



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 January 2026

by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/C3810/W/25/3375154

Land outside 65 High St, Littlehampton BN17 5EJ

- 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 Thomas Johnston of NWP Street Ltd against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is LU/178/25/PL.
 - The development proposed is Installation of communication kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C3810/H/25/3375155

Land outside 65 High St, Littlehampton BN17 5EJ

- 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 Thomas Johnston of NWP Street Ltd against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is LU/179/25/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is Installation of 1 No. new communications kiosk with integrated defibrillator and illuminated advertising display.
-

Decisions

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

Preliminary Matters

3. There are two appeals relating to the same site. Appeal A is against the refusal of planning permission for the communications kiosk and Appeal B is against the refusal of advertisement consent for the illuminated advertising display which would be integrated within the communications kiosk. The appeals are intrinsically linked. I have considered each appeal on its individual merits, however, as they raise similar issues, I have combined both decisions into a single decision letter.
4. In respect of Appeal B, the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) require that decisions are made only in the interest of amenity and public safety. The Council has not raised concern in respect of public safety, and on the basis of the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree.
5. The submitted site plan does not reflect what is on the ground, particularly with regard to street furniture and road signage to the front of Nos 65, 67 and 69 High

Street. I have assessed the proposal on the basis of what is present within this part of the High Street.

Main Issues

6. The main issue in Appeal A is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
7. The main issue in Appeal B is the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance/Visual Amenity

8. The appeal site is within a pedestrianised part of High Street close to its junction with East Street. The proposed kiosk would be sited close to an existing bench to the front of No 67 and the entrance to No 69A, and a street sign indicating the pedestrian zone and the limits on loading to the front of No 65.
9. Close to the appeal site are numerous items of street furniture, including benches, cycle loops and waste bins. There is an information board on the opposite side of the High Street, some benches and closer to the junction with East Street are 2 telephone kiosks and a salt box. Further along the High Street in a westerly direction are tables and chairs outside cafes. Advertisements in the area are primarily located in fascias above shopfronts, both illuminated and non illuminated and small-scale freestanding signs outside premises. Digital display advertisements are not prevalent in the area.
10. Owing to the width of the High Street in this pedestrian zone and the size, amount and scale of street furniture and advertisements, the area has an open character with linear rows of buildings of varying designs providing enclosure.
11. The proposed kiosk at over 2.4 metres high, would as a result of its size and changing and illuminated advertisements, be a prominent and dominant feature in the street scene, which, despite being sited in a similar line to nearby street furniture and constructed of durable, quality materials, would detract from the open character of this part of the High Street. Moreover, its proximity to seating, the existing telephone kiosks, information board and numerous nearby road signs would result in visual clutter within this part of the High Street. It would result in a harmfully, dominant form of advertisement which would be significantly at odds with the otherwise low level and non illuminated street advertisements that are characteristic of the area.
12. I note the suggestion that the proposal would reflect a common element of street furniture found in urban centres within the United Kingdom. Be that as it may, such street furniture, and indeed digital advertising is not a feature of this part of Littlehampton.
13. Although planning conditions could control maintenance, levels of illumination and hours that the advertisement would be illuminated, they would not resolve the incompatibility of this large item of street furniture and its digital advertisement display in this location.

14. For the above reasons I conclude that in respect of Appeal A, the communication kiosk would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy D DM1 of the Adoption Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (July 2018) (ALP) which seeks amongst other matters, for development to reflect and improve the character of the site and surrounding area in terms of its scale, siting and design features, and enhance streets and public spaces. Although not referred to its reason for refusing the planning application my attention has been drawn to Policy TEL DM1 of the ALP but I have not been provided with a copy of it so am unable to determine whether or not there would be conflict with it.
15. In terms of Appeal B, the illuminated advertisement display would be poorly sited and designed given its context. As a consequence, the quality and character of this part of Littlehampton would suffer. Harm to the visual amenity of the area would result, in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).

Other Matters

16. I have reviewed the benefits put forward by the appellant, including, but not limited to the open nature of the kiosk allowing access for all, including for people with disabilities. This is a matter which carries positive weight in favour of the proposed communication kiosk, but not the advertisement.
17. Limited evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the communication kiosk would provide a lifeline in the event of an emergency which could not be provided by the nearby phone boxes. I note that the advertising could be used by the Council at no cost to it and local businesses could use the advertising at a discounted rate. No evidence has been provided to indicate a demand for such services, how this could be secured or what the discounted rate would be.
18. In terms of business rates, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that *'whether or not a 'local finance consideration' is material to a particular decision will depend on whether it could help to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It would not be appropriate to make a decision based on the potential for the development to raise money for a local authority or other government body¹.* Payment of business rates would not help make the development acceptable and this matter does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
19. The communication kiosk would have a defibrillator within it. There is no doubt that this is a useful piece of equipment in an emergency and I note the evidence submitted by the appellant in this regard. The Council has however indicated that there is a defibrillator 56 metres from the appeal site, 4 others within 150 metres and 10 within 500 metres. Such provision is not disputed. Given the supply of such equipment nearby reduces the weight that I attach to this benefit.
20. The proposal would contain local information and maps, but this is provided elsewhere on the High Street. Furthermore, those with a mobile phone and data package would be able to access such information. The Council indicates that the High Street is covered by 5G for the majority of mobile phone providers, thus the assertion that the proposal would improve coverage is questioned.
21. The appellant has indicated that a tree would be planted for every kiosk granted planning permission. There is no mechanism before me to secure this benefit.

¹ Ref: Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 21b-011-20140612

Reference to the development being undertaken in accordance with the submitted Biodiversity Enhancement Statement (as suggested by the Council in its list of suggested conditions) is not sufficiently precise in terms of tree planting and does not pass the tests for imposing conditions as set out within the Framework or the PPG. This matter does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

22. Collectively I find that the benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the identified harms to the character and appearance of the area and the conflict with the development plan, and the harm that would be caused to visual amenity in conflict with national planning policy.

Conclusions

23. For the reasons given above, Appeal A is dismissed.
24. For the reasons given above, Appeal B is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR