



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 January 2026

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/L5810/W/25/3373117

Outside No.65 Broad Street, Teddington TW11 8QZ

- 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 Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PA25/0919.
 - The development proposed is the proposed removal of an existing In Link unit, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L5810/H/25/3370979

Broad Street, Outside No. 65, Teddington TW11 8QZ

- 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 Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PA25/0920.
 - The advertisement proposed is two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of an existing In Link unit, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit outside No.65 Broad Street, Teddington TW11 8QZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA25/0919, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule A.
2. Appeal B is allowed and express consent is granted for two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit outside No.65 Broad Street, Teddington TW11 8QZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA25/0920. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five conditions set out in the regulations and the additional conditions in the attached schedule B.

Preliminary Matters

3. There are two appeals on this site. Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission for the provision of a street hub. Appeal B is in respect of the refusal of advertisement consent for two digital 75-inch LCD display screens one on each side of the street hub unit. The kiosk and the advertisement are integral to each other, and both are the subject of these appeals. I have dealt with each case on its

individual merits, but to avoid duplication both proposals are considered together in this decision, unless otherwise indicated.

4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the regulations) require that advertisement appeal decisions be made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance confirm this approach.
5. Since the application was determined, the Council have adopted the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2025) (LP). In these circumstances, I am required to determine the appeal against the current development plan for the area at the time of my decision. The appeal has therefore been determined in accordance with Policies 28, 29 and 30 of the LP.

Main Issue

6. The main parties agree that the proposed advertisements would not be detrimental to public safety. Therefore, for Appeal A, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the area including the setting of the Broad Street Conservation Area and the nearby non designated heritage assets.
7. For Appeal B, the main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

8. The appeal site is located in a section of pavement to the north of Broad Street. The boundary of the Broad Street Conservation Area (CA) runs along the middle of Broad Street and therefore the appeal site lies just outside of it. The significance of the CA is both historical and architectural due to being an example of a Victorian and Edwardian High Street which developed along a historic thoroughfare leading into the settlement of Teddington. Within the CA there are a variety of examples of shopfronts with the majority having well-preserved fascia boards, pilasters and corbelling. The appeal site is in proximity to 47-57, Broad Street and is on the opposite side of the road to 58, 64 and 68-72 which are designated by the Council as Buildings of Townscape Merit and are therefore non-designated heritage assets. The significance of these buildings lies with the traditional architectural details of the buildings and the shop frontages.
9. The appeal site is located in front of a modern three storey building with shops at ground level which have modern shop frontages of various colour. The pavement along this part of the street is stepped back from the main building line and therefore is much wider in character than the rest of Broad Street. It contains street trees, a bus shelter with advertisements, seating and an information board. There are also various pieces of street furniture including lamps, signage, a parking meter and black coloured telephone kiosk. Further along the street the pavement contains bins and cycle storage stands. There is a similar bus stop with advertisements on the opposite side of Broad Street. The site is also close to the traffic lights at the crossroads. Overall, this part of the street has a modern appearance which is visually distinct from the traditional character and appearance of the CA and therefore makes a neutral contribution to its setting.

10. The proposed street hub would replace an existing InLink unit in the same location which has silver metal and black trims. I observed that the existing hub assimilates within the wider street scene due to the established street furniture in proximity to it. According to the appellant the existing hub is approaching the end of its operational life and the proposed replacement would replicate all of its existing services. The proposed hub would be approximately 7cm taller, 35cm wider and 9cm deeper than the existing hub. Like the existing hub it would have screens on both sides.
11. Despite being larger in scale than the existing hub, its sideways positioning in the pavement would reduce its prominence when viewed from across the road within the CA. Furthermore, it would be seen against the backdrop of the modern shop frontages, their temporary internal signage and lighting.
12. I observed that due to the slight curve in Broad Street and the narrower pavement, longer distance views towards the appeal site from the direction of Hampton Road are restricted. Moreover, closer views of the proposal from this direction would be largely obscured by the bus shelter and other intervening street furniture. Therefore, there would be limited views of the proposed hub in vistas towards the stone fronted Barclays Bank building, a non-designated heritage asset.
13. The proposal would be more visible when viewed from the other side of the Broad Street/Church Street crossroads, however it would be seen against the backdrop of the modern shop frontages, bus stop and behind the traffic lights, which would disrupt its visual prominence. Due to the presence of street furniture between the appeal site and 47-57 Broad Street the proposed hub would have neutral impact on the setting of these non-designated heritage assets.
14. Although the proposed hub would introduce a larger, bulkier unit, owing to the context of the prevailing character of this section of Broad Street, its modern appearance would not be an incongruous addition. Therefore, taking into account the siting, scale and appearance of the hub, I consider that the overall effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and setting of the CA and the non-designated heritage assets would be a neutral one.
15. For these reasons, I conclude that in relation to Appeal A, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the CA and nearby non-designated heritage assets. It thereby accords with Policies 28, 29, and 30 of the LP which amongst other things seeks to ensure that new development enhances the local environment and character and the setting of non-designated heritage assets.
16. In relation to Appeal B, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the area. The policies of the development plan have been considered in so far as they are material and, in this respect, the scheme would not conflict with the development plan.

Other Matters

17. Concerns have been raised by a third party in relation to the need for the replacement hub and the impact on motorists. The hub would replace the existing unit and provide free public Wi-Fi, free UK calls, USB charging, emergency services button, environmental sensors, insight counting and small cell mobile connectivity. Paragraph 123 of the Framework states that local planning authorities

must determine applications on planning grounds only and should not question the need for electronic communications systems. The hub would be located within a wider pavement and as such the Council have concluded that it would not obstruct the pavement and based on my observations and the evidence before me, I concur.

Conditions

18. The Council has suggested that additional conditions beyond the 5 standard conditions are required. The appellant has agreed to these conditions which have also been applied to similar hubs approved in the area.
19. For appeal A, in order to meet legislative requirements, a condition shall be imposed to address the period for commencement (1). I have imposed a condition relating to approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt (2).
20. For appeal B, in addition to the standard conditions as required by the regulations, conditions relating to illumination (3), sound (4) and images (5), are required in order to preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and in the interests of road safety. A tree condition (6) is required to ensure that nearby trees are not damaged.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that both appeals A and B should be allowed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULES OF CONDITIONS

Appeal A

- 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 24007356_PLN_LOC_1.1, 24007356_PLN_SI_2.1, 24007356_PLN_EL_3.1 and Street Hub Unit Dimensions.

Appeal B

- 3) In daylight hours, the proposed advertising display luminance shall be controlled to reflect ambient light conditions and shall operate in accordance with recommendations within the Institute of Lighting Professionals Lighting Guide 'PLG 05/23 The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (2023), specifically Table 10.5 (Recommended maximum daytime permitted values of sign luminance). The display luminance shall not exceed 3,500cd/m² at any time. In the hours of darkness from dusk to dawn, the proposed advertising display luminance shall not exceed 300 candelas per square metre.

The proposed advertising display shall be reduced to not exceed 150 candelas per square metre between midnight and 6am.

- 4) No music or sound shall be emitted from the advertisements.
- 5) No individual advertisements displayed on the proposed advertising displays shall contain moving images flashing animation video or full motion images or images that resemble road signs or traffic signals.

The interval between successive advertisements shall be instantaneous (no greater than one second), with no flashing and smooth instant change into the next static image and the complete display shall change; there should be no visual effects, including swiping or other animated transition methods between successive advertisements, and the display will include a mechanism to freeze the image in the event of a malfunction or default to a blank screen to avoid any flashing error message or pixilation.

The proposed advertising display shall not change more frequently than once every 10 seconds, the use of message sequencing for the same product is prohibited and the advertisement shall not include features/equipment which would allow interactive messages/advertisements to be displayed.

- 6) Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme of tree protection, in line with BS5837, for both on and off-site trees, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purpose of the development until a time when the approved tree protection details and plans have been implemented in full. The approved tree protection details shall thereafter be retained on site for the duration of the development.

END OF SCHEDULES