

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 17/02/2025	Ref: 71477/ADV
Registration: 23/12/2024	LDFC: 21/02/2025	Expiry Date: 17/02/2025
Site Visit: 31/01/2025	Site Notice: 31/01/2025	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: ADVT

Proposal: Advertisement consent for 2 no. digital 75 inch LCD display screens either side of 1 no. BT street hub unit

Location: Pavement between Roma 268 Bury New Road & Morrisons, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 8QS

Description

The application relates to an area of pavement outside of 268/Morrisons on Bury New Road. Bury New Road is an A road - the A56 . The area of pavement is located to the west of Morrisons supermarket with a row of commercial properties directly facing the site. The site is located within a district shopping centre. All Saints Conservation Area is located to the south west of the site.

Advert consent is sought for the installation of 2no. LED advertisement panels to the front and rear of a communication hub. The proposed screens would be encased within a hub that measures 1236mm wide and 2986mm high.

Relevant Planning History

71498 - Installation of 1 no. BT Street Hub Unit with 2 no. digital 75 inch LCD display screens either side of unit and relocation of existing phone kiosk - Pending

Publicity

Not relevant

1 objection received:

- I have seen these advertising screens in Manchester. They emit significant glare in the day and especially at night.
- This site is a busy pavement and the road approaches the exit to Morrisons, a busy junction and pedestrian crossing and tram station.
- This will cause difficulties for any drivers, but some especially are affected by glare at night and in wet conditions.
- As such, these advertising screens will be a safety issue with little benefit to the community. Allowing "community ads" does not offset the potential for a motorist to not see a cyclist or pedestrian, leading to injury or worse.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Recommendation for refusal due to pedestrian safety, clutter, restriction of visibility, lack of information in relation to driver distraction, access to the cycle parking facilities.

Conservation Officer - No objections raised.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

S1/3	Shopping in District Centres
EN1/9	Advertisements
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
EN1/10	Telecommunications
EN1/4	Street Furniture
HT5/1	Access For Those with Special Needs
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
EN2/1	Character of Conservation Areas
EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework

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.

Amenity

NPPF Paragraph 141 states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

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. UDP Policy EN1/4 - Street Furniture states that the Council will encourage the provision of suitably located and well designed street furniture which satisfies the requirements of pedestrians, shoppers and other uses and enhances the character and appearance of the urban street scene including open spaces.

UDP Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design seeks to protect the character and townscape of the boroughs towns. PfE Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places aims to promote a series of beautiful, healthy and varied places.

This proposed site is located on an already cluttered stretch of public footpath with bike storage, a bus shelter, highways signage, bins, lighting columns and junction boxes all located within the immediate vicinity of the site. The site plan submitted in support of the application is poor and fails to show the location of all of the existing street furniture including a bus stop/shelter, bins etc to the south of the proposed site. The proposal would also fail to maintain existing desire lines on the adopted highway. The introduction of an additional item of street furniture, and associated advertisements in this location is therefore considered to lead to additional clutter in the street scene that would not be acceptable.

The proposed advertisement would be sited in an isolated position at the edge of the highway that would cause a detrimental increase in street furniture on this stretch of pavement causing unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the street scene. The location of the proposed advertisement screens would represent an incongruous structure in its proposed position and would conflict with desired sight lines from the adjacent bus stop.

All Saints Conservation Area is separated from the site by the A56, and is located adjacent to a more modern shopping centre. Given this relationship, and the existing proliferation of street furniture in this location, it is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

As such the proposal would conflict with the aims of the policies set out above.

Public/Highway Safety

In addition to the policies set out above PfE Policies JP-C5 and JP-C6 require streets to be well designed and managed to make a significant positive contribution to the quality of place and support high levels of walking, cycling and public transport.

The proposed advertisement would be located on the adopted highway.

No driver distraction survey has been submitted for the 2no. LED screens despite their proximity to the A56, signalised junction and adjacent bus stop. The site specific supporting information states "the position where the BT Street Hub is to be located in relation to the

road would not cause any interference with nearby road signs and or navigational lights." This is not an adequate assessment of the impact the proposed LCD display screens, and appears to be the same assessment provided within the supporting information for all sites currently under consideration rather than a site specific response. The applicant has therefore failed to adequately assess the impact of the proposed screens for passing motorists on the A56 and on the approach to the adjacent signalised junction, to the detriment of highway safety.

The site plan submitted with the application is misleading, suggesting a pavement width of 3350mm but including land that is not adopted highway and is in fact a public forecourt in association with the adjacent supermarket. This area of land could be fenced off by the land owner should they so wish, or the bike stands could be replaced/moved etc. The pavement width in this location, when reviewed in relation to the limits of adoption is actually reduced to a minimum of 1.4 metres which is not sufficient according to the site specific information submitted in support of the application. A busy footpath, on main road (A56) should not be reduced in width to this extent. In addition there is potential for the siting of the proposed advertisement to restrict access to the adjacent cycle parking facilities on the private forecourt of Morrisons.

It is considered the position in which the proposed advertisement screens would be sited would conflict with pedestrian movement in general or those with mobility impairment along this stretch of pavement, particularly when considered alongside the existing street furniture that has been set out above.

The proposal would also restrict visibility to the north of approaching southbound buses on the A56 (Bury New Road) for pedestrians waiting at the adjacent bus stop, which would be contrary to the Council's 'Bury Local Transport Strategy' travel aspirations. The close proximity of the signage to this bus stop would also impact on the pedestrian safety of those using the bus stop due to the additional street clutter, and restriction of pedestrian desire lines.

The proposed siting of the advertisements would therefore result in an unnecessary obstruction of the existing adopted highway and the creation of additional street clutter for an installation that primarily consists of an advertisement screen which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety, maintaining existing pedestrian desire lines and contrary to the active travel aspirations of the Council.

As such the proposal would conflict with the policy considerations set out above.

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 advertisement screens and hub within which they are sited would result in an unnecessary and unacceptable obstruction of the existing adopted highway on the A56 (Bury New Road) and the creation of additional street clutter for

an installation that primarily consists of an advertisement screen, which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety, maintaining existing pedestrian desire lines on the adopted highway on Bury New Road and contrary to the active travel aspirations of the Council. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Development Plan: EN1/9 - Advertisements, EN1/4 - Street Furniture, EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design, JP-P1 Sustainable Places, JP-C5 Streets for All, JP - C6 - Walking and Cycling and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2 The proposal would result in an unacceptable obstruction of the existing adopted footway on the A56 (Bury New Road) in close proximity to the existing bus stop, and would restrict visibility to the north of approaching southbound buses on the A56 (Bury New Road) for pedestrians waiting at the adjacent bus stop, which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety, maintaining existing pedestrian desire lines on the adopted highway on Bury New Road and would be contrary to the Council's 'Bury Local Transport Strategy' travel aspirations. The proposal therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan EN1/9 Advertisements. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Development Plan: EN1/9 - Advertisements, EN1/4 - Street Furniture, EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design, JP-P1 Sustainable Places, JP-C5 Streets for All, JP - C6 - Walking and Cycling and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to properly assess the impact the proposed LCD display screens will have on driver distraction for passing motorists on the A56 and on the approach to the adjacent signalised junction, to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan EN1/9 Advertisements. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Development Plan: EN1/9 - Advertisements, EN1/4 - Street Furniture, EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design, JP-P1 Sustainable Places, JP-C5 Streets for All, JP - C6 - Walking and Cycling and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The proposed advertisements, by virtue of their illumination, size and siting would appear as an incongruous addition to the street scene which would be severely detrimental to both the appearance of the streetscene and to the general visual amenities of the area contrary to Development Plan Policies EN1/9 - Advertisements, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, EN1/4 - Street Furniture, JP-P1 Sustainable Places and the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP	17/02/2025	HL	17/02/25