



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **H Marriott MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: 6000871

Pavement o/s 29-31 Carr Street, Ipswich IP4 1HA

- 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 Simon Warner (BT Plc) against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is IP/25/00475/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated existing BT payphone(s).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R3515/Z/25/3373988

Pavement o/s 29-31 Carr Street, Ipswich IP4 1HA

- 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 Simon Warner (BT Plc) against the decision of Ipswich Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is IP/25/00476/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated existing BT payphone(s).
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub on the Pavement o/s 29-31 Carr Street, Ipswich IP4 1HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref IP/25/00475/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
2. Appeal B is allowed and express consent is granted for the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub on the Pavement o/s 29-31 Carr Street, Ipswich IP4 1HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref IP/25/00475/ADV. 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 additional conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals relate to a single proposed BT Street Hub on the same site. Appeal A relates to an application for planning permission and Appeal B to advertisement consent. Each appeal has been considered on its individual merits, but to avoid duplication, they are address in a single decision, except where otherwise indicated.
4. Both descriptions refer to the removal of an associated BT payphone(s). However, no payphones exist near the site, and it is therefore unclear which payphone(s) this relates to. Accordingly, this reference has been omitted from the Decisions, and

any removal elsewhere in the city centre has not been a determinative matter in my assessment.

5. The appeal site is situated outside of but near to the Central Conservation Area (CA). Although there is no statutory protection for the setting of a CA in the Act, paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires consideration of any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, including from development within its setting.
6. With respect to Appeal B, Section 3(1) of the 2007 Regulations limits my considerations to matters relating to amenity and public safety. The Council raise no public safety concerns, and I have no reason to disagree given that the usability and accessibility of the surrounding pavement would remain unaffected. Policies cited by the Council in relation to Appeal B, are only relevant insofar as they relate to amenity and have not been determinative in this decision.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

9. The proposed BT Street Hub (the Hub) would be located on Carr Street, a pedestrianised route lined with two- and three-storey buildings, comprising shops and other commercial premises at ground level. It links Northgate Street to Old Foundry Road. The nearby CA encompasses the city centre and its significance derives from the medieval street network and varied historic buildings. Non-designated heritage assets, including the Co-Op buildings, are also nearby. The footway near the appeal site is relatively wide, surfaced in modern paving, and accommodates street furniture such as benches, bicycle stands, bins, a letter box, planters, street signs and a free-standing digital screen with a defibrillator¹ which was allow at appeal in July 2024 (the existing hub). A-board signs and outdoor seating are also present. Collectively, these elements create the cohesive character of a modern shopping street.
10. The Hub would provide free public Wi-Fi, USB charging and call facilities. It would be a freestanding structure with high-definition digital displays on both sides, primarily for commercial advertising but also capable of community and emergency messaging. The Town Centre and Waterfront – Public Realm Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) seeks to remove redundant street clutter and promote the co-ordinated replacement of street furniture.
11. During my site visit, I observed a variety of advertisements, including those on building facades and the existing hub. The proposed displays would change every 10-seconds, and luminance levels would comply with relevant standards², ensuring they would not appear dominant within the street scene.

¹ Council ref: IP/21/01068/FUL and Appeal ref: APP/R3515/W/24/2242263

² Institute of Lighting Professionals, Professional Lighting Guide PLG 05 2015 – The brightness of illuminated advertisements including digital displays

12. Although positioned close to the existing hub, the proposal would not appear incongruous within its surroundings, particularly given its contemporary design, position in front of a modern commercial block and the variety of colours and styles of the modern shopfronts in the area. The hub would be aligned on the same side of the street as the existing hub, meaning that views along the thoroughfare would generally reveal one hub at a time rather than both simultaneously. While glimpses of heritage assets, including the CA, may occur beyond the hub, its spatial relationship with these assets, including its positioning to one side of the thoroughfare adjacent to the modern shopfronts, would ensure that no harm to their significance through development within their respective settings would arise.
13. Overall, while the proposed hub would add to the amount of street furniture along Carr Street, it would not be unusual or unexpected in this predominantly retail environment. Even cumulatively with existing street furniture, the hub would integrate satisfactorily within its urban context.
14. For appeal A and B, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area or visual amenity. In this regard, it would accord with Policies DM12, DM13, DM26 and DM34 of the Ipswich Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Review (2022) (CS) which amongst other things, seek high-quality and reliable communications, good public realm design, protection of the historic built environment and advertisements to preserve or enhance the character of their setting. For the same reasons, there would not conflict with Paragraph 135 of the Framework which requires developments to add to the overall quality of the area, or the guidance contained in the SPD.

Conditions

15. The Council has suggested conditions for both appeals which I have considered against paragraph 57 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have amended these where necessary to improve precision and enforceability.
16. For Appeal A, in addition to the statutory time condition (1), a condition listing the approved drawings (2) is necessary for clarity.
17. Interested parties have raised concerns regarding the safety of the hub, including the potential for anti-social behaviour. The appellant's Anti-Social Behaviour Management plan states that any misuse would be addressed once it is active in liaison with the police, other emergency services and local authorities, as required. Even so, I agree with the Council's suggestion that condition (3) is necessary, requiring the submission and approval of further details in a management plan to ensure its safe operation and to mitigate the risk of anti-social behaviour. This would also be in line with the comments received from Suffolk Constabulary and the condition imposed by the Inspector in determining the existing hub.
18. For Appeal B, the five standard conditions in the 2007 Regulations apply. The appellant's statement confirms that the proposed screens would display static images, which would feature no moving elements, and that the luminance would be in accordance with recommended levels set out in the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance suggested. In this regard, conditions relating to luminance in the hours of darkness and daylight, display and transition of images are reasonable and necessary in the interests of amenity and public safety (1, 2 and 3). While the Council's suggested that Condition (3) should refer to the maximum

luminance not exceeding 600cd/m², this figure does not appear to correlate with the figure contained in the copy of Table 10.4 of the Institute of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guidance (PLG 05 2015) ‘The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays’ provided. Therefore, I have omitted this reference. However, compliance with the table in any case would ensure the maximum luminance level would be acceptable.

19. A condition preventing images resembling traffic signs or signals, is not necessary given the pedestrianised nature of the street, even allowing for occasional delivery or other access.

Conclusion

20. **Appeal A and B:** For the reasons given above, both appeals should be allowed, subject to the five standard conditions set out in the 2007 Regulations and the additional conditions set out above

H Marriott

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

Appeal A Ref: 6000871

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 001 Rev A, 002 Rev A, 003 Rev A ‘Proposed BT Streethub Elevations’ and 003 Rev A ‘Existing and Proposed Elevations’.
- 3) Prior to the first use of the BT Streethub hereby approved, a management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of restrictions on the use of Wi-Fi, restrictions on charging capacity and incoming calls, the call charges that will apply and operation of the integral cameras. The management plan shall be implemented as approved and retained for the lifetime of the development.

Appeal B Ref: APP/R3515/Z/25/3373988

In addition to the five standard conditions in the 2007 Regulations:

- 1) In the hours of darkness, the advertisement display luminance shall be no greater than the recommended maximum nighttime luminance value set out in Table 10.4 within the Institute of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guidance (PLG 05 2015) ‘The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays’ (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m².
- 2) In daylight hours, the advertisement display luminance shall be controlled in order to reflect ambient light conditions, and shall at all times be no greater than

the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in Table 10.5 within the Institute of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guidance (PLG 05 2015) ‘The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays’ (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m2.

- 3) The rate of content change of advertisements shall be limited to no more than once every ten seconds, and there shall be no moving images, animation, video, or full-motion images displayed.

END OF SCHEDULE