
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 April 2026

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 May 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/C3810/W/25/3375146

Land outside 71A Aldwick Road, Bognor Regis PO21 2NW

- 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 (NWP Street Ltd) against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is BR/139/25/PL.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1 no. new communication kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C3810/H/25/3375147

Land outside 71A Aldwick Rd, Bognor Regis PO21 2NW

- 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 (NWP Street Ltd) against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is BR/140/25/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1 no. new communication kiosk with integrated defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Decision

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals relate to the same site and to each other. Appeal A is concerned with the refusal of planning permission for a proposed communication kiosk. Appeal B is in respect of refusal of advertisement consent for a digital advertisement display which would be an integral part of the proposed kiosk. I have considered each appeal on its individual merits but in order to avoid duplication I have combined them into a single decision letter as they raise similar issues.

Main Issues

4. The main issue relating to Appeal A is the effect of the kiosk on the character and appearance of the area. For Appeal B, the main issue is the effect of the kiosk on visual amenity. The local planning authority has not raised concerns with regard to public safety.

Reasons

5. The site is located within the Aldwick Road shopping area. There are retail units at street level and so the area has a commercial retail character. Advertisements in the area generally relate to retail fascias and projecting signs above existing shopfronts with only a small number of these appearing to be illuminated.
6. Street furniture within the vicinity of the site is not extensive but includes low level items such as benches, planters, bollards, bins and fencing. There is also a bus shelter close to the junction with Victoria Drive/Park Road although its panels were all transparent at the time of my site visit, with no advertisements. There were other, temporary, features such as, A-frame signage and wheelie bins within the street scene.
7. The kiosk would be positioned on an area of wide pavement to ensure that pedestrian movement lines would not be affected by the installation. It would also be positioned close to a lay-by just before the pavement angles away from the carriageway, giving it a prominent siting within the streetscape.
8. The kiosk would have a black powder coated steel appearance and be open-fronted. It would be a large structure and appear more akin to an advertising panel as opposed to a traditional red telephone box. Indeed, the telephone and other services would almost appear as secondary features upon the proposed structure. There are no other kiosks of a similar nature within the locality. Furthermore, there are no digital displays of the size proposed in the area.
9. The kiosk would be a large, visually dominant and intrusive structure that would create additional visual clutter within the street scene. The illumination of the advertising panel would add to its prominence and visual dominance within this part of Aldwick Road. Neither the kiosk nor the advertisement would relate to other street furniture or advertisements in the area. Consequently, the visually dominant and intrusive nature of the structure would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene, harming the visual amenity of the area.
10. The public telephone provided by the kiosk can offer a lifeline to some people and would be more accessible to those with mobility impairments than traditional telephone boxes. The kiosk would also provide other facilities, such as, mapping information and a defibrillator. Furthermore, the advertisement panel could be used to display public health messages, alerts or be utilised by local businesses for advertisement purposes. Working alongside Trees for Cities there is the future possibility of a tree being planted on an urban street.
11. Whilst some of these benefits could not be guaranteed through the planning process and in some instances the scale of benefit is not stated, there would nonetheless be some positive aspects of the proposal. Furthermore, conditions have been put forward that could control the timing and images displayed and/or the level of illumination. The advertisement proposal would also be subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.
12. However, these matters do not absolve me from making an assessment as to the effects of the proposal in regard to the considerations set out under the main issues section above. Furthermore, given my findings, I do not consider the stated benefits, and proposed conditions would sufficiently overcome my concerns to allow planning permission or advertisement consent to be forthcoming.

13. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed kiosk and advertisement would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area (Appeal A) and its visual amenity (Appeal B). Given these conclusions, I find there to be conflict with Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan 2018 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments reflect or improve upon the character of the site and surrounding area and that streets and public spaces are attractive. There would also be a failure to achieve the aims of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework in ensuring that development is sympathetic to local character and of paragraph 141 which deals with the quality and character of places in relation to advertisements.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR