



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 January 2026

by **JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2026

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/Z/25/3375692**

#### **Footpath outside 151 Far Gosford Street, Coventry CV1 5DY**

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) against a refusal to grant express consent.
  - The appeal is made by BT Group PLC against the decision of Coventry City Council.
  - The application Ref is PL/2025/0001702/ADV.
  - The development proposed is the installation of one BT Street Hub unit and associated advertisement panels on either side of the unit.
- 

### **Appeal B: 6001610**

#### **Footpath outside 151 Far Gosford Street, Coventry CV1 5DY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by BT Group PLC against the decision of Coventry City Council.
  - The application Ref is PL/2025/0001703/FUL.
  - The development proposed is the installation of new BT Street Hub and associated display of advertisement panels to both sides of the unit.
- 

## Decisions

### **Appeal A: APP/U4610/Z/25/3375692**

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the installation of one BT Street Hub unit and associated advertisement panels on either side of the unit on the footpath outside 151 Far Gosford Street, Coventry CV1 5DY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/0001702/ADV. The consent is for 5 years from the date of this decision and is subject to the 5 standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.

### **Appeal B: 6001610**

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a new BT Street Hub and associated display of advertisement panels to both sides of the unit on the footpath outside 151 Far Gosford Street, Coventry CV1 5DY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/0001703/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings COV-002 001 Rev A, COV-002 002 Rev A, COV-002 003 Rev A & COV-002 004 Rev A.

- 3) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, the 2 existing BT phone boxes on the footpath adjacent 147 Far Gosford St, Coventry CV1 5DY (as shown in Figure 5 of the appellant's Appeal Statement dated November 2025), shall be removed and the land restored to a condition which matches the footway immediately surrounding their site.

## **Main Issues**

3. Having regard to the location of the site within the Far Gosford Street Conservation Area, the main issues with these appeals are the effect on amenity (Appeal A) and whether the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area and harm its significance (Appeal B).

## **Reasons**

4. Far Gosford Street currently has the character and appearance of a vibrant and lively street with numerous shops, bars and restaurants along its length. When I visited at around dusk, I noted the high level of illumination that was apparent from not just the diverse range of advertisements on the premises along the road, but also from the large shop windows and the streetlighting, and this emphasises the road's active commercial character. Moreover, throughout the conservation area there tends to be much street furniture, as would be expected of a busy commercial centre with what appears to be a high footfall. Overall, the significance of the conservation area therefore lies, in part, in it containing an eclectic mix of buildings of various ages and styles that, along with the intervening public spaces, reflect its role as a commercial centre for many years.
5. The stretch of pavement subject of this appeal is lined by shops, restaurants and similar, many of which have modern retail frontages with extensive glazing, while across the road is a large recent development of a contemporary design. The pavement on which the hub would be sited contains sizeable stone plinths with trees, interspersed by streetlights and waste bins. As a result, the road is already brightly lit in the evenings and there is an extensive amount of street furniture on the pavement, though its width means a clear passage for pedestrians is retained.
6. Although it would be an additional element, the proposed hub would be situated between the plinths, bins and light columns and so it would be within the arrangement of existing street features. Therefore, it would not be extending street furniture onto new areas of the pavement or adding to any sense of clutter. Furthermore, with the recently constructed block opposite and the various shop fronts adjacent, the hub would not appear as a discordant or uncharacteristically modern feature in this streetscape. Finally, given the level of lighting already in the vicinity, any additional illumination from the advertisements would not be striking or dominant to a harmful degree, and would not exacerbate the existing situation.
7. As part of the development it was also proposed to remove 3 existing telephone boxes. One is nearly a kilometre away and well outside the conservation area, and so has no bearing on the scheme's merits. The other 2 though stand side-by-side just to the east on the corner of Vecqueray Street. Although not in the red line of the site, they are close by and this hub is intended as their replacement. To my mind, and having regard to the effect of the development on the conservation area as a whole, removing these bulkier phone boxes with their greater footprint, and replacing them (albeit a little distance away) with the slim-lined feature before me would be to the benefit of the area's character and appearance. Such a matter

could be secured by imposing a condition on Appeal B, but it would need to be negatively worded to give a clear timeframe for these works to be undertaken.

8. A locally listed building, the Calcott Cycle Works, is to the west. The significance of this lies partly in the way that elements of its detailing on the front elevation reflect the building's function and late Victorian origins. Although Far Gosford Street is commercial in nature, it contributes to the building's significance by providing a setting that allows the frontage to be readily experienced. For the reasons stated, and given the separation between the 2, I consider any effect the scheme would have on this setting would not adversely affect the significance of that non-designated heritage asset.
9. In assessing these appeals I appreciate that the Management Plan identifies a poor public realm in the conservation area. However I consider that what is before me would not be causing harm in that regard or making that situation worse. Rather, the proposal would have a neutral effect on the significance of the conservation area. I have also had regard to the numerous appeal decisions submitted. However, they seem to be based very much on the specific context of each case, and I see nothing in them to lead me to different findings in this specific instance.
10. As such the proposal would not fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area, it would not harm the significance of that designated heritage asset or the nearby non-designated heritage asset, and it would not harm amenity. As a result, it would not conflict with Policies DE1 and HE2 in the *Coventry City Council Local Plan*, which seek to safeguard heritage assets and secure development of a high quality design that respects its surroundings.

## Conclusion

11. Accordingly I conclude that advertisement consent should be granted for Appeal A, and planning permission granted for Appeal B.

*JP Sargent*

INSPECTOR