



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2026

by **J Smith MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6001611

OS OneBeyond, 1 Haymarket Shopping Centre, Belgrave Gate, Leicester LE1 3HP

- 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 Nathan Still of In Focus Public Networks Limited against the decision of Leicester City Council.
- The application Ref is 20251340.
- The development proposed is replacement and updating of advertised public call box.

Appeal B Ref: APP/W2465/Z/25/3375691

OS OneBeyond, 1 Haymarket Shopping Centre, Belgrave Gate, Leicester LE1 3HP

- 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 Nathan Still of In Focus Public Networks Limited against the decision of Leicester City Council.
- The application Ref is 20251339.
- The development proposed is installation of one internally illuminated digital LCD screen to a telephone kiosk.

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement and updating of advertised public call box at OS OneBeyond, 1 Haymarket Shopping Centre, Belgrave Gate, Leicester LE1 3HP, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings submitted within the SITE PLAN & IMAGES document (Document Reference: A02938).
2. Appeal B is allowed and express consent is granted for the installation of one internally illuminated digital LCD screen to a telephone kiosk as applied for. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations, and the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be operated and managed according with the information contained within General Product Information and Product Specification sections found within the submitted Call Box Specification document, or an updated equivalent. This operation and management shall be carried out for the lifetime of the development.

Preliminary Matters

3. Appeal A concerns the refusal of planning permission to erect an advertised public call box. Appeal B concerns the refusal of express consent to display advertisements on the call box as proposed under Appeal A. As they are intrinsically linked and raise similar issues, I have combined both decisions into a single decision letter.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposals upon the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies outside the Haymarket Shopping Centre on Belgrave Gate, just at the boundary to the street known as Haymarket. This particular area of Belgrave Gate is host to a pedestrianised zone and a shared space for vehicles. Vehicular access however is limited to deliveries, controlled by rising bollards at the end of Belgrave Gate. This area is characterised by a distinctly modern commercial streetscape, featuring a variety of ground-floor business uses and buildings with a strong vertical emphasis. During my site visit, I also noted the presence of numerous advertisements integrated into the streetscape. Across both this immediate context and the wider area, there is a broad range of street furniture of varying heights, including vehicle bollards, bicycle racks, litter bins, and road signage. In this setting, a contemporary structure of the proposed height would not appear out of place.
6. I note the Council's view that the proposal would contribute to street clutter. However, the development would be positioned in line with an existing arrangement of street furniture, including benches, street trees, litter bins, and cycle racks. Although the proposed structure would exceed these elements in height, the surrounding building massing and its alignment along Belgrave Gate would allow it to integrate appropriately with the established streetscape. It would not be situated so close to these features, or to the Haymarket Shopping Centre, as to create a cramped or visually disjointed arrangement, nor would it impede access to adjoining shopfronts.
7. I now turn to the concern that the proposed development would disrupt views along Belgrave Gate and diminish the perceived openness of the street scene. In assessing this matter, I acknowledge that the structure would be visible from the public realm. However, within the context of Belgrave Gate, it would occupy only a small portion of what is a wide, pedestrianised streetscape.
8. Based on the foregoing assessment, in relation to Appeal A, the proposed call box would not be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. Therefore, it would be in accordance with Policy 3: Designing Quality Places of the Leicester City Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2014. Specifically, this policy, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development complements the visual amenity of an area by reason of its scale, position, quality, character, and design.
9. With regard to Appeal B, I have taken into consideration Policy 3, as it seeks to ensure that development is complementary to the visual amenity of an area and therefore is material in this case. The proposed development, as far as it is a

material consideration for Appeal B, would accord with Policy 3 of the Leicester City Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2014.

Conditions

10. With specific regard to Appeal A, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition which relate to the commencement of the development [1] and the approved plans [2]. With regard to Appeal B, the operation and management of the development [1] is necessary, in the interests of maintaining public safety through the management of the kiosk.
11. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the removal of the structure if it is unused for three calendar months. I consider a three-month period to be unreasonably short, and I am not persuaded that such a timeframe could be effectively enforced, as it would necessitate continuous monitoring. I also note that the structure would accommodate an advertisement display and would therefore be in use. Accordingly, I am not convinced that the condition is necessary, and in any event, it would fail to meet several of the six tests for planning conditions.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, both appeals should be allowed.

J Smith

INSPECTOR