



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/Q3630/W/25/3363952

Footpath outside Tesco Extra, 117 Station Road, Addlestone, KT15 2AS

- 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 Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.24/1607.
 - The development proposed is described as the “installation of 1No. BT Street Hub Unit and associated advertisement panels on either side of the unit”.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Q3630/H/25/3363953

Footpath outside Tesco Extra, 117 Station Road, Addlestone, KT15 2AS

- 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 BT Group PLC against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.24/1641.
 - The advertisement proposed is “two digital 75 inch LCD display screen, one on each side of the Street Hub unit”.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the “installation of 1No. BT Street Hub Unit and associated advertisement panels on either side of the unit” at Footpath outside Tesco Extra, 117 Station Road, Addlestone KT15 2AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RU.24/1607, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers: ADL-101 Proposed Site Elevation, ADL-101 Proposed Site Plan, BT Street Hub Unit Dimensions.
2. Appeal B is allowed, and express consent is granted for two digital 75 inch LCD display screen, one on each side of the Street Hub unit at Footpath outside Tesco Extra, 117 Station Road, Addlestone KT15 2AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RU.24/1607. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional condition:
 - 1) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisement permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 600 candela per metre and the illumination shall be static.

Appeal Procedure

3. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

4. The descriptions on the application forms differ to the decision notices. I am however, satisfied that they accurately describe the proposals in each case. The main parties would not be prejudiced by me using them.
5. Appeal A relates to planning permission for the hub and Appeal B advertisement consent thereon. To avoid duplication, I have dealt with the two schemes together. In respect to Appeal B, The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 sets out the relevant considerations for this type of appeal. These are amenity and public safety.
6. The main issues of Appeal A are the effect of a) the installation on the character and appearance of the area and b) the proposal on highway safety with particular regard to the free flow of pedestrians. The main issues of Appeal B are the effect of the advertisement in terms of a) amenity and b) public safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance/ Amenity

7. The appeal site is outside of a supermarket, between its side elevation and the carriageway. It is a fairly wide and open paved space. There is some street furniture close by including a bench, a refuse container, a lampstand, a bus shelter and a disused phone box. Despite this, the street scene is uncluttered since items are well spaced. There are a number of street trees in the wider area, and it is commercially vibrant, near to a relatively busy roundabout.
8. The overall height and scale of the hub would be modest given the space around it. It would complement rather than crowd the street scene along with the other smaller items of furniture. It would appear diminutive against the lampstand, trees and bus shelter. In the context of the larger scale graphics in some of the supermarket side windows and the advertisement on the bus shelter, the signage on the hub would not be overly obvious. It would be read against the larger scale of the supermarket building and an otherwise plain backdrop. There would not be an unacceptable proliferation of signage, and the overall feel of the installation would be befitting of the area's general liveliness.
9. I only have limited information on the examples cited by the Council. The map that has been provided shows the locations of other advertisements and it is clear there is sufficient separation distance between them and this proposal for there not be any unacceptable cluttering around the appeal site.
10. In terms of Appeal A, the scheme would therefore comply with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030 (LP) which seeks to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard. In terms of Appeal B, with this and the above in mind, the advertisement signage taken as a whole would be acceptable in amenity terms and comply with the 2007 regulations.

11. The Council has drawn my attention to Policy EE1 which seeks to ensure that proposals are of a high quality with particular regard to amenity. The policies are a material consideration of the proposal and as a result of the above the scheme would sit appropriately with their aims. They have not been decisive.

Highway/ Public Safety

12. The appeal proposal is to be sited within the publicly owned highway with a wide parcel of privately owned land next to the supermarket making the entire area much wider. The areas of land have a clear separation line; however, they are unrestricted, and pedestrians are free to roam across the entirety of the external space. Whilst under private ownership, any closure or blocking of this space would restrict access to the supermarket. I have not been provided any evidence that the land is at risk of closure.
13. Moreover, even if the private land was blocked off, I am sufficiently convinced that even though the pathway would be narrower than 3m where the hub would be located as per the Surrey County Council's Healthy Streets Guidance (SCCHSG) it can be reduced for short sections to 1.5m. The gap between the hub and the edge of the pathway would marginally exceed this figure and therefore would comply with the SCCHSG. Moreover, for the short amount of smaller pathway it would provide, pedestrians would not be required to enter into the carriageway as there would be enough space to pass by or pause for a moment should there be passing pedestrians. Given the space available, the low risk of closure and the shortness of encumbered areas should this be the case, I do not see this arrangement being detrimental to the passage of less able bodied people, the elderly or those with small children.
14. With the above in mind, and in terms of Appeal A, the proposed hub would not have a detrimental impact on the free flow of pedestrian traffic and would not impede on highway safety for users. It would therefore comply with Policy SD4 of the LP, the Surrey County Council Local Transport Plan and SCCHSG and the relevant paragraphs of the Framework. In terms of Appeal B, the advertisement signage as a whole would be acceptable in public safety terms since it would be an integral part of the hub installation. It would thus comply with the 2007 regulations. The provisions of the development plan, so far as they are relevant have been considered, the scheme would also meet with the aims of the LP and the Framework as detailed above.

Other Matters

15. The main parties have discussed the need for the street hub in terms of the benefits of communication infrastructure. The Framework details that planning decisions should support the expansion of electronic communication networks such as this one. As I have found the proposal to be acceptable, I need not consider whether the benefits are sufficient to justify the proposal in this location. Moreover, I have no reason to question the need for the development.
16. I appreciate concerns that the development has not submitted a ICNIRP certificate. The proposal is not a mast or a base station. Moreover, the evidence provided does not suggest it is required for this scale and type of installation. I have therefore not considered the matter further.

17. There is a lack of substantive evidence to demonstrate that the hub would be harmful in terms of adding further screens. Indeed, there are not a great number locally. I am also unconvinced, based on what I have seen, that installations such as the one proposed would encourage anti social behaviour. The appellant has submitted an anti-social behaviour management plan, but in the absence of any crime statistics for the area, I do not see that such would be necessary.

Conditions

Appeal A

18. The time limit condition and reference to the approved plans are required for enforcement purposes. I have not included a matching materials condition since details thereof are shown on the plans and I consider them acceptable. The Council have not recommended any additional conditions to be placed on the permission and I have not deemed any other further conditions necessary.

Appeal B

19. The standard conditions apply to the consent as per Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations. As the signage is illuminated, and in the interest of public amenity and the context of the wider street scene, it would be necessary to apply a condition to limit the illuminance level with regard to the nighttime. The Council have recommended a condition that the development is secured by the plans. However, as the application is for express consent any deviation would require a new consent and therefore the condition is not necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. For the reasons given above, the appeals would comply with the development plan and the regulations respectively. There is nothing sufficiently compelling to consider them otherwise. I therefore recommend they are both allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeals are allowed, subject to the conditions specified.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR