
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/Z/25/3371534

890 Hedon Road, Hull HU9 5PL

- 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 Limited against the decision of Kingston-Upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00381/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the erection of 1x D-Poster Advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has submitted a Highway Safety Report with the appeal. However, as the appeal is following the streamlined CAS appeal route there is no mechanism for the Council or other interested parties to have made comment upon its findings. Whilst it would be procedurally unfair in such circumstances for me to rely upon it in my determination of the appeal, in any event it does not address the specific areas of concern that I observed during my site visit.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Traffic joining the roundabout from Northern Gateway is not traffic light controlled. However, there is traffic light control once on the roundabout for those vehicles proceeding north either onto Littlefair Road or onto Hedon Road in an eastbound direction. There is only limited space available for vehicles that have moved onto the roundabout but are waiting for those traffic lights to change. There is as a result the potential that this line of queuing traffic might backup to the point that it impedes traffic moving across the roundabout, and in particular that continuing along Hedon Road from the east in a westbound direction. Vehicles moving in that direction would need to be fully aware of such a possibility, and they may be moving at speed if the traffic lights which control their entry to the roundabout are on green.
5. Reference is made in the submissions of both parties to the roundabout being at the gateway to the Port of Hull. This includes access to the ferry terminal, which is consistent with the road signage that I observed at my site visit. There would seem therefore to be a great potential for a significant number of vehicles to be using this

roundabout at times when ferries have docked and vehicles are leaving. It would be likely that many drivers would not be local and thus not be overly familiar with the functioning of this roundabout. These factors, along with the fact that the exit from Northern Gateway is not traffic light controlled, to my mind increases the likelihood that more vehicles may end up waiting at the traffic lights in question than can be accommodated without impairing traffic movement across the roundabout east to west.

6. The proposed advertisement would be sited so that its predominant impact would be on the eye line of drivers who are heading along Hedon Road and across the roundabout in a westbound direction. Due to the alignment of the road and physical features in the area, the advert would appear most clearly to the driver as they crossed the roundabout. It would be illuminated and its images would change, albeit at defined intervals. Their primary viewing of the advert would be likely to be at a similar point that they would need to be able to anticipate any tailback from the traffic lights which would block their path. There is to my mind a clear conflict between the presence of the proposed advertisement in such a location and public safety interests in the circumstances I have described.
7. I have a further concern in terms of the access to the business on whose land the proposed advert would be located. This access lies close to the roundabout, on the westbound part of Hedon Road. There were large vehicles present on that site at the time of my visit. Vehicles turning into that site would need to slow just as they have left the roundabout, potentially having to wait for any larger vehicles leaving the site to join Hedon Road or choosing to hold traffic behind themselves to allow the exiting vehicle to join the carriageway. Exiting vehicles may result in the braking of vehicles entering this section of Hedon Road. This all raises the possibility that traffic would back up onto the roundabout. Again, this would take place towards the area where drivers would have the greatest potential to be distracted by the proposed advertisement.
8. Neither the Highway Authority nor National Highways identified specific areas of concern, beyond both objecting to the proposal. I accept that the above are my observations made at my site visit, but I consider that I spent enough time in the location to gain a reasonable understanding of how the roundabout works and may work if it experiences peaks of traffic. The possibility of a conflict with public safety interests was clearly evident. This may be able to be disproved in highway safety terms through a more technical assessment. However, this has not been undertaken in these specific regards, and I cannot permit the display of an advertisement which, based on the information before me and what I have seen, has a likelihood of resulting in significant harm to public safety.
9. The appellant refers to accident data which shows that a limited number of crashes have occurred in the location within the last five years. However, this is without the sign being present. Given that I have identified areas of potential conflict and that the proposed advertisement might affect driver concentration, I do not consider that this data supports a position that the proposal would be a safe addition. That the proposal would not obscure any directional signs, CCTV or traffic lights does not overcome my concerns, nor does the fact that such adverts are common and now expected or that industry standard planning conditions restricting things like illumination levels and display intervals could be imposed.

10. My attention has been drawn to what the appellant considers to be comparable sites both within the Council's own area and in other local authority areas. However, it would seem to me that each individual location has its own safety considerations relating to the specific design and layout of the public highway and the relative placing of the advertisement. I do not consider that reference to any of the examples provided explains why the concerns I have identified in this particular case should not be deemed to be a risk to public safety.
11. I therefore conclude that the submission fails to demonstrate that the proposal would not cause harm to public safety due to its positioning. I have taken into account Policy 20 of the Local Plan 2017 which seeks to protect public safety and so is material in this case, together with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Given I have concluded that there is a likelihood that the proposal would be detrimental to public safety, the proposal conflicts with these policies.

Other Matters

12. The appellant further refers to a number of benefits of digital advertising in economic, social and environmental terms. I also acknowledge that digital displays are part of a wider strategic scheme that will replace the number of displays and reduce clutter by removing traditional paper poster boards. However, I can only base my assessment of an advertisement consent appeal on the effect that the proposal would have on the interests of amenity and public safety. The wider reduction in the number of displays nationwide does not justify harm to public safety.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR