The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/Z/21/3287270
Advertising Right Adjacent 210 Radford Road, Coventry CV6 3BQ

- 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 Mr Ben Porte (Clear Channel UK Ltd) against the decision of Coventry City Council.
- The application Ref ADV/2021/2852, dated 15 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2021.
- The advertisement proposed is replacement of existing 48-sheet poster display with illuminated freestanding 48-sheet D-Poster display. Advert to comprise pressed metal and reinforced plastic frame. Display will be illuminated to levels recommended by ILP PLG05 and images will be static and change once every ten seconds.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the advert on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

Amenity

3. The appeal site is located on a corner plot at the junction of Radford Road and Lydgate Road. The proposed freestanding poster display would be located against the southern gable end of 210 Radford Road, a redbrick end terrace building with a commercial ground floor and a residential flat above. A small area of car parking bounded by metal palisade fencing is located immediately to the south of the proposed advert location. No 210 has a raised location adjacent to a busy traffic-controlled crossroads junction at the southern end of a small local centre for retail and business. The wider surrounding area includes residential, public open space and community facilities.

4. An extant advert consent[1] was granted in February 2021 for the replacement of the existing paper and paste display on the gable end of no 210 with an illuminated 48 sheet display. Whereas the extant consent is for a display fixed directly to the flank of no 210, the current proposal would be freestanding, with the display mounted onto 2 structural beams. The proposed beams are substantial in scale, measuring 0.533 m (depth) x 0.21 m (width). As such, whilst they would be flush against the flank elevation of no 210, the display

[1] LPA Ref: ADV/2020/3042

panel would project approximately 0.8m past the end of the building (approximately 0.435m further than the projection of the display panel under the extant consent).

5. Whilst the site is within a commercial area, surrounding buildings are of a limited scale. The incongruous industrial appearance of the supporting beams, in combination with the overall additional bulk and projection of the advert, would result in an advert more prominent and obtrusive in public views than the recently consented advert.

6. I acknowledge that the proposal would be lower than the recently consented advert. Nevertheless, the incongruous appearance and increased bulk of the proposal would contrast more unfavourably with the limited scale of the host building and the more restrained character of advertisements within the local area. It would appear as an inharmonious and visually intrusive feature at a location prominent in public views. Given the limited scale of surrounding buildings, the appeal proposal would not be an example of the type of advertisement considered to be acceptable in commercial areas in the Planning Practice Guidance[2].

7. As such, the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on amenity. In accordance with the Regulations[3], I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are relevant. The proposal would conflict with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan (adopted 2017), which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure high quality design that respects the surrounding area. It would also conflict with paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework which advises that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR

[2] Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306
[3] The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007