class A1) and other service uses in the specific town and village centres. Delete from Paragraph 2.2 ‘This guidance.’</p> <p>Where relevant all references to retail have been deleted within the text and replaced with Shops (Class A1) and shopping.</p> <p>Amend title of paragraph 9.2) from ‘Retail Balance’ to ‘Balance of Uses’.</p> <p>Amend the titles of Key Principles 1 and 2 from ‘Retail Balance’ to ‘Balance of Uses.’</p>
			The description of the Use Classes (Paragraphs 6.10 to 6.14) and the changes to the Use Classes Order should be earlier in the document in order to inform what follows.	Noted.	<p>Move ‘Use Classes Order” (Paragraphs 6.10 to 6.14) after Paragraph 6.1. Renumber as 6.2 to 6.6</p> <p>Insert after first sentence in Paragraph 6.14 (To be renumbered paragraph 6.6) “ This is because planning permission is needed to change from one use class to another whereas previously this was not the case and so the District Council as</p>

			<p>Suggest clarification of what is meant when reference is made to Class A3 uses in Policies R4 and R19 of the Local Plan</p>	<p>The Local Plan policies were adopted prior to the 2005 changes to the Use Classes Order.</p>	<p>Local Planning Authority had less control. This allows' Delete 'It allows' from the beginning of the next sentence.</p> <p>Insert at the end of paragraph 6.5 (to be renumbered paragraph 6.10) 'This policy was adopted prior to the recent changes to the Use Classes Order. Therefore reference to Class A3 in the context of Policy R4 now includes restaurant and cafes, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways in accordance with the Use Classes Order.'</p> <p>Add to the first bullet point of section 5 ',particularly in light of the changes to the Use Classes Order which have separated Class A3 into three separate Use Classes.'</p> <p>Insert at the end of paragraph 6.7 (to be renumbered paragraph 6.12) 'This policy was adopted prior to the recent changes to the Use Classes Order. Therefore reference to Class A3 in the context of Policy R19 now includes restaurant and cafes, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways in accordance with the Use Classes Order.'</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

			<p>Suggest clarification of the role of the SPD in relation to Policy R5.</p> <p>Query who raised concerns regarding the number of take aways in Ashby.</p>	<p>Noted. It is also suggested that the text clarifies the status of this local plan policy.</p> <p>These concerns were raised by local residents of Ashby.</p>	<p>Delete "R5" from the first bullet point under Section 5 – Objectives of the SPD.</p> <p>Insert at the end of paragraph 6.6 (To be renumbered 6.11) 'It is acknowledged that along Market Street, financial and professional services (Class A2) have exceeded more than 10%of the total frontage. However Policy R5 is still the current planning policy and relevant applications will be considered on their individual merits and against other relevant policy and material considerations.'</p> <p>Insert "Policy R5 of the Local Plan seeks to prevent groupings of financial and professional services. However the restrictions sought in the policy have already been exceeded although this still is a relevant planning policy and material consideration in determining a planning application." After the third sentence of paragraph 8.7</p> <p>Delete Paragraph 9.7</p> <p>Delete first sentence of Paragraph 7.1 and replace with 'Concerns have been expressed locally over the perceived proliferation of hot</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--



			<p>Suggest the type of evidence that should be submitted if a change of use is being sought for a property that is vacant.</p>	Noted and agreed.	<p>food takeaways in Ashby de la Zouch town centre and the negative impact on amenity and loss of shops and reduction in consumer choice.'</p> <p>Insert "negatively on' in the last sentence of paragraph 7.2 between 'impacted' and 'the'.</p> <p>Insert an additional paragraph 9.5 that reads 'The principles above seek to support existing policy and support an appropriate balance of shopping and other commercial uses. Where reference is made to vacant units, written evidence should be submitted to show that attempts have been made to market the premises. This should include a statement detailing the marketing measures undertaken, any marketing particulars and the level of interest shown in the premises.'</p>
			<p>Suggest that clarification is provided as to the means use to ensure the provision of a litter bin.</p>	Noted and agreed.	<p>Insert an additional paragraph 9.6 'Key Principle 4 requires the provision of a litter bin and this will be secured via appropriate means, including Section 106 agreements.'</p>
			<p>Suggest wording change to Key Principle 4</p>	Noted and agreed.	<p>Bullet Point 5 be amended to read 'Impact on amenity, traffic or safety issues arising from the</p>

			Suggest wording change to Key Principle 6	Noted and agreed.	proposal itself or cumulatively with the existing uses in the area.”  Key Principle 6 be amended to read “The concentration of take away uses will not be permitted to increase above the existing 19% of commercial uses within the Local Centre of Ibstock.”
15	National Trust		No specific comments to make on the SPD.	Noted.	No action required.
16	English Heritage		No additional comments to make on the SPD.	Noted.	No action needed.
17	Castle Donington Parish Council		See representation No 11		
18	Leicestershire County Council		No comments to make on the SPD.	Noted.	No action needed.
19	The Theatres Trust		No comments to make on the SPD but look forward to being consulted on Local Development Documents.	Noted.	No action needed.