



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2026

by K Reeves BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6002724

Pavement o/s 405-409 Wimborne Road, Bournemouth BH9 2AJ

- 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 BT Telecommunications Plc against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is P/25/03874/FUL.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V1260/Z/25/3376844

Pavement o/s 405-409 Wimborne Road, Bournemouth BH9 2AJ

- 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 BT Telecommunications Plc against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is P/25/03873/ADV
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphone kiosk(s).
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones at Pavement o/s 405-409 Wimborne Road, Bournemouth, BH9 2AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/25/03874/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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. 001 Rev A, 002 Rev A and 003 Rev A.
 - 3) Prior to the installation of the BT Street Hub hereby permitted, the existing payphone kiosk located within the red line area and shown on drawing no. 002 Rev A shall be removed in its entirety from the site.
2. Appeal B is allowed and express consent is granted for installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphone kiosk(s) at Pavement o/s 405-409 Wimborne Road, Bournemouth, BH9 2AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/25/03873/ADV. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional conditions:

- 1) The maximum level of luminance shall be no more than 600 cd/m² during hours of darkness (dusk until dawn). In daylight hours, the level of luminance shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in the Institution of Lighting Professionals - Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m². The level of luminance of the advertisement displays shall be controlled by light sensors that measure ambient light levels and automatically control the perceived brightness to within the limits set by this condition.
- 2) The advertisement displays shall only display static images and shall not display any moving images, animation, intermittent or full motion video images, or any images that resemble road signs or traffic signals.
- 3) No individual advertisement shall be displayed for a duration of less than 10 seconds and the transition between advertisement images shall take place over a period no greater than one second with no visual effects (including fading, swiping or other animated transition methods).
- 4) The advertisement displays shall contain at all times a feature that will turn off the screen (i.e. show a black screen) in the event that the display experiences a malfunction or error.

Preliminary Matters

3. The descriptions of development as set out above include reference to proposed BT phone kiosk removal, although one of those structures (Pavement o/s 447 Wimborne Road) is not identified within the application site boundary and there is no alternative mechanism before me which would secure its removal. As it is not located within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, its removal would not be determinative to the appeals.
4. Appeal A seeks planning permission for the installation of a BT Street Hub, while Appeal B concerns the associated application for advertisement consent. As both appeals relate to the same site and proposal, I have considered them together to avoid unnecessary duplication.
5. With respect to Appeal B, the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) specify that decisions must be based solely on considerations of amenity and public safety. The Council has not raised any objections on the grounds of public safety, and I see no reason to reach a different conclusion.

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.
7. The main issue in respect of Appeal B is the effect of the proposed advertisements on visual amenity.

Reasons

8. The proposed structure would occupy the same general position as the existing payphone kiosk at the front edge of the pavement. The kiosk currently forms part

of a run of street furniture, including cycle stands and a litter bin, within a wider frontage on both sides of the road containing a bus stop, lighting columns, signs, bollards and further bins and stands. This section of Wimborne Road already has a functional, visually busy character in which street furniture is an expected component of the public realm.

9. I recognise the Council's objective to reduce unnecessary street clutter in areas of high pedestrian activity. However, the existing payphone kiosk is a sizeable, dated feature that already contributes to the level of street furniture here. Its removal would offset the introduction of the replacement unit, and although the new structure is larger, it would sit within a wide pavement and an established cluster of functional items, so it would not materially increase the visual presence or spread of built elements. Policy seeks to avoid unnecessary additions, not prevent the modernisation or substitution of existing elements in an already utilitarian environment.
10. The Council also argues that the digital screen and modern appearance would appear intrusive against what it describes as a relatively open and uncluttered backdrop. That characterisation is not supported by the physical context, which is a frontage that is already defined by multiple functional items, creating a visually busy and utilitarian setting. In this context, the modern form of the replacement unit would read as a contemporary successor to the existing kiosk rather than an isolated or visually assertive feature. Although larger and incorporating illumination, it would be absorbed into the established pattern of movement, activity and commercial frontage and would not appear dominant or incongruous.
11. The Council has cited appeal decisions. In Commercial Road, the Inspector found that BT Street Hubs added to a high concentration of street furniture, signage and advertising, tipping the balance against amenity. In Old Christchurch Road, illuminated panels were held to introduce cumulative clutter within an already visually busy, pedestrian-heavy environment. In Holdenhurst Road, although an existing kiosk would be removed, the Inspector concluded that the new Hub nonetheless added further intrusion to a fragmented streetscene. Unlike those cases, the proposal here would not introduce an additional visually assertive element, instead it would replace an existing payphone kiosk and maintain the current level of street furniture. The circumstances of the cited appeals do not lead me to a different judgement in this case.
12. For these reasons, with regard to Appeal A, the proposal would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would comply with Policies CS9 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and Policy 5.11 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002), which collectively require that development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the area, avoids visual clutter and does not introduce dominant, intrusive or incongruous features into the streetscene.
13. Additionally, the proposal would not conflict with the objectives of the Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy: Guiding Principles Supplementary Planning Document (2013), which seeks street furniture that enhances the public realm, avoids visual clutter, respects local character and contributes to a coherent, high-quality and pedestrian-friendly streetscape.

14. In relation to Appeal B, and in accordance with the relevant Regulations, I have considered the provisions of the development plan to the extent that they are applicable. The aforementioned policies are therefore material considerations in this context. The proposal would not have a materially harmful impact on visual amenity and would meet the objectives of the above policies.

Conditions

15. For Appeal A, I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty and a condition ensuring the removal of the existing payphone kiosk is required to prevent an increase in visual clutter.
16. For Appeal B, a series of standard conditions are applied as required by the Regulations, including limiting the consent to five years. Additionally, to ensure highway safety is not compromised, it is necessary to impose conditions to require a cut out in the event of malfunction, to control the frequency of image change, ensure that images remain static and to control the level of luminance.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, both Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed.

K Reeves

INSPECTOR