

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 08/01/2026	Ref: 72570/ADV
Registration: 21/11/2025	LDFC: 19/12/2025	Expiry Date: 16/01/2026
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections:	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: ADVT

Proposal: Non-illuminated advertising panels to all 4 sides of existing telecommunications cabinet

Location: Pavement adjacent to 103-123 Water Street, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 3BJ

Description

The application relates to a green telecoms box which is located on a footway on a main road to Radcliffe Town Centre.

The cabinet is set against a low wall and black railings which form the front boundary to an apartment development.

The cabinet itself is approximately 1.2m x 1.2m and dark green in colour. Advert panels have been added to all sides.

The application seeks advertisement consent for the advert panels to all 4 sides of the telecommunications cabinet. The unit is covered on 4 sides by posters adverts for the company which comprises 2 x 1196mm x 576mm posters to both the front and back and 270.5mm x 1193mm to each side panel.

The posters comprise of a dark blue background with white text, noted to be aluminium and advertises the broadband supplier. A number of separate applications for the same advertising to cabinets at different sites within the Local Authority area have been also submitted.

Relevant Planning History

n/a

Publicity

n/a

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Recommends refusal

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN1/4	Street Furniture
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.

Policy EN1/9 - Advertisements states that the Council will seek to control advertisements in the interests of amenity and public safety in order to enhance the quality of the Borough's environment.

Para 141 of the NPPF states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Amenity

The cabinet is a stand alone unit located on a footway in an open area and viewed in

isolation without any connection to existing commercial premises or its advertising. The unit is dark green in colour and without the panels would blend well without being a particularly noticeable feature. Street furniture does not generally have advertising. Bus shelters can be used for advertising purposes and this is commonly seen, however these are items of street furniture which are placed to be noticed and used by members of the public. In this instance, the addition of the panels results in the unit standing out as an unduly intrusive feature in the street, particularly given the unit is set against the gardens of a residential development and therefore is harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

Commercial advertising can add interest and vitality to an area however it can be visually intrusive where inappropriately placed. There are a high number of these cabinets within the borough, from different suppliers, and consideration should be given to the principle of advertising of this nature which could result in a proliferation of advertising and visual clutter. Whilst each site is assessed on its own merits the view regarding this has previously been supported on Appeal Decision APP/T4210/H/11/2149282 and 5 further linked appeals 2149283,2149284,2149285,2149286,2149287.

As such, the proposal for the poster adverts is considered unacceptable and contrary to policy EN1/9 and the principles of the NPPF.

Safety

The Traffic Section have been consulted and recommend refusal on the grounds that the advert would result in the unauthorised display of an advertisement on the adopted highway on infrastructure not approved for that purpose, which would pose an undue distraction to traffic on the adjacent classified road, set an unwelcome precedent and be detrimental to highway safety and maintaining the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

The proposed advert is located on an existing street cabinet. The position is such that it would not cause a hazard to pedestrians. In terms of distraction, the signage contains a lot of text and at different font sizes. There are a lot of words there and could cause a degree of distraction to highway road users and drivers travelling along the main road or existing the adjacent side road. Moreover, the proliferation of such cabinets within the street scape are such that the acceptance of the degree and nature of signage would be difficult to resist elsewhere as a principle and as such, there is merit in the distraction argument put forward in this instance.

As such, the proposal for the poster adverts is considered unacceptable and contrary to policy EN1/9 and the principles of the NPPF.

Further issue

The application form notes that the applicant does not own the land where the advert is placed and has not sought permission, giving the reason that the 'panels are attached to cabinets which are installed in the public highway'. Advert consent includes 5 standard conditions, the first of which is the requirement to have the permission of the owner of the site, and this includes the highway authority if the sign is to be placed on highway land. As such the applicant would not be able to comply with this condition.

As the proposal would not comply with UDP Policy EN1/9 - Advertisements it is recommended the application is refused.

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

DELEGATED REPORT

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 would, by reason of its size and siting, be out of character and severely detrimental to the general visual amenities of the area as it would introduce an alien and discordant feature in the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the following policy of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: EN1/9 - Advertisements.
- 2 The proposal would result in the unauthorised display of an advertisement on the adopted highway on infrastructure not approved for that purpose, which would pose an undue distraction to traffic on the adjacent classified road, set an unwelcome precedent and be detrimental to highway safety and maintaining the amenity of adjoining occupiers. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies EN1/9, JP-C5 and JP-C8.
- 3 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that they have the consent of the landowners and therefore they are unable to comply with Condition 1 of Schedule 2 The Standard Conditions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT 8/1/26		DM 08/01/26	