



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6002523

Pavement o/s 63 High Street, 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 Simon Warner of BT Telecommunications Plc against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is LU/200/25/PL.
 - The development proposed is the proposed installation of 1no. BT street hub and removal of associated existing BT payphone(s).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C3810/Z/25/3376760

Pavement o/s 63 High Street, 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 Simon Warner of BT Telecommunications Plc against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is LU/201/25/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is the proposed installation of 1no. BT street hub and removal of associated existing BT payphone(s).
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Appeal A relates to an application for planning permission, whereas Appeal B is concerned with express advertisement consent, but both appeals relate to the same site.
3. The description of development stated on the application form for Appeal B does not reflect the advertisement consent that was sought. Therefore, I have determined Appeal B based on the description of development found on the Council's decision notice, which reads, "2 No 1.905m internally illuminated LCD display screens, one on each side of the Streethub Unit."
4. In respect of Appeal B, The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) both explain that advertisements are subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. As the Council does not raise concern about public safety in respect of Appeal B, subject to the imposition of conditions, I have focused on the proposal's effect on amenity.
5. In respect of Appeal A I have a statutory duty under s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) to have special regard to preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural

or historic interest. However, this duty does not apply to Appeal B because s66(1) only applies to a grant of planning permission.

Main Issues

6. The main issue in respect of Appeal A is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to the Grade II listed buildings at 67A, 69 and 72 High Street and 1 East Street and other heritage assets.
7. The main issue in Appeal B is the effect of the proposal on amenity. I will, nevertheless, consider the Grade II listed buildings at 67A, 69 and 72 High Street and 1 East Street in determining the proposal's effect on amenity.

Reasons

8. The appeal site is located on a traditional High Street which runs on an east-west axis with two-storey terraced properties on either side. Commercial premises characterise and line either side of High Street, which is a pedestrian route. Upper floors of properties are often populated by residential uses. Advertisements populate the street in conjunction with the commercial premises. Some are externally illuminated; others are not illuminated. Street furniture, including cycle stands and benches populate High Street. Two payphones are located to the southeast of the site, each has a non-illuminated advertisement panel.

Appeal A

9. No 72 lies to the south west of the appeal site. Its significance relates to its architectural and historical interest owing to its three-storey construction in the mid-19th century with stucco architraves to glazing bar sash windows on the first and second floors. The fascia oversails the shop front, and its entrance has flush panelled reveals and a rectangular fanlight. Nos 67A and 69 High Street and No 1 is a mid to late 18th-century building at the corner of High Street and East Street. There is a mixed palette of materials with stucco and painted brick, respectively. There are bay windows on the ground floors facing High Street and East Street. The significance of the asset derives from its architectural and historical interest.
10. A series of locally listed buildings (non-designated heritage assets (NDHA)) are also close to the appeal site at 57, 61/63, 65, 70 and 74 High Street. These buildings form a transitional group between the town centre and the historic development on East Street. They are proportionate and reflect the style, appearance and material palette of neighbouring buildings and the local area.
11. The proposed modern form of development would be sited in a relatively clear section of the pedestrianised street in between existing street furniture and adjacent to the designated heritage assets and the NDHAs. However, it would be close to an existing shopfront, which, together with its scale and large screens, would result in a prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene. I note the appellant's point that the proposal needs to be the height and design proposed for technical reasons, and while there would be benefits of the proposal, it would cause a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. By extension, the proposal would not preserve the two designated heritage assets, their setting and their architectural and historic significance.
12. Even though the Council did not consider that the proposal would harm designated heritage assets or the NDHAs, I have reached my own view given the statutory duty that I need to discharge in respect of the designated heritage assets.

13. Two existing kiosks to the east of the site are proposed to be removed. A planning condition could achieve this prior to the proposal's installation. This would reduce street clutter, but the existing kiosks are located next to a street tree and are not a prominent feature in the street scene, unlike the location of the proposal. Hence, the removal of the existing kiosks would not overcome the identified harm.
14. The proposal would not, therefore, preserve the listed buildings or their settings and their special architectural or historic interest. The degree of harm, with regard to the Framework, would be less than substantial, but I give this harm great weight. The proposal's public benefits need to be weighed against that harm.
15. The removal of the existing kiosks would, notwithstanding my view about the Grampian condition, be a public benefit that carries limited positive weight. The provision of 5G coverage would enhance the existing signal strength in the area, although there is good coverage already. This matter carries limited positive weight. Furthermore, free Wi-Fi can be found in various stores or coffee shops nearby already, and there is already wayfinding information nearby. Therefore, these public benefits carry modest positive weight only. The ability to make free phone calls, including emergency calls, would be a public benefit that carries limited positive weight. However, I find it unlikely that people would either leave their devices unattended or stand at the proposal while they charge their devices. Even if this is a public benefit, it carries modest positive weight. Public messaging would be a public benefit of limited positive weight. Collectively, the public benefits in this case do not outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have identified.
16. The scale of harm that would be caused by the proposal in respect of the NDHAs would be modest, and the various benefits of the proposal would outweigh that.
17. I conclude that the proposal would harmfully affect the character and appearance of the area, and not preserve the Grade II listed buildings at 67A, 69 and 72 High Street and 1 East Street. The proposal would conflict with Policies D DM1, HER SP1 and HER DM1 of the Adopted Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (LP) as well as Policy 17 of the Littlehampton Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Plan (NP). Jointly, these policies seek, among other things, development to reflect or improve on the character of the site and the surrounding area in terms of its scale, siting and design features so that development proposals conserve or enhance the historic environment of the district. The proposal would also not accord with Framework paragraph 215.

Appeal B

18. Two internally illuminated LCD screens would be attached to either side of the proposal subject of Appeal A in an easterly and westerly direction on High Street. The proposed adverts would differ from the adverts associated with the adjacent commercial premises as they would be digital and prominent in the pedestrianised street due to their siting. The two panels would be large, and the brightness of the screens along with successive adverts would result in a form of advertisement that is out of kilter with the amenity of the area, to its detriment. The effects caused could be reduced by imposing planning conditions to control the level of luminance, to prevent moving images and instant transitions between adverts, and so that there is a minimum time period in which advertisements take place. An in-built sensor which would adapt the illuminance levels to respond to the ambient light of the environment is also part of the proposal.
19. However, collectively, I do not consider that the proposal and the planning

conditions would overcome the harm that I have found. They would reduce the degree of harm but not alleviate it entirely even if I were to impose a condition controlling the luminance to 300cd/m² because of this location.

20. I recognise that the proposal is a legitimate means of income, and the proposal seeks to provide a display with a consistent appearance, but I conclude that the proposal subject of Appeal B would harm the visual amenity of the area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Framework paragraph 141. I have reached this view based on the proposal's merits and the location of the appeal site.

Conclusions

21. The proposal subject of Appeal A conflicts with the development plan, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
22. I have concluded that the proposal subject of Appeal B would harm amenity.
23. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeals A and B should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR