The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/Z/21/3270362
97 Holyhead Road, Coventry CV1 3AD

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
- The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of Coventry City Council.
- The application Ref ADV/2020/2812, dated 4 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2021.
- The advertisement proposed is upgrade of existing 48 sheet advert to support digital poster.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Based on the information before me the proposal seeks to replace a paper advertising board with a digital poster. At the time of my site visit I noted that the paper hoarding had been removed. The Council considered the scheme on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located on the junction of Holyhead Road and Minster Road. It is a two storey end terrace property and neighbours a single storey retail unit. Holyhead Road is a busy route in and out of the city centre. The road junction is wide at this point due to the set back of properties on the corners. Due to this openness the flank wall of the host property is a prominent feature in views of the surrounding area.

5. The site lies within the Nauls Mill Conservation Area (CA) and despite the presence of some commercial uses the area largely retains its historic residential character defined by attractive red brick buildings.

6. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, in accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

7. I acknowledge that the proposal would replace a previous advertising board having a similar size, position and orientation. However, I find that it would be

oversized and out of scale with the host property obscuring a significant area of the flank wall and extending right up to the windows unacceptably dominating its appearance. In addition, due to the protruding chimney breast the proposed poster display would sit proud of the bulk of the building resulting in an unduly prominent and visually intrusive feature in the area.

8. The appeal building is located opposite locally listed buildings but given the separation between them I am satisfied that the proposal would not significantly affect their settings. However, overall, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA due to its size and prominence.

9. The appellant has suggested that the luminance between the previous hoarding and the proposed poster display would not result in a material difference and the changeover of images would not distract drivers. I also note a number of conditions in respect of the display, including levels of luminance in line with industry standards have been suggested. I am also mindful that the poster would display only static images. However, even with regard to these matters I find that the proposed digital poster would be an intrusive feature.

10. The proposal may well also have benefits in terms of maintenance and waste, CO2 emissions, energy requirements and business rates. I acknowledge that the poster could be used to display public art and messages beneficial to the community, but there is no certainty that this would occur. In any event these factors would not outweigh the harm to amenity that I have identified.

11. Whilst the previous paper advertising hoarding was in place for a number of years, it has since been removed and is not justification for a scheme that I have found to be harmful.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on amenity. In accordance with the Regulations[1], I have taken into account policies DE1 and HE2 of the Coventry Local Plan (2017) which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies. For the same reasons, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR

[1] The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007