



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by A Knight BA PG Dip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/C3810/W/25/3366482

Land outside 24 London Road, Bognor Regis PO21 1PY

- 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 NWP Street Ltd against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is BR/11/25/PL.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1 no. new communications kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertising display.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C3810/H/25/3366484

Land outside 24 London Road, Bognor Regis PO21 1PY

- 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 NWP Street Ltd against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is BR/12/25/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1 no. new communications kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertising display.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals relate to the same appeal site and to each other. Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission for a freestanding communication kiosk (the development). Appeal B relates to the refusal of advertisement consent for a digital display screen (the advertisement) which would be integral to the development. I have determined both appeals on their merits but, to avoid duplication, dealt with the two together below.
4. The description of the proposed development and advertisement in the banner heading above is that used in the application forms. I note that in its decision notices the Council used the descriptions 'Installation of 1 No. new communications kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertising display' and 'Installation of 1 No. illuminated advertising display within communications kiosk with integrated defibrillator' respectively.
5. I am the appointed Inspector for other nearby appeals concerning directly comparable proposals by the same appellant. Whilst, given the proximity of the respective sites and the similarity of the issues involved the decisions will

inevitably appear similar, each proposal has been assessed on its individual merits.

6. In respect of Appeal B, Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) state that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council has not raised any issues of public safety. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to reach an alternative view.

Main Issues

7. For Appeal A, the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.
8. For Appeal B, the main issue is the effect of the advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

9. The appeal site is part of a pedestrianised shopping street in the commercial centre of Bognor Regis. The street is flanked on either side by two and three storey buildings running along most of its length, creating an enclosed feel. Along the street are found street trees, bike racks, slim bollards, litter bins, lampposts, and public benches, the latter being formed from substantial concrete blocks and timber. The trees, lampposts and benches are set out at broadly regular intervals. Commercially provided tables and chairs are within clearly delineated areas outside the outlets to which they belong.
10. Consistent with its commercial character, the street is heavily populated with advertisements, including shopfronts, projecting signs and A-boards. The street furniture also includes displays; banners hang from the lampposts, and small murals are affixed to the public benches.
11. Between the street furniture and the advertisements, it is a busy scene, but not one lacking order; Each advertisement is recognisably displayed on, or very near, the building to which it relates, so as to not only draw attention to the goods and services within, but to identify clearly the extent of each commercial unit.
12. The street furniture is simple and unfussy, and the displays incorporated into them use a consistent design motif throughout to promote the town itself, rather than any of the commercial outlets. As a result, they are easy to distinguish from the surrounding commercial advertisements, and do not compete with them for attention. Given all of the above, despite its many and varied constituent elements the street scene around the appeal site benefits from a clear visual structure that makes it easy to process.
13. The development would be a freestanding kiosk, open on two sides. It would be some 2.4m tall, 1.1m wide, and 0.8m deep with an LCD display screen on its largest outside face. A static advertising image would change every 10 seconds. The development would be oriented at a right angle to the main stretch of the street and so be visually prominent when approached from the south or north, and from along the street.
14. The design of the development is based on traditional public phone boxes and would be recognisable as such. In that respect, it would not be an unusual or

incongruous addition to the street. Even so, it would add a significant, bulky structure to an area of pavement already containing several items, all reasonably close to each other. It would also disrupt the broad regularity with which the largest elements of street furniture are laid out. This combination would result in a crowded, congested feel. By introducing general advertisements to an environment largely devoid of them, the proposed advertisement would harmfully undermine and disrupt the existing visual order which the street benefits from.

15. I have been provided with excerpts from previous decisions in Hillingdon¹ and Middlesbrough², in which comparable kiosks were found acceptable. The first case evidently involved the replacement of an existing phone box described by the Inspector as a tired looking feature. That is not true of the scheme before me. I have little evidence to show me that the setting in the second case is comparable to that at London Road. For these reasons I attach little weight to the cited previous decisions.
16. It is intended that a street tree would be planted as a consequence of the development. Whilst details would be agreed separately, I have little reason to believe that the tree would be in the area around the appeal site. As such, this benefit would do little to offset the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.
17. The development would provide a range of services, including 4G coverage, and free phone calls to emergency services. It would be maintained regularly. These are public benefits that would contribute towards advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure, which the Framework states is essential for economic growth and social well-being. I also recognise that in locations where mobile network coverage is poor, or for those who do not possess a mobile phone, a public call box may be the only option for making vital calls.
18. However, I have little evidence that the centre of Bognor Regis is a location with poor coverage; indeed, the appellant has not contested the Council's assertion that local coverage is reliable. I also have little before me to demonstrate that levels of mobile phone ownership are low in Bognor Regis, such that demand exists for public telephony facilities.
19. It would be possible to display public messages on the screen, including from the Council. Local businesses may benefit from a discounted rate for advertising. The development would display helpful information including local maps showing points of interest and providing emergency numbers. It would also house a defibrillator, a facility with the potential to make a significant difference to the survival chances of a person suffering cardiac arrest.
20. Whilst I acknowledge the benefits listed above, the weight afforded to them is tempered by the absence of evidence to show unmet local need for any of the services that would be supplied, or to show that similar facilities could not be provided without the proposed development. Overall, the harms identified would outweigh the benefits.
21. Regarding Appeal A, I find that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy D DM1

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/Z/16/3157043.

² Application Ref: Ref: 22/0734/FUL.

of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (2018) where it requires that development reflect or improve local character and enhance streets and public spaces so that they are attractive.

22. Regarding Appeal B, for the reasons given I find that the advertisement would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area, contrary to the provisions of paragraph 141 of the Framework which states, amongst other things, that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons set out above, the proposals under Appeal A and Appeal B would harm the character and appearance and visual amenity of the area. Having considered all matters raised, I conclude that Appeals A and B are dismissed.

A Knight

INSPECTOR

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/C3810/W/25/3366482	NWP Street Limited
Appeal B	APP/C3810/H/25/3366484	NWP Street Limited