



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2026

by **E Pickernell BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2026

---

### **Appeal A Ref: 6002723**

#### **Pavement o/s 15 Holdenhurst Road, Bournemouth BH8 8EH**

- 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/25/03870/FUL.
  - The development proposed is the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/V1260/Z/25/3376843**

#### **Pavement o/s 15 Holdenhurst Road, Bournemouth BH8 8EH**

- 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/25/03869/ADV.
  - The advertisement proposed is the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.
- 

## **Decision**

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

## **Preliminary Matters**

3. There are two appeals relating to the site, one against the refusal of planning permission and the other against the refusal of advertisement consent. To avoid duplication, while considering each on its own merits, I have dealt with both in a single decision letter.
4. With regards to Appeal B, the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) all make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Therefore, I have had regard to the policies of the development plan only in so far as they are a material factor relevant to the consideration of amenity.

## **Main Issues**

5. The main issue in respect of Appeal A is the effect on the character and appearance of the area, including its effect on non-designated heritage assets.
6. The main issue in respect of Appeal B is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the visual amenity of the area.

## **Reasons**

### *Appeal A – Character and appearance*

7. The appeal site comprises part of the pavement adjacent to Holdenhurst Road, to the northeast of its junction with the Lansdowne roundabout. The ground floor units of the adjacent terrace of buildings are in commercial use. These buildings have been identified by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).
8. There is a series of elements of street furniture within the pavement, near to the appeal site, comprising planters, streetlights, bins and bike stands. These are of a similar design, providing a sense of cohesiveness and consistency to the street furniture in the area, which continues to the opposite side of the road. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appeal proposal would introduce a rectangular street hub structure between existing bike stands and a lamp post. I recognise that a certain height is required to provide a signal, however, at almost 3m in height, the hub would be significantly larger and bulkier than the nearby items of street furniture other than the streetlights which comprise slim poles. Although the hub would not be as wide as the existing planters near to the appeal site, its overall bulk, mass and solidity, combined with its proximity to the road, would result in a significant visual intrusion into the streetscape. As such the hub would represent an incongruous form of development which would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
10. The adjacent NDHA in part derives its significance from its relationship with the street. The appeal scheme would introduce an overtly eye catching and incongruous element into the setting of the NDHA, albeit adjacent to the more commercial ground floor of the building, as opposed to the more characterful upper floors. As such it would result in minor harm to the aspects of the setting of the NDHA which contribute to its significance, resulting in indirect harm to the asset. In such circumstances the Framework requires a balanced judgement to be made having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset.
11. The appellant contends that the proposal would involve the removal of existing pay phone kiosks in three locations. One of these is relatively close to the appeal site, however it is partially glazed, located adjacent to a tall, modern building and near to the back edge of the pavement. As such it is significantly less prominent in the street scene than the appeal proposal would be. The other kiosks referred to are on different roads where the context differs and which are not seen in the same vantage points as the appeal site. As such I attach limited weight to their retention as a fall-back position.
12. The proposal would bring about benefits in respect of the provision of wi-fi connectivity, device charging, internet access and improved 4G and 5G coverage. I acknowledge that the appellant has certain obligations in this regard. The hub would also facilitate access to the emergency services and other functions such as

housing sensors and displaying community information and wayfinding, utilising carbon-free technology, and be accessible to people with disabilities. The Framework seeks to facilitate the provision of digital infrastructure in suitable locations. Overall, I give the benefits of the proposal moderate weight.

13. In this instance, I have taken into account the cumulative benefits including the removal of the three existing kiosks, I do not find that the benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm which I have identified.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and an NDHA. It would therefore conflict with Policy 5.11 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002) (LP), Policies CS7, CS40 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) (CS) and Policies D3, D4 and D7 of the Town Centre Area Action Plan (2013) (TCAAP). Together these seek to ensure that proposals have an acceptable appearance and maintain or enhance the heritage characteristics of the area. They also seek to respect and improve the existing character of the different parts of the Town Centre and the public realm.
15. The Council have also referred to Policy CS8 of the CS however this refers to the use of buildings within the Lansdowne Employment Area and as such has not been determinative in my consideration of this main issue.

#### *Appeal B – Visual amenity*

16. Appeal B relates to the proposed illuminated advertisement panels which would be part of the street hub considered under Appeal A. The advertisement panels would take up the majority of the front and rear facing sides of the hub.
17. Many of the ground floor units in the vicinity of the appeal site display advertisements for the individual businesses including fascia signs, small projecting signs and 'A' boards. Some of these contain illuminated elements.
18. However, the proposed illuminated panels, would be large and prominently located within the pavement, close to the road and perpendicular to the street. As such they would appear more visually intrusive and eye-catching in this context, even if the brightness were controlled. Consequently, the advertisements would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area.
19. I have taken account of Policies CS7, CS40 and CS41 of the CS and Policies D3, D4 and D7 of the TCAAP insofar as they are relevant to a consideration of amenity.
20. Policy 5.11 of the LP refers to proposals for telecommunications equipment and is therefore not relevant to proposals for advertisements.

#### **Other Matters**

21. In respect of Appeal B, the Council has raised no concerns in relation to the effect of the appeal proposal on public safety and based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree.
22. I am aware that the site is near to the Grade II listed Central Fire Station. Mindful of the statutory duty in respect of Appeal A, set out in s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have had special regard to

the desirability of preserving its setting. The significance of the building is, in part, derived from its prominence within the street scene. The appeal proposal and the listed building would be visible in some of the same vantage points. However, given the location and extent of the proposed development, I consider that it would preserve the setting of the listed building and the contribution it makes to its significance. I note that the Council also did not have concerns in this regard.

23. The appellant has drawn my attention to several appeals they consider to be relevant. In The Union Street/High Street, Birmingham appeals<sup>1</sup> the Inspector considered that because of the removal of two kiosks the proposal would not add to clutter. In the 94 London Road, Headington, Oxford appeals<sup>2</sup> the Inspector found that the proposed hub would not read as unduly prominent or bulky and that the proposed advertisements would be appropriate in the varied character of the street. However, although I have not been provided with full details, I note that these appeals involved an assessment of the proposals based on the site specific circumstances, as I have done here. I therefore consider these decisions to be of limited relevance to my consideration of these appeals.

### **Conclusion**

24. With regard to Appeal A, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
25. With regard to Appeal B, I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of the area.
26. Accordingly, both Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

*E Pickernell*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/P4605/W/18/3202341 & APP/P4605/H/18/3201305

<sup>2</sup> APP/G3110/W/22/3308266 & APP/G3110/H/22/3308267