



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 21 January 2026

by **S Burch BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/Z0116/W/25/3367567

Pavement Adjacent Colston Tower, Colston Avenue, Bristol, BS1 4UB

- 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 Bristol City Council.
- The application Ref is 25/10724/F.
- The development proposed is described as the 'proposed installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 2no. digital 75" LCD advert screens, and associated BT Phone Kiosk removals.'

Appeal B Ref: APP/Z0116/H/25/3367568

Pavement Adjacent Colston Tower, Colston Avenue, Bristol, BS1 4UB

- 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 Bristol City Council.
- The application Ref is 25/10725/A.
- The advertisement proposed is described as the 'proposed installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 2no. digital 75" LCD advert screens, and associated BT Phone Kiosk removals.'

Decision Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 2no. digital 75" LCD advert screens, and associated BT Phone Kiosk removals at the pavement adjacent Colston Tower, Colston Avenue, Bristol, BS1 4UB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/10724/F, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Decision Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 2no. digital 75" LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit at the pavement adjacent Colston Tower, Colston Avenue, Bristol, BS1 4UB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/10725/A. The consent is granted for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have used the descriptions from the respective application forms in the banner headings above. However, in my formal decision for Appeal B I have amended the description to match the description used by the Council on the decision notice, as this more accurately describes the proposed advertisement.

4. As set out above, there are two appeals on this site. They differ only in that Appeal A relates to planning permission and Appeal B relates to express advertisement consent. I have considered each on its individual merit. However, as they raise similar issues, I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated, to avoid duplication.
5. In respect of Appeal B, the Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) both make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account cumulative impacts. Regard does not need to be had to the development plan. Therefore, while I have taken relevant policies of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (CS), the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies- Local Plan (2014) (LP) and the Bristol Central Area Plan (BCAP) into account as a material consideration, they have not been determinative.
6. The appeal site is situated within the College Green Conservation Area (CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. It is also situated adjacent to the City and Queen Square CA.
7. The appeal site is located within the setting of several nearby Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings. I have a duty under section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the buildings or their settings. The Council's case officer reports set out how the appeal site is located in proximity to Grade II listed properties on St Augustine's Parade, amongst others. It however does not specify the addresses of the listed buildings on this road. The listing descriptions of 1,2 and 3 St Augustines Parade (St Augustines Court), 29 and 30 St Augustines Parade and the Bristol Omnibus Company Travel and Chief Traffic Offices have however been provided. I have therefore considered the effect of the proposal on these listed properties, amongst others.
8. Regulation 5A (3) of the 1990 Regulations (as amended) requires Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to notify Historic England of any application for planning permission for any development of land where that development could affect the setting of a Grade I or Grade II* listed building. The Council did not consult Historic England at application stage, despite it identifying harm to a Grade II* listed building. I have therefore sought comments from Historic England at appeal stage. Both main parties were provided with the opportunity to respond to any comments received from Historic England. I have considered any comments in my decisions.
9. Although not mentioned by either main party, Historic England set out that the site is also located in proximity to St Stephen's Church, a Grade I listed building. I have therefore also considered the effect of the proposals on this listed building.

Main Issues

10. The main issues for Appeal A are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area, including the College Green CA, City and Queens Square CA and the setting of nearby listed buildings; and

- public safety

11. The main issues for Appeal B are the effect of the proposed advertisement on:

- amenity; and
- public safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance/amenity, including the CA's and listed buildings

12. The appeal site is situated along a stretch of pavement on Colston Avenue. The surrounding area is predominantly commercial in character, with a range of shops, restaurants, cafes, bars, gyms and offices. It is designated as a Secondary Shopping frontage. The footway in the vicinity of the appeal site contains various items of street furniture including street signs, lamp posts, an existing display screen and phone kiosk and bus stops.
13. The College Green CA Character Appraisal outlines how the area in which the appeal site is located in is defined by the historic extent of the, now culverted, River Frome and docks. The character and land use reflects its historic function as a busy dockside. The area has a strong architectural backdrop and buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site are more modern with dissipating active frontages united by a broadly light-coloured material palette and Art Deco style. As the appeal site relates to a section of pavement in a commercial area surrounded by various street furniture, it makes a neutral contribution to the significance of the CA as a whole.
14. As mentioned, the site is situated adjacent to, but not within, the City and Queen Square CA. The City & Queen Square CA Appraisal sets out how the special interest of the CA is derived from its historic development and quality of built form combined with the legibility of the historic street layout and traditional plot boundaries. The area is characterised by its rich architectural mix of traditional buildings and the distinctive settlement patterns.
15. 29 St Augustines Parade (No.29), a Grade II listed building, is situated south of the appeal site. The listing description outlines how the three-storey property with an attic comprises brick, limestone dressings and a pantile roof. The ground floor is in two sections with panelled timber jambs and a 2-leaf door to the right. 30 St Augustines Parde (No.30), a Grade II listed property, is also situated south of the appeal site. The three-storey property with attic also comprises brick with limestone dressing and a tiled mansard roof. The 19th century shop front has attached moulded columns to large, fluted consoles and fascia. The significance of these properties is derived from their special architectural interest.
16. St Augustines Court, a Grade II listed building, lies south of the appeal site. The property is four storeys with an attic. It comprises a 20th century shop front with upper floors divided by pilaster strips and moulded strings. Materials include render with limestone dressing and a cast iron frame. The Grade II listed Bristol Omnibus Company Travel and Chief Traffic Offices are also situated south of the appeal site. The property is three stories with an attic and 2-window range. The mid-19th century shop front has Tudor arches to plate-glass windows and a central doorway. The significance of these properties is also derived from their special architectural interest.

17. The appeal site is also located proximate to the Roman Catholic Church of St Mary on the Quay, a Grade II* listed building. The property is listed for its architectural interest, historic interest and its interior. The listing description outlines how the building is an accomplished rendition of the Greek Revival style and it was the first Catholic Church to be built following the Emancipation Acts. It also benefits from a high-quality interior, and its significance is derived from the above factors.
18. As set out by Historic England, opposite the site, to the east, is St Stephen's Church. There is limited information regarding this building before me, however Historic England outline how it remains a prominent eye catcher set back from the principal building line of Colston Avenue. In my mind, its significance is largely derived from its grand architectural style and large tower. Historic England consider it to be a positive contributor to the CA.
19. The proposed freestanding hub would be positioned on the outer section of the footpath. Its positioning on the outer section would be relatively in keeping within the siting of other street furniture in the area, such as lampposts, streetlights and a nearby bus stop, and would not confuse the legibility of the footpath. The modern design of the hub and use of dark materials would be in keeping with the colour and design of other street furniture in the area, including a display screen on a nearby bus stop. These factors would allow it to assimilate well with its surroundings.
20. Although relatively tall, the slim profile of the hub would reduce its overall bulk such that it would not be unacceptably prominent in the street scene. Additionally, it would be set against the backdrop of the large buildings in the area. The proposed hub would also be sufficiently separate from existing street furniture so as not to result in unacceptable clutter. In addition, the scheme also seeks the removal of three existing BT payphones/display screens in the wider area, which would effectively remove street clutter, and is an important consideration in favour of the scheme.
21. Given the width of the footpath, the advertisements within the hub would not appear overtly prominent or result in the proliferation of signage in the street scene. The appearance of the advertisement displays within the hub would not be unusual in this commercial context and given their size, they would not appear prominent set against the scale of the buildings in the immediate vicinity. As there are other examples of illuminated signage and the street is well-lit by streetlights, the illumination of the advertisements would not appear out of place or obtrusive. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the internal illumination would be poor quality. If the appeals were to be allowed, a planning condition could be used to control the level of illumination. The Council set out that the current kiosk only has an advert on one side, however there is a display screen, similar to that proposed, proximate to the site with an advert on both sides.
22. In terms of the proposals effect on the Roman Catholic Church of St Mary on the Quay, the hub, including the advertisements would be situated close to this building. It would be visible in oblique views of the Church from the south given its proximity. In this regard, views of the Church would be partially obscured. The hub would therefore somewhat detract from the ability to appreciate the Church, resulting in harm to its setting. Historic England raise similar concerns, outlining how the scheme would result in a degree of harm to its significance.

23. The appeal site is separated from the Grade II listed properties at No's 29, 30 and The Bristol Omnibus Company Travel and Chief Traffic Offices by various other buildings, Colston Street, and some soft landscaping on Colston Street. The separation distance, multiple intervening structures, and the commercial character of the area would ensure that the proposals do not harm the setting of the listed buildings. Additionally, it is noted that there is an existing display screen on a bus stop proximate to these buildings.
24. St Augustines Court is located some distance from the appeal site. This distance, coupled with multiple intervening structures and buildings would ensure that the proposed hub is minimally visible in views of the listed building and would preserve the setting of the listed building.
25. The appeal site is located on the other side of 'The Centre' from St Stephens Church. Numerous road junctions, as well as the large central reserve separates the site from this building. The distance, coupled with the multiple intervening structures and the commercial character of the area would ensure that the proposals do not harm the setting of this listed building.

Public benefits and heritage balance

26. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the assets' conservation. Additionally, the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Consistent with that approach, paragraph 213 sets out that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, should require clear and convincing justification.
27. Given the scale and nature of the proposal, the degree of harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed building would be less than substantial. On a scale, it would be at the very low end of substantial harm. Under such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
28. In terms of the benefits, as set out the hub would facilitate access to Wi-Fi and improve 5G coverage. There is also the potential for the hubs to collect and display real-time data such as air quality, traffic congestion and pedestrian, vehicle and bike numbers. Such data could provide useful insights to local communities and decision makers.
29. Of particular importance, the scheme would include the removal of a number of various phone boxes. One of these is situated on the pavement along Colston Avenue, close to the Roman Catholic Church of St Mary on the Quay. It is of similar size and design to the proposed hub, although an advertisement is only positioned on one side of it. The existing hub, including the advertisement, is currently visible in views of the Church from the south, therefore detracting from its settings. The existing hub would be sat further back from the listed building, closer to the junction with Colston Street. In this regard, the removal of the existing hub would better reveal the significance of the Church, with the new hub situated further away from it. The removal of this hub could be ensured through a planning condition. The scheme would therefore essentially result in the replacement of an existing hub with a similar hub, albeit further away from the listed building.

30. Nonetheless, paragraph 202 of the Framework states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource. The harm that the appeal proposal would cause to the setting of the Grade II* listed building attracts considerable weight. However, the public benefits of the proposal, in particular the removal of the existing hub close to the Roman Catholic Church of St Mary on the Quay, carries substantial weight in favour of the scheme. I consider that the weight afforded to the public benefits of the scheme would therefore outweigh the harm to the setting of the listed building.
31. Overall, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their setting, but I find that the scheme offers a public benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the Grade II* listed building, and I conclude that there is a clear and convincing justification for the proposal such that there would not be unacceptable harm to heritage assets.
32. I acknowledge that Historic England also consider the scheme to result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst I afford significant weight to their comments, for the reasons set out above, I do not consider there to be harm in this regard. In any case, the comments from Historic England do not consider the benefits of the scheme, in particular the removal of the existing hub close to the Grade II* listed building, and two other hubs. These are important considerations in favour of the scheme.
33. Consequently, in respect of Appeal A, I conclude that I conclude that the proposed development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the College Green CA and the City and Queen Square CA. It would accord with Policy BCS21 of the CS and Policies DM26, DM27, DM28, and DM36 of the LP in this regard. Collectively, amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure high quality design that contributes positively to an areas character and identity and a safe, attractive, high quality and inclusive public realm.
34. It would also accord with the Framework, as well as Policies BCS22 of the CS and DM31 of the LP, which broadly seek to preserve or enhance heritage assets and their setting, but also includes a requirement for less than substantial harm to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal.
35. In respect of Appeal B, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of the area. As set out, the harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset would be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. I have taken into account Policy BCS21 and BCS22 of the CS and Policies DM26, DM27, DM28 and DM31 and DM36 the LP.

Public safety

36. The hub would face oncoming drivers and would be located on the outer section of the footpath, in drivers sight lines, which would reduce the risk of them turning away from the road to look at the advertisements. It would be positioned south of the traffic lights adjacent to Colston Tower. This would allow for clear views of the traffic lights as drivers and cyclists approach the crossing. Additionally, given the commercial character of the area, with bus stops and multiple crossing points, and from my experience during my site visit, cars appear to travel relatively slowly through the area. The Council raises concerns regarding the frequent and irregular crossing over the road by pedestrians. However, there are a number of controlled crossings in close proximity to the site, to facilitate safe crossing for pedestrians.

37. Whilst I have taken the Transportation Officers comments into account, there is little substantive evidence, and nothing that I could see on-site, to suggest that the road layout is so complicated, or that driving or cycling conditions are so demanding, that the proposal would present an unacceptable highway safety. Furthermore, should the appeal be allowed planning conditions could be used to restrict the advertisements to static images and the frequency and nature of their changeover, further minimising any distraction. A condition could also be used to ensure that any advertisements do not resemble traffic signs. There is little substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposed advertisement would cause drivers to misinterpret a traffic signal, or that such impacts would be exacerbated during hours of darkness, adverse weather or during periods of poor visibility. There is also limited evidence before me to demonstrate that the advertisements would create glare on traffic lights.
38. The Council has drawn my attention to several recorded vehicle accidents on the nearby highway network. Whilst these are noted, such incidents can happen anywhere. Based on the evidence before me, I also cannot be sure of the exact circumstances or reasons behind these incidents. As such, I am not satisfied that the proposed hub would directly increase the risk of collisions.
39. I acknowledge that the proposed hub would create an additional obstruction in the footpath. However, the proposed hub would be situated on the outer section of the footpath where other street furniture is mainly positioned. As such, in my view and based on my experiences at my site visit, pedestrians, including those with impaired sight or mobility issues, would already be more likely to travel on the inner section of the footpath to avoid existing obstructions. There would be ample space around the hub for pedestrians to pass freely along the footway.
40. Any pedestrians, including those using wheelchairs, would likely only use the free Wi-Fi for short periods, so they would not need to remain adjacent to the hub for extended periods. The Council refer to the Transport for London (TfL) Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, which provides guidance for assessing pedestrian comfort. However, as the document is primarily intended for streets in the London area, its relevance to the appeal site is limited.
41. Concerns are raised regarding the lack of servicing statement which would identify where servicing vehicles would stop to maintain the equipment safely. However, it is reasonable to expect that any employees servicing the units would park in a safe and legal manner. The submitted plans do not indicate that any other above ground structures, apart from those shown on the plans, are proposed. There is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposed hub would be structurally unsound.
42. Concerns are raised that the proposed hub could facilitate anti-social behaviour and crime. Whilst the risk of opportunistic crime exists in any public place, little substantive evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed hub would directly increase this risk. Additionally, any use of the free Wi-Fi would likely be for relatively short periods of time, preventing any prolonged loitering. Noting the provisions of the BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan, which provides for call restrictions and prioritises any contact from the police, a planning condition would reduce the risk of the BT street hub being used for crime to an acceptable degree.

43. Concerns are also raised regarding the hub creating problems for existing CCTV cameras, such as colour contrasting and reduced visibility. There is however limited substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that this would be an issue in the circumstances of this appeal and the surrounding context. From the evidence before me, it appears that the appropriate consultations have been carried out by the Council.
44. Overall, with regard to Appeal A, for the reasons outlined above and based on the evidence before me, the scheme would have an acceptable effect on public safety. The scheme is therefore in accordance with Policies BCS10 and BCS13 of the CS, Policies DM23 and DM28 of the LP and Policy BCAP30 of the BCAP. Collectively, amongst other matters, these policies seek to promote high quality pedestrian routes and ensure highway safety. I also do not find any conflict with the broad aims of the West of England Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (2020-2036), which seeks to promote walking as a form of transport.
45. In respect of Appeal B, for the reasons outlined above and based on the evidence before me, the scheme would have an acceptable effect on public safety. I have taken into account Policy BCS10 of the CS and Policy DM23 of the LP.

Other Matters

46. Four linked dismissed appeals in Bristol have been drawn to my attention¹. The location of these appeals is however some distance away from the appeal site. Based on the evidence before me, I cannot be sure that the circumstances relating to pedestrian/public safety and the effect on the conservation area are directly comparable to the appeals before me. Reference to these dismissed appeals does not alter my position on the above main issues.
47. From the evidence before me, it is not clear if the appeal site is situated on a primary or secondary pedestrian route. Nonetheless, the scheme would involve the removal of various redundant phone boxes, which is an important consideration in favour of the scheme. Additionally, the hub would facilitate access to Wi-Fi and improve 5G coverage, amongst other things. Therefore, in this instance, I consider that it would provide an appropriate and proportionate level of public realm improvements.
48. Concerns are raised regarding the lack of information in relation to the level of online and data security the hubs would have. The evidence before me however outlines how such devices must comply with PSTI legislation. These matters would therefore be covered by this legislation.
49. The appellants submission outlines how the hub would be powered by 100% renewable carbon- free energy. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the proposed hub would exacerbate climate change. Additionally, the Council's pollution control team have no objection to the appeals. There is nothing in the evidence to suggest that the public would have to pay for the running of the hubs.
50. Concerns are raised regarding the effect of LED sources and advertisements on human health, including eye and mental health. However, there is limited substantive evidence before me to demonstrate a direct link between the proposed

¹ APP/Z0116/W/24/3356651, APP/Z0116/H/24/3356653, APP/Z0116/W/24/3356654, APP/Z0116/H/24/3356655

hub and human health. Furthermore, if the appeal were to be allowed a planning condition could be used to ensure that any illumination from the advertisement is within the range recommended by the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) for such an advertisement. I have not been directed to any planning policy which seeks to control the content of such advertisements.

51. Concerns are raised by interested parties regarding the effect of Wi-Fi, 4G and 5G antennae and small cell technology on health and public safety. However, the appellant has provided a certificate to confirm that the proposal has been designed to comply with the guidelines published by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP).
52. An interested party raises concerns regarding data capture and privacy. Whilst there is a video camera above each screen, the evidence outlines how these are not currently connected or used, and any use would be after consultation and notifying the public and stakeholders through multiple channels. A planning condition could be used, if the appeals were to be allowed, to ensure that any required consultation is carried out. There is limited evidence before me to demonstrate harm to wildlife.
53. Concerns are raised regarding the upkeep of the hub. The appellant's submissions however outlines that the hub would be inspected weekly and cleaned at least every two weeks. The proposed developments have attracted numerous letters of objections. However, the number of objections is not a reasonable ground to refuse development in this instance.
54. I am satisfied that the submitted heritage statement is proportionate to the appeals.

Conditions

55. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against the tests set out in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Where appropriate, I have adjusted the wording in the interests of precision and enforceability.
56. For Appeal A, in addition to the standard time-limit implementation condition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans and documents in the interests of certainty. A condition is also imposed to ensure the ongoing maintenance and management of the hub in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and to ensure that the development does not increase crime and disorder.
57. I have also imposed a condition, similar to that suggested by the Council, for the removal of the existing BT telephone kiosks. As noted, the removal of the existing kiosk on Colston Avenue is of particular importance in considering the public benefits of the scheme. A condition is also used to ensure that any required consultation is carried out prior to the use of the cameras on the hub. I have not imposed the condition requiring a construction management plan for the proposed installation as the proposal would be modest in scale.
58. For Appeal B, in addition to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations, which are not repeated in the attached schedule, I have imposed conditions restricting the advertisements to static images and the

frequency and nature of their changeover in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and highway safety.

59. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the advertisements do not resemble traffic signs, in the interests of highway safety. I have however removed the Council's reference to the emission of sound, smoke or odours as there is no evidence to substantiate that they would create problems in this regard.
60. In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety, I have also imposed a condition requiring a dimmer and a photocell to be installed. This condition also ensures, in the event of a fault, that the screen freezes the image. I have used a condition to restrict the luminance of the advertisement. I have not been directed to any specific policies regarding the level of illuminance that should apply in this area. I have therefore amended the wording of the suggested condition relating to level of luminance to ensure compliance with the recommendations of the ILP.
61. I do not consider that it would be necessary to monitor the illumination for the appeal proposal or submit monitoring reports in relation to highway safety and lighting. I have therefore not attached the suggested conditions relating to this. As outlined above, a condition will be used to ensure that the proposal complies with the recommendations of the ILP. I have not attached the suggested condition relating to the submission of an access, maintenance and inspection plan, as I am not satisfied that there is sufficient justification to demonstrate that such a plan is necessary.
62. It is not necessary to attach a condition listing the approved plans, as my decision relating to Appeal B grants express consent, not planning permission.

Conclusion

63. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B are allowed.

S Burch

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE 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 the following drawings and documents:
 - Site location Maps, Drg No. 001 A
 - Proposed Site Plan, Drg No, 002 A
 - Existing and Proposed Elevations, Drg No. 003 A
 - BT Street Hubs Beyond Connection Street Hub Product Statement V2.0, dated September 2024.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be managed in accordance with the management measures detailed in the BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan Version 3 for the lifetime of the development.
- 4) Within three (3) months of the development hereby permitted being implemented the existing BT Telephone Boxes at the pavement outside Beacon Tower, Colston Avenue, Bristol BS1 4UB, the pavement outside 20 Clare Street, Bristol, BS1 1YG the pavement outside Horizon House, Deanery Road, Bristol BS1 5AH must be removed and the pavement shall be reinstated to a condition matching the adjacent highway.
- 5) The cameras on the hub shall not be used until any required consultation has taken place.

Appeal B

- 1) The minimum display time for each advertisement shall be 10 seconds, and the advertisement display panels shall display static images only.
- 2) The interval between successive advertisements shall be no greater than 1 second and the complete display shall change without effect.
- 3) No content on the digital display screens shall resemble traffic signs, as defined in Section 64 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 4) The advertisement shall be equipped with a dimmer control and photocell which shall constantly monitor ambient lighting conditions and adjust sign brightness accordingly. The display shall include a mechanism to freeze the image in the event of a malfunction.
- 5) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisements permitted by this consent shall be within the range recommended by the Institute of Lighting Professionals for this type and size and screen in the Professional Lighting Guide 05 (PLG 05) The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements (or its equivalent in a replacement Guide).

****END OF SCHEDULE**