

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jane Langan	Date of report: 02/10/2025	Ref: 72322/ADV
Registration: 21/08/2025	LDFC: 01/10/2025	Expiry Date: 16/10/2025
Site Visit: 18/09/2025	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections:	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay:		EIA: NA
N/A		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: ADVT

Proposal: Front-lit box letters logo to shopfront; Internally illuminated replacement sign to existing projecting sign housing; Internally illuminated lightbox mounted to internal display window wall behind shopfront (high level); Internally illuminated digital display screen (behind shopfront)

Location: 24 Central Street, Bury, BL9 0JN

Description

The site is a retail unit in a pedestrian shopping development within the town centre. The application is for replacement signage for a new tenant and comprises as follows :-

- A fascia sign of internally illuminated built up letters in aluminium/acrylic 2.5m wide and 0.23m high applied to the shop front glazing above the entrance doors
- A replacement acrylic panel with logo to the existing 0.70m by 1.1m internally illuminated projecting sign housing
- To the first floor display window, wall mounted behind the shop front, a 1m by 1m internally illuminated aluminium/acrylic lightbox
- A 0.98m wide by 1.6m high internally illuminated digital display screen located to the rear of the ground floor shop front glazing to a total height of 2.3m

Relevant Planning History

52632 - 1 No. internally illuminated fascia sign; 1 No. illuminated projecting sign - AC 17/06/2010

Publicity

None.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No objection. No effect on traffic as a pedestrian area.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

EN1/9 Advertisements

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE) and the saved policies within the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP), together with other relevant material planning considerations.

The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP and PpE Policies will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;

The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

UDP Policy EN1/9 relates to adverts and signage and states that proposals should have regard to the character of the locality, scale of the existing building and land use and be considered on their impact on amenity and safety.

Amenity - The fascia sign would be appropriate in its size and design and located above the shop front and entrance in keeping with other units within the development.

The internal sign at first floor would not be over large at 1m by 1m and also in keeping with the development where signage acts as a form of display for the full height glazed units.

The projecting sign would see a new acrylic panel added to the existing housing which is a standard in size and design to the other units along the row.

The digital screen would be internally located and not overlarge in relation to the shop front glazing. This type of advertising is becoming increasingly popular and there are several units within the centre with similar.

DELEGATED REPORT

Safety - The signs are positioned where they will not cause hazard to pedestrians. The luminance level of 300cd/m2 is acceptable and given the commercial nature of the shopping row a condition is not considered necessary.

The proposal would comply with UDP Policy EN1/9 - Advertisements.

Recommendation: Approve with Standard Conditions

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JL	02/10/25		