



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2024 by T Bennett BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/23/3330981

126 Grayswood Avenue, Coventry CV5 8HP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Neil Jones on behalf of InPost UK against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2023/0001588/FUL, dated 27 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Application for siting of parcel locker (retrospective).'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the installation on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located outside a convenience store within a small parade of shops in a prominent position on the corner of Grayswood Avenue and Dulverton Avenue. The store has a dual aspect frontage with the shop windows covered over with advertising. Illuminated signage and a box security shutter are above the windows.
5. The locker is on top of a concrete plinth, in front of one of the windows. Owing to its large scale and notwithstanding its muted colour, the locker appears as an overly bulky addition. The window concerned is already obscured, but the locker is off-centre thereto, appearing discordant against the building as a whole. None of the surrounding commercial units have a fixture that obscures the shop frontage, nor protrudes forward of what is a distinct and character forming building line. The locker thus jars with the pleasant consistency of local commercial frontages.
6. The canopy at the top of the locker, due to being alongside the existing box shutter and illuminated store signage, garners a cluttered appearance to the shop frontage, adding to the above harms to the character and appearance of the area. Such that there is conflict with Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan 2017 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure development proposals

respect and enhance their surroundings and positively contribute to the character of the area. It also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) in this regard.

Other Matters

7. As I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds, I have not investigated matters relating to noise disturbance, litter and increased vehicular activity. These were not contentious issues for the Council in any event and I have no compelling reason to disagree.
8. The development does provide benefits which help achieve some of the Framework's sustainability objectives and the climate change adaptations promoted by Policy EM1. The locker has the potential for linked trips which could support local businesses. By having a central drop off/pick up point, it can reduce the number of trips by customers and delivery drivers, leading to reduced congestion and improved air quality. However, the Framework and the development plan also seek to achieve well-designed places. The proposal adds an incongruous structure in a prominent location. I remain to be convinced, in the absence of alternative arrangements particularly, that the benefits are worth the harm. That and the associated conflict with the development plan being worthy of substantial weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR