



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2025

By Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/Z/24/3357433

232 Foleshill Road, Coventry, CV1 4HW

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Ltd against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0001698/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the replacement of 1 no. existing paper and paste display with 1 no. digital display (D-Poster).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on public safety.

Reasons

3. The Council's decision notice refers to a conflict with policies AC1 and AC2 of the Coventry Local Plan 2016. These policies are not determinative, as proposals for Advertisement Consent are determined solely in relation to amenity and public safety. Nevertheless, the policies assist in understanding the Council's reasoning.
4. The proposed advertisement would replace an existing paper and paste display which is attached to the side gable wall of a retail shop. It is situated within an area of mixed uses, which includes a number of commercial uses and their associated signs and advert displays.
5. Number 232 is situated at a traffic light-controlled 'T' junction between Foleshill Road and Cash's Lane. Traffic also enters and exits Honeyfield Road, which is close to the main junction and the appeal site.
6. The proposed digital display would be the same dimensions as the existing paper and paste advertisement and I note that the Council has no objection to the proposal on amenity grounds. Given that the proposal would effectively be a replacement, I agree that the change would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the street scene.
7. Turning to the main issue, I consider the proposed display would have the potential to distract drivers and other highway users when using, what is, a busy junction that leads to and from the city centre. Whilst there would be no moving images and the intensity of illumination could be controlled, the display would be particularly prominent and fully in view when approaching from the northern direction, at a point

where lane discipline and the need to concentrate on the changing traffic signals requires a driver's full attention. The display would also be visible, albeit at an angle, when approaching the junction with Cash's Lane.

8. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account other examples of what the appellant considers to be similar proposals both locally and further afield. This includes an appeal decision (APP/B4215/Z/23/3320504) at land at Fairfield Street, Manchester. In my opinion, no two sites are the same and my decision is based on my observations of the volume and nature of traffic using the junction at the appeal site. I also observed at my site visit that a similar display exists on Foleshill Road to the north of the junction. However, that display does not directly face the traffic at the junction and it, therefore, does not compare to the appeal proposal.
9. The appellant points to the low accident rate at the junction and the fact that drivers are continually having to assimilate changes and different scenarios when driving. That may be the case, but it does not convince me that the risk to public safety would not increase, if consent was granted.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR