
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd of September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/C3810/W/25/3366490

Land opposite 54 High Street, Littlehampton BN17 5EA

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

Appeal B Ref: APP/C3810/H/25/3366491

Land opposite 54 High Street, Littlehampton BN17 5EA

- 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 Mr Thomas Johnston (NWP Street Ltd) against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is LU/26/25/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1 no. new communications Kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertising display.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. An application for planning permission and advertisement consent was made for the same site.
4. In respect of the advertisement appeal. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) both make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account cumulative impacts. Regard does not need to be had to the development plan. I have taken relevant policies into account as a material consideration, however, they have not, by themselves, been determinative for this appeal. The Council has not raised any concerns on public safety grounds, and I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issues

Appeal A

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Appeal B

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

7. Appeal A seeks planning permission for the installation of a communication kiosk with a defibrillator and appeal B is for the advertising display on the Kiosk. The kiosk structure would be 2.459m high, 1.115m deep and 0.884m wide overall. There would be a 1.635m by 0.925m Liquid Crystal Display (LCD) for advertising which would be recessed behind toughened laminated glass. Internally, the kiosk would contain a defibrillator and a telephone. The kiosk would be a modern interpretation of a telephone booth.
8. The kiosk would be located on High Street in Littlehampton which is a paved road on a traditional High Street with high pedestrian footfall. The kiosk would be located within relatively close proximity to public seating and rubbish bins. There are also numerous 'A' boards within the High Street which are moveable but appear to be heavily relied upon for advertising and therefore would be almost permanent features of the street scene.

Character and Appearance

9. The proposal would be a large feature within the street scene and due to its prominent position, overall size and changing and illuminated images, it would draw the eye and form a dominant and visually jarring addition to the street scene.
10. The location of the proposal in a narrow section of pavement and in close proximity to public seating and bins as well as 'A' boards would add to the visual clutter within this part of the pavement. The proposal would detract from the overall traditional character and appearance of the High Street which appears to have been subject to recent refurbishment.
11. I conclude that the effects of the location, size and changing images in addition to the cumulative effect of more street furniture would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 which seeks development to be of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the overall environment.

Visual Amenity

12. Information boards within the High Street are traditional and non-illuminated. There are no other examples of illuminated display signs within the immediate vicinity of the site and therefore the siting of the proposal and level of illumination would harmfully dominate this section of the pavement.
13. I therefore conclude that the effect of the advertisement and illumination would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

Other Matters

14. The benefits of the proposal would be to connect the Council with the public and to promote initiatives. Discounted advertising rates would also be offered to local businesses, although no details have been provided of what the discount would be. The appellant also points towards the advertisement display contributing towards business rates. An interactive LCD display would provide local information and the landline would also provide access to a phone for people without a mobile or landline. The proposal would include a defibrillator.
15. I noted during my site visit that the High Street contained information boards providing basic information to users of the High Street. Local businesses on the High Street also advertise using 'A' boards and I have no information as to whether the cost of advertising on the kiosk would be in line with the current costs of advertising locally. I have not been provided with information regarding the revenue stream from business rates to the Council, however, I have not attached this much weight.
16. There are two defibrillators within 200m of the proposed kiosk and therefore the need for a defibrillator in this location has not been demonstrated. There is also a phone booth present within walking distance of the site and the area does not suffer from poor network coverage. In light of the above, the proposed benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm identified.
17. Whilst the appellant has offered to plant a tree in an urban area for every kiosk that is installed, the environmental benefit identified is not considered to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area or visual amenity from the proposal.

Conclusion

Appeal A

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

Appeal B

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR