



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by **Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/P0119/W/25/3374871

Pavement o/s Iceland, 41-43 Regent Street, Kingswood,, Bristol BS15 8LA

- 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 Simon Warner of BT Telecommunications Plc against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P25/00527/F.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/P0119/Z/25/3376569

Pavement o/s Iceland, 41-43 Regent Street, Kingswood, Bristol BS15 8LE

- 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 Simon Warner of BT Telecommunications Plc against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P25/02230/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of 2no. internally illuminated digital screens.
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub at Pavement o/s Iceland, 41-43 Regent Street, Kingswood, Bristol BS15 8LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P25/00527/F, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 (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	Site Location Maps
002 rev A	Proposed Site Plan
003 rev A	Existing and Proposed Elevations
 - 3) The BT Street Hub, including its electronic features, shall be managed in accordance with the BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan (Version 3) (or any replacement version), for the lifetime of the development.
2. **Appeal B** is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 2no. internally illuminated digital screens at Pavement o/s Iceland, 41-43 Regent Street, Kingswood, Bristol BS15 8LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P25/02230/ADV. The consent is for 5 (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 intensity of the illumination of the advertisement permitted by this consent shall be no greater than that which is recommended by the Institute of Lighting Professionals in its Professional Lighting Guide 05 (PLG 05) Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements (or its equivalent in a replacement Guide) for a sign located within Zone E3 – Suburban.
- 2) The digital screens shall not display any moving or audible images (including animation, flashing, scrolling or video elements) with each piece of content on the display screens for a minimum of 10 seconds with an instantaneous rate of change between each piece of content.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. **Appeal A** relates to planning permission for a BT Street Hub (street hub) while advertisement consent for the digital displays on it sought via **Appeal B**. Given they are intrinsically linked and were refused by the Council for a similar reason, to avoid duplication, I have dealt with the two appeals together.
4. I have taken the wording of the description of development and the advertisement from the Council's decision notices as these most accurately set out the proposals.
5. With respect to Appeal B, the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) state that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Furthermore, any relevant policies within the development plan are not, by themselves, determinative in regard to advertisement appeals such as this.
6. Consequently, the main issue of both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the safety and, in accordance with the Regulations, the public safety of users of Regent Street.

Reasons

7. The proposal comprises the installation of a street hub within the pavement outside a row of shops, including those within the Kings Chase Shopping Centre (shopping centre). It would replace the nearby telephone kiosk, which is no longer fit for purpose, as part of a wider programme of replacement works being undertaken by the appellant.
8. Between Regent Street's junction with Downend Road and the entrance to the shopping centre, the pavement functions as a pedestrian thoroughfare, provides direct access to the shops and accommodates a bus stop, complete with a shelter and standalone information board. Various other items of street furniture commonly found within a town centre environment, including benches, bins, bicycle rack, street lamps, post boxes and the aforementioned telephone kiosk are also located within this stretch of pavement. A row of four street trees are planted at regular intervals with many of these features between them, thereby providing greenery to the street scene.
9. The combination of these features creates a visual and physical separation between the area around the bus shelter and the wider section of pavement

adjacent to the shops which forms part of the ramped access to the shopping centre.

10. During my site visit, around midday on a weekday, I observed the area to be busy with pedestrians disembarking or waiting for a bus, going to/from the shops or moving through the area. Aside from the pinch point formed due to the siting of the kiosk, the pavement width was sufficient to comfortably accommodate the number of people I observed in the area. Furthermore, the separation of the bus stop area and the main pavement created by the trees, benches and information board, minimised conflict between shoppers/pedestrians and passengers waiting for a bus, with the flow of pedestrians largely unhindered.
11. The proposed street hub would be positioned broadly in line with the street trees and the various items of street furniture between them. Its relationship with the trees would, nonetheless, provide sufficient space for pedestrians, wheelchair users, pushchairs and others with mobility issues or carrying shopping bags to move through. This gap would be wider than the well-used spaces between the trees, benches and information board nearer to the bus stop currently used in this way. Consequently, despite the introduction of a further item of street furniture into the street scene, its position would not obstruct pedestrian movement, including those with mobility issues.
12. The only items located within the pavement between the line of trees/street furniture and the shop frontages comprise the kiosk and two post boxes. Both features provide physical barriers to pedestrians. In the case of the kiosk, its height and bulk also acts as a visual barrier. The removal of the kiosk would, therefore, result in unobstructed views along the façade of the shops and a reduction in the number of features pedestrians would need to navigate around. The result would be a less cluttered and confusing environment in both physical and visual terms, allowing people of all mobilities to move comfortably.
13. Illuminated displays would be an integral part of both sides of the street hub. While the result would be the introduction of a lit item of street furniture into the street scene, such features are commonly found within similar town centre environments. Furthermore, set against the backdrop of shop frontages, signage and internal lighting, together with the use of planning conditions to control illuminance levels and display content, the street hub would not be a prominent feature in the sightlines of drivers using Regent Street and Downend Road. As such, the street hub and its displays would not be unacceptably distracting to drivers, particularly those travelling along the carriageway closest to the pavement.
14. Reference has been made to a high number of accidents on the street. However, no substantive evidence is before me to confirm this, nor whether this relates to vehicles on the carriageway or incidents on the pavement, including those involving pedestrians. Furthermore, while I observed a constant flow of vehicular traffic along the carriageway closest to the site, given the nearby traffic lights at the Downend Road junction and at the shopping centre entrance, and the regularity of buses pulling into and out of the bus stop layby, vehicle speeds were low. The installation of the street hub with digital displays would not, consequently, lead to a significant increase in driver distraction so as to result in unacceptable risk to public safety.

15. My attention has also been drawn to the work being undertaken as part of a regeneration scheme for Kingswood. However, no further details of this scheme, its status or likelihood of being implemented, including any relevant timescales, has been submitted. Therefore, the relationship between the proposal and the emerging regeneration works has not been demonstrated to a level sufficient to justify the dismissal of these appeals.
16. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the safety or public safety of users of Regent Street, in accordance with the Regulations and Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy¹ insofar as it seeks to enable safe and convenient access for all.
17. Reference to Policy PSP11 of the Local Plan² is also included on the Council's decision notices. However, as this relates to requirements sought where development proposals generate demand for travel it is not determinative in these cases.

Conditions

18. In respect to Appeal A, aside from the standard time limit and plans conditions, I have imposed a condition requiring the street hub to be managed in accordance with the BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan (Version 3), in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and public safety.
19. In addition to the five standard conditions of the Regulations, I have attached two conditions to Appeal B that; restrict the illumination intensity of the display to align with best practice contained within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Professional Lighting Guide 05 (PLG 05) Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements; and to avoid the use of moving images and limit the frequency of change. Both these conditions aim to avoid the risk of drivers being distracted.
20. As the street hub automatically reduces its illumination intensity at night, it is not necessary for me to impose a daily time restriction on its operation. As I am satisfied that the siting of the street hub would not impede visibility splays or pedestrian movement, the use of a condition requiring confirmation of this effect is unnecessary.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all relevant matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should be allowed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR

¹ South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-2027 (Core Strategy)

² South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (Local Plan)