



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 October 2025

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/L3625/W/25/3369695

Land outside 29 High Street, Redhill, Surrey RH1 1RD

- 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 Thomas Johnston (NWP Street Ltd) against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00877/F.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1 no. new communications Kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertising display.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L3625/H/25/3369696

Land outside 29 High St, Redhill, Surrey RH1 1RD

- 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 Thomas Johnston (NWP Street Ltd) against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00878/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is Installation of 1 no. Digital advertisement display within proposed new communications Kiosk.
-

Decision

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals relate to the same site and to each other. Appeal A is concerned with the refusal of planning permission for a proposed communication kiosk. Appeal B is in respect of refusal of advertisement consent for a digital advertisement display which would be an integral part of the proposed kiosk. I have considered each appeal on its individual merits but in order to avoid duplication I have combined them into a single decision letter as they raise similar issues.
4. I have taken the description of development in Appeal B from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes that for which consent is sought.
5. With respect to Appeal B, the development plan policies referred to by the Council are not determinative, but I have taken these into account as a material consideration.

Main Issues

6. The main issue relating to Appeal A is the effect of the kiosk on the character and appearance of the area. For Appeal B, the main issues are the effect of the kiosk on visual amenity as well as on highway/public safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance/ amenity

7. The site is located within High Street, a wide pedestrianised road. Buildings on either side are both modern and historic with retail units at street level. Advertisements generally relate to retail fascia and projecting signs above existing shopfronts, some of which are illuminated. The entrance to the Belfry shopping centre is prominent, overhanging part of the High Street.
8. Nonetheless, it is the line of trees and lighting columns which are particularly notable and prominent features of this part of High Street. Positioned centrally the trees are within wide 'planters' which offer space for people to sit. Parallel to them are lighting columns with two 'arms' that offer both a high and a low light source.
9. Together they help to create an attractive public space that contributes to a sense of place. Other street furniture such as bollards and bins are discreet and generally low level so as not to interfere with the pleasing view created by the symmetry of the lines of trees and lighting columns.
10. In contrast, the kiosk would be positioned randomly between two trees. Its size and appearance mean that it would be a very obvious and unrelated incursion which disrupts the established vista along High Street. When viewed from the Cromwell Road side, the digital display would add to the discordant nature of the proposal, being unconnected to other structures or light sources around it and distracting from the pleasant visual amenity created by the trees and lighting columns.
11. Accordingly, Appeal A would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies DES1, DES10, and INF3 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 (DMP) which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure development respects the local character and context generally and that communication equipment in particular minimises the impact on visual amenity.
12. With regard to Appeal B, it would unacceptably harm the visual amenity of the area. In accordance with the Regulations, I have considered the provisions of the development plan so far as it is relevant, in particular Policies DES1 and DM10 of the DMPD which seek to protect visual amenity. Given my conclusions, Appeal B conflicts with these policies as well as the amenity aims of the Framework.

Highway/Public Safety

13. The Highway Authority notes that the positioning of the kiosk would result in the gap between it and other 'obstacles' being less than 3 metres, which is considered to be inappropriate in a town centre location.
14. The kiosk would be positioned between two trees located centrally within High Street. Gaps between the trees and between the lighting columns are generous

and appear to accord with the Highway Authority's requirements. This spacing allows pedestrians and those with mobility issues to move easily around these features and each other. This spacing also enables shoppers to move from one side of the road to the other with relative ease.

15. The kiosk would not be so large as to prevent pedestrians from being able to see round it nor is the gap between these two trees the only route people could take to get from one side of High Street to the other. I am also mindful that given that it is within a pedestrianised street no one would be forced into the path of vehicles if taking an alternate route to get from one side of the road to the other.
16. Clearly, if repeated often enough, reducing the gaps between the trees could cause problems to pedestrian flow generally and particularly for those with mobility issues. However, on its own, I am satisfied that the kiosk would not unduly curtail movement in this area or have a harmful effect upon highway and public safety.
17. Consequently, I find that the proposal would comply with policies DES1 and DES10 of the DMP insofar as they seek to ensure adequate access is provided and highway or pedestrian safety is not compromised. Although the officer report refers to Policy TAP1 of the DMP the decision notice does not. However, as I have found there to be adequate circulation and visibility, I do not find the proposal contrary to it. Similarly, I also find no conflict with section 9 of the Framework where it states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

18. The proposed kiosk provides a communications hub to all those who may need one, including those with mobility impairments albeit I have no information on current levels of mobile phone coverage or ownership in the area. In addition to a telephone there would be mapping information as well as allowing the advertisement panel to display messages from the local Council although the Council has not indicated whether it would be likely to make use of this facility.
19. The kiosk would also provide a defibrillator, but I noted during my site visit there is already one located outside the entrance to the nearby Belfry shopping centre. The appellant indicates that allied to the installation of kiosks there are opportunities to plant new trees but no specific details have been provided in relation to this particular proposal.
20. I acknowledge that the Framework confirms that advanced, high quality and reliable communication infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. It also supports the expansion of electronic communications networks.

Conclusion

21. Whilst there are certainly some public benefits arising from the proposal, in addition to some possible environmental and economic benefits, for the reasons given above, the weight I attribute to these benefits is moderate.
22. Conditions have been put forward that could control such matters as the timing and images displayed and/or the level of illumination. The advertisement proposal would also be subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations. However, given my above findings I do not consider such conditions would overcome my concerns and enable both appeals to be allowed.

23. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal schemes would not comply with the development plan and fail an assessment against the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007. There are no compelling reasons, taking into account other material considerations advanced and the scope of the Regulations, to deviate from them.
24. Both Appeal A and Appeal B are therefore dismissed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR