



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2025

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3445/Z/25/3366099

Soudal House Unit 1 Centurion Park Watling Street, Wilnecote, Tamworth B77 5PN

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against the refusal to grant permission for express consent to display an advertisement.
- The appeal is made by Clear Channel UK against the decision of Tamworth Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 0037/2025.
- The development proposed is Installation of internally illuminated 48-sheet D-Poster advertisement.

Decisions

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) make clear that control of advertisements should only be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material and any other relevant factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) reiterates this approach. I have therefore taken Policy EN5 of the Tamworth Borough Local Plan 2006-2031 (2016) (LP) into account only insofar as it is material.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed replacement digital display on (a) visual amenity including the amenity of neighbouring users and (b) on pedestrian and highway safety.

Reasons

Amenity

4. The proposed internally illuminated 48-sheet D poster would be located at the edge of the south-west quadrant of a large traffic island which addresses, in addition to the slip roads to/from the A5 dual carriageway near its intersection with the M42, Quarry Hill and the entrance to Centurion Park. This is part of a business and

employment area populated with large buildings including Soudal House and a budget hotel. Whilst I note the appellants description of the immediate surroundings, the public realm within which the proposed display would be experienced is nevertheless a greened and spacious environment due to established planting which creates a calm visual setting both to the traffic island and along Quarry Hill. This is a principal feeder road from the M42/A5 leading to the extensive residential areas of Wilnecote and surrounding areas. Signage is largely limited to that necessary for negotiation of the road network, to business names and individual sites.

5. The nearest residential area to the proposed display would be Glendale Court and in particular the line of south-facing two storey houses set on higher ground above Quarry Hill. Although fronted by hedges and a line of tall conifers these do not effectively screen the upper floor bedroom windows of some houses which would thereby have a direct view of the location proposed for the display. Although most apparent to incoming traffic from the A5, the proposed display would nevertheless introduce an awareness, whether directly or indirectly, of frequently changing commercial images which would significantly harm the character of the outlook experienced by occupiers of these houses.
6. Notwithstanding the specific backdrop of the location, the proposed display would appear as a prominent and uncharacteristic feature in the street scene. Whilst national guidance directs that advertisements may be more acceptable in commercial areas and where there are major roads, and the absence of similar displays¹ is not a determinative factor, each case must be determined on an individual basis with regard to amenity. In this case I consider the proposed display would have a detrimental impact upon visual amenity of the location² where the commercial uses are well screened by established tree belts, a factor which would emphasise the intrusive effect of the proposed display as an alien feature.

Highway safety.

7. The proposed display would be encountered by users of the traffic island and widely visible to those approaching from the north and east (A5) directions such that most users will have ample forewarning or be likely familiar with its presence. The layout of the traffic island is an uncomplicated four-arm layout with pavements and crossing points presenting few prospects for confusion by users who will be unlikely to be distracted by the changing images. Whilst there will be situations where a display of this type could be a harmful distraction and so present risk to highway safety, my observations direct that this would not be the case here.

Conclusion

8. Overall, notwithstanding the absence of harm to highway safety, including upon pedestrians, I consider that the proposal would cause an unacceptable impact on visual amenity of the area and therefore conclude, taking all matters raised into account and for the reasons given, that the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ Or paper and paste hoardings

² and of residential amenity for some local users