
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by **David Murray** BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

Appeal A - Ref: APP/Y3615/W/25/3368962

Land Outside The Friary, Commercial Road, Guildford, GU1 4YT

- 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 New World Payphones against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/00099.
 - The development proposed is the installation of communication kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/Y3615/H/25/3368963

Land Outside The Friary, Commercial Road, Guildford, GU1 4YT

- 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 New World Payphones against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/00100.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of communication kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Decisions

Appeal A - Ref: APP/Y3615/W/25/3368962

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B - Ref: APP/Y3615/H/25/3368963

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect on the character and amenity of the local street-scene; and
 - the effect on the pedestrian movement in the area and public safety.

Reasons

Background

4. The applications seek planning permission and advertisement consent for the same kiosk proposed to be situated near the entranceway to The Friary shopping centre. The kiosk would be about 2.5m tall and about 0.9m wide. One side of it would

contain a phone with a small information display screen and a defibrillator. The other side would have large digital display for static advertisements that would change every 10 seconds.

Effect on character and amenity

5. The site lies outside of the Town Centre Conservation Area and away from the nearest listed building at 8 North Street. I agree that the significance of these heritage assets would not be harmed by the proposal.
6. In terms of the general setting of the site, I noted at the visit that there are many other forms of street furniture around this location at the entrance to the shopping centre and to the bus station. The kiosk proposed would be sited close to: a multi bike stand, a wayfinding display board and map for the bus station about 2m high, various bollards, and two street poles (which may contain hanging plants in season).
7. The proposed kiosk and illuminated advertisement would be visually prominent in this location and its scale and bulk would add to the array of furniture which already appears intrusive in this public space. I find that the presence of the kiosk would be harmful to the visual quality of the space and add to the clutter in the area. As such the proposal would conflict with Policy D1 of the Local Plan : Strategy and Sites and Policy D4 of the Local Plan : Development Management Policies as it would not maintain the distinct character of the area. In advertisement terms it would be harmful to amenity.

Pedestrian movement and public safety

8. At the time of my visit mid-afternoon the space outside of the entrance to The Friary was busy with walkers and I saw that it is also used as a main pedestrian route to the bus station. The free movement of pedestrians is already restricted by some of the street furniture mentioned above. The siting and the physical extent of the proposed kiosk would be a material disruption to the extent of the available pavement and to the simple movement of pedestrians. It is likely that pedestrians would have to walk in the road to get around the kiosk and the structure would also restrict the visibility of both pedestrians and vehicle drivers at this corner. These factors would not be in the interest of pedestrians and public safety. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy D10 because of the position and width of the kiosk.
9. The Council and the highway authority also refer to an enhancement scheme of the highway land which the proposal may be said to prejudice. However, I have considered the proposal on the circumstances of the land as they exist now and it would be unreasonable to predict what the effect may be on arrangements and details that have not been shown to be finalised.

Other Matters

10. People making representations raise objections to the proposal some of which relate to the main issues considered above. Other objections include the effect on health and well-being, and that the proposal will encourage anti-social behaviour. However, there is insufficient evidence provided to raise these factors to have the same weight as main issues.

Planning balance

11. On the main issues I have found that the proposal would be harmful to the visual quality of the space and the amenity of the area. The position and width of the kiosk would also be likely to disrupt the free flow of pedestrians on this busy pavement and not be in the interests of pedestrians and highway safety and therefore public safety. These factors lead to the proposal conflicting with the policies in the development plan referred to above.
12. This policy conflict has to be balanced with other considerations. There would be some public benefit associated the local wi-fi connection and digital public pay-phone, an information system, and of the availability of a defibrillator. However I noticed at the visit that there is already such a facility installed nearby at the foot of North Street. I also acknowledge that the form of the structure is based on the traditional call-box which was a usual feature in a local street scene.
13. However these public benefits are limited and do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above or the policy conflict. Appeal A should therefore be decided in accordance with the development plan. In appeal B there would be harm to amenity and public safety and the advertisement should not be allowed.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should not be allowed

David Murray

INSPECTOR