

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2018

**by Sue Glover BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18<sup>th</sup> September 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/W/18/3202177**

**Outside 51-65 Holdenhurst Road, Bournemouth, BH8 8GN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015.
  - The appeal is made by Infocus Public Networks Ltd against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 7-2017-18550-LP dated 5 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2018.
  - The development proposed is the installation of an electronic communications apparatus.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not approval should be given in respect of the siting and appearance of the proposal having regard to the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. Holdenhurst Road is a key connecting route in Bournemouth with a wide dual carriageway in this part, with trees in the central reservation. The proposed apparatus, a telephone call box, would be sited on the footway close to the kerb outside Lansdowne Point, an international student complex. On this side of the street there are tall, modern buildings of 5 and more storeys, giving an urban feel but with an open, spacious quality at street level with long views up and down the street.
  4. This part of the footway is wide, and busy at peak times with students and office workers. It has an uncluttered appearance with limited street furniture including lighting columns and highway signs, and a pelican crossing further to the north.
  5. Notwithstanding the open side and glass panels, the call box with a footprint of about 1.32m by 1.11m, and a height of about 2.56m would not be insubstantial in size and it would appear as a significant item of street furniture. Although a simple design with toughened glass panels and steel frame, there is potential for dirt and dust accumulation resulting in an opaque rather than a transparent glazed appearance.
-

6. The call box would be sited close to the edge of the kerb and would have a bulky appearance of a different character from the other, more slim-line kerbside street furniture. Although its appearance would be in keeping with the modern design of the adjacent building with its substantial glazing and dark coloured frames, it would appear as an isolated feature separated from the building's façade. The spacious character of the street would be eroded, and long street views partially disrupted.
7. Taking all these matters into account, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposed call box would materially harm the character and appearance of the area. There would be conflict with development plan policies, insofar as those policies are a material consideration to this appeal for prior approval. I have also taken into account current policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, and other national planning and highway guidance, in so far as they are relevant to matters of siting and appearance.

### **Other Matters**

8. As the principle of development is established by the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO), the need for the call box is not a relevant matter. The appeal relates to a call box only and not any advertisement consent that may otherwise be required. Given the wide footway remaining, the proposal would not create a significant impediment to safe pedestrian movement or to those with a visual or mobility disability.
9. I have no reason to consider that the call box would encourage anti-social behaviour as the design is not fully enclosed. It would have a graffiti proof external finish intended to discourage vandalism, and there is nearby street lighting and natural surveillance of the site. There would be benefits of a fully accessible design to aid those with impaired mobility who rely on a wheelchair or scooter, and PV roof modules to generate solar power to illuminate the interior.
10. I have taken into consideration other appeal decisions by another Inspector for similar proposals in the locality, but I have judged this proposal on its own merits in respect of its own individual siting and appearance.

### **Conclusion**

11. I have taken into account all the other matters, but the cumulative benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal therefore does not succeed.

*Sue Glover*

INSPECTOR