

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jane Langan	Date of report: 07/04/2026	Ref: 72731/ADV
Registration: 16/02/2026	LDfC: 10/03/2026	Expiry Date: 13/04/2026
Site Visit: 18/02/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections:	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay:		EIA: NA
N/A		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: ADVT

Proposal: Replacement of existing signage with 1 no. freestanding static LED display located within the site boundary

Location: Frank Ratcliffe Roofing Centre, Pitt Street, Radcliffe

Description

The site relates to a roofing company and comprises of a brick building and storage yard enclosed by metal palisade fencing. It sits along Bolton Road, between Pitt Street and Acre Street, and has its entrance off Higher Dean Street to the rear. There are a number of signs attached to the Bolton Road elevation of the building and banners and signs attached to the metal fencing including a non illuminated free standing post sign to the Pitt Street side. The immediate area is generally residential with terraced properties directly opposite along Bolton Road and a Public House across at the Pitt Street junction.

The application proposes to remove the free standing non illuminated post sign, located to the rear of the fencing to the Pitt Street side, which is approximately 1.2m high and 2.4m wide. It would be replaced by a 1.9m high and 3.8m wide LED display mounted on 2.2m high posts. Adverts would relate only to the roofing business with the screen displaying static images and adverts would change no more than once every ten seconds. It would be fitted with an automatic brightness control system, regulated by ambient light sensors, with luminance levels to comply with the recommendations set out in the Institute of Lighting Professionals publication "The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements" (PLG05, 2015), or any document amending or superseding that guidance. During twilight and nighttime hours, the luminance of the display would not exceed 300 cd/m². A default safety mechanism would be incorporated so that, in the event of any malfunction or system failure, the display would automatically freeze or default to a black screen.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Publicity

None.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Recommend refusal as the sign would pose an distraction to traffic.

Transport for Greater Manchester - No comments to make.

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 PfE 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 - Advertisements on commercial premises are generally acceptable where they are properly sized and sited providing that they respect the scale of the building, are not overly large, do not cut across architectural features and respect the development around the site.

The site is located along a main road and route through Radcliffe. Terraced houses line either side of Bolton Road and there are several shops with illuminated signage and a public house however the area is predominantly residential.

The Design and Access statement with the application notes that proposed sign is comparable with the scale and size of the existing signage at the site. The sign proposed is though much larger than the existing non illuminated sign and with LED illumination it would be significantly more visible from the main street view. The application also notes that it would replace existing signage along the frontage. The removal of this would be welcomed as the frontage and railings are cluttered with small signs and banners however the sign proposed would only be viewed from one direction, approaching from the east. It is considered that the proposed sign would be unduly large in relation to the scale of the premises and would appear out of place and intrusive in the street and the LED illumination would only serve to increase its prominence. In terms of the residential properties then there would be a view of the sign from those opposite but it would not be directly facing.

Safety - The proposed sign would be located within the site to the rear of the fencing and would not be a hazard to pedestrians.

The application includes a Safety Assessment report which concludes that subject to the adoption of recommendations for luminance levels, content of images and hours of operation the proposal would pose a minimal change to the risk to road users.

No comments were made on consultation with Transport for Greater Manchester however the Local Authority Highways Section has reviewed the proposals and consider that the proposed LED display, due to its type and position in close proximity to the Pitt Street/A665 Bolton Road junction, would pose an undue distraction to approaching eastbound traffic having negotiated the bend on the adjacent classified road and vehicles manoeuvring at the junction, which would be detrimental to highway safety and maintaining the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed sign due to its size, position and means of illumination would be out of character, standing out as an intrusive feature in the street scene seriously detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. It is also considered that it would cause harm to highway safety due to posing an undue distraction to passing motorists. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to UDP Policy EN1/9 - Advertisements and is recommended for refusal.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed sign by reason of its size, siting and means of illumination would be out of character and seriously detrimental to the general visual amenities of the area and therefore contrary to the following policy of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: EN1/9 - Advertisements.
- 2 The proposed LED display, due to its type and position in close proximity to the Pitt

DELEGATED REPORT

Street/A665Bolton Road junction, would pose an undue distraction to approaching eastbound traffic having negotiated the bend on the adjacent classified road and vehicles manoeuvring at the junction, which would be detrimental to highway safety and maintaining the amenity of adjoining occupiers and therefore contrary to the following policy of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: EN1/9 - Advertisements.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JL	07/04/26	DM	08.04.2026