



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 3 September 2025

by **K Reeves BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/R0335/W/25/3365044

Pavement o/s Railway Station, Market Street, Bracknell RG12 1HX

- 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 Telecommunications Plc against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00730/FUL.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 2no. digital 75" LCD advert screens, and associated BT Phone Kiosk removal.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R0335/H/25/3365045

Pavement o/s Railway Station, Market Street, Bracknell RG12 1HX

- 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 Telecommunications Plc against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00731/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 2no. digital 75" LCD advert screens, and associated BT Phone Kiosk removal.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 2no. digital 75" LCD advert screens, and associated BT Phone Kiosk removal at Pavement o/s Railway Station, Market Street, Bracknell, RG12 1HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00730/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001 Rev. A, 002 Rev. A, and 003 Rev. A.
2. Appeal B is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 2no. digital 75" LCD advert screens, and associated BT Phone Kiosk removal at Pavement o/s Railway Station, Market Street, Bracknell, RG12 1HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00731/A, dated 29 October 2024. 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 conditions:
 - 1) The maximum level of luminance shall be no more than 300 cd/m² during hours of darkness (dusk until dawn). In daylight hours, the level of luminance

shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in the Institution of Lighting Professionals - Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m^2 . The level of luminance of the advertisement displays shall be controlled by light sensors that measure ambient light levels and automatically control the perceived brightness to within the limits set by this condition.

- 2) The advertisement displays shall only display static images and shall not display any moving images, animation, intermittent or full motion video images, or any images that resemble road signs or traffic signals.
- 3) No individual advertisement shall be displayed for a duration of less than 10 seconds and the transition between advertisement images shall take place over a period no greater than one second with no visual effects (including fading, swiping or other animated transition methods).
- 4) The advertisement displays shall contain at all times a feature that will turn off the screen (i.e. show a black screen) in the event that the display experiences a malfunction or error.

Preliminary Matters

3. The descriptions of development as set out above include the removal of an existing BT kiosk in the area although that structure is not identified within the application site boundary and there is no alternative mechanism before me which would secure its removal. As it is not located within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, its removal would not be determinative to the appeals.
4. Appeal A seeks planning permission for the installation of a BT Street Hub, while Appeal B concerns the associated application for advertisement consent. As both appeals relate to the same site and proposal, I have considered them together to avoid unnecessary duplication.
5. With respect to Appeal B, the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) specify that decisions must be based solely on considerations of amenity and public safety. The Council has not raised any objections on the grounds of amenity, and I see no reason to reach a different conclusion.

Main Issues

6. The main issue in respect of Appeal A is the effect of the proposal upon highway and pedestrian safety. The main issue in respect of Appeal B is the effect of the proposed advertisements on public safety.

Reasons

7. The proposed installation would be located at the front edge of the pavement, adjacent to the carriageway, in a position that aligns with the established pattern of street furniture in the area. This includes lighting columns, signs, benches and bins, all of which contribute to the functional character of the streetscape. Its placement on the outside of a gentle bend means that it would face motorists approaching from both directions, making it visible to passing traffic.

8. I acknowledge the Council's concerns regarding the potential impact of bright illumination and changing displays associated with the proposed advertisement, particularly in terms of distracting drivers and increasing the risk of collisions involving vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. These are valid considerations in assessing public safety. However, during my site visit, I observed that this stretch of road benefits from good visibility in both directions, allowing drivers ample time to respond to visual stimuli within the streetscape.
9. The proposed installation would be positioned at a sufficient distance from key junctions, including the entrance to the bus station, the mini-roundabout adjacent to the railway station, and a traffic light-controlled pedestrian crossing located nearby. Its separation from these decision-making points reduces the likelihood of interference with driver concentration or manoeuvring. In this context, and given the nature and location of the proposal, I am satisfied that the installation would not materially exacerbate risks to highway or public safety.
10. Moreover, the area is already well-lit by numerous lighting columns, which would help minimise the visual contrast between the proposed installation and its surroundings, thereby reducing its prominence. The advertisements themselves would be of modest size, further limiting their visual impact. Crucially, both the level of illumination and the frequency of display changes can be regulated by a planning condition. Provided that other potentially distracting features, such as flashing lights or moving elements within the displays, are similarly controlled, I am satisfied that the proposal would not compromise public safety.
11. The relatively uncluttered nature of this stretch of pavement provides ample space for pedestrians to move freely, including those using wheelchairs or prams. The proposed installation would not introduce any significant obstruction for disabled individuals or those who are visually impaired, nor would it compromise sightlines along the footway or adjacent carriageway. I am satisfied that the proposal would not adversely affect pedestrian flow or impede safe crossing in this location, including the use of the nearby traffic light-controlled pedestrian crossing.
12. For these reasons, with regard to Appeal A, the proposal would not cause material harm to highway and pedestrian safety. Consequently, it would comply with Policies LP25, LP43 and LP52 of the Bracknell Forest Local Plan 2020 – 2037 (LP), which collectively seek, in part, to minimise harm to the transport network and highway safety, and to ensure public safety in relation to development and advertisements.
13. In relation to Appeal B, and in accordance with the relevant Regulations, I have considered the provisions of the development plan to the extent that they are applicable. The aforementioned policies are therefore material considerations in this context. In particular, as established, Policy LP52 of the LP seeks to protect public safety from harmful advertisements. The proposal would not have a harmful impact on public safety and would meet with the objectives of the above policies.

Other Matters

14. Although concerns have been raised by interested parties regarding the visual impact of the proposed installation, I am satisfied that it would not harm the amenity of the area. Positioned outside a railway station within a well-established urban environment, the installation would sit comfortably among existing infrastructure, including signage, lighting columns, and ticket machines. Its modern and compact

design would ensure a harmonious integration with its surroundings, without detracting from the character or appearance of the public realm.

15. In relation to potential health effects associated with telecommunications equipment and compliance with the guidelines of the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), the appellant has submitted an ICNIRP certificate confirming that the proposal meets the relevant safety standards. This certification demonstrates that any telecommunications equipment within the proposed hub would operate within internationally recognised limits for public exposure to electromagnetic fields. As such, the provision of this certificate offers reassurance that the proposal would not pose a risk to public health, and I am satisfied that it complies with the necessary regulatory requirements in this regard.
16. Concerns have also been expressed regarding the impact of the proposal on children, the elderly and individuals with long-term health conditions or disabilities, including those who are visually impaired and light-sensitive individuals. I have therefore had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), as set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. This duty requires the elimination of unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation, the advancement of equality of opportunity, and the fostering of good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Protected characteristics include age and disability.
17. In assessing the proposal, I have remained mindful of the PSED and the needs of all highway users. I find that the size and siting of the hub and associated advertisements would not disproportionately affect individuals with protected characteristics. Moreover, while additional concerns have been raised regarding potential health impacts, there is no specific evidence before me relating to this proposal or its location that would substantiate such claims. Accordingly, the PSED does not lead me to conclude that the appeals should be dismissed on these grounds.
18. I acknowledge concerns regarding climate change, sustainability, and biodiversity. However, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate harm in these respects, and I am not persuaded to reach a different conclusion.
19. Matters relating to the use of CCTV, environmental monitoring, public Wi-Fi, and associated data protection implications fall under the remit of other legislative frameworks. As such, they are not determinative in the context of these appeals.

Conditions

20. For Appeal A, I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty.
21. For Appeal B, a series of standard conditions are applied as required by the Regulations, including limiting the consent to five years. Additionally, to ensure highway safety is not compromised, it is necessary to impose conditions to require a cut out in the event of malfunction, to control the frequency of image change, ensure that images remain static and to control the level of luminance.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above, both Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed.

K Reeves

INSPECTOR