



Appeal Decisions

Site visits made on 10 September 2019 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decisions by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2019

All Appeals

- The appeals are made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeals are made by Maximus Networks Ltd against the decisions of the Council of the of London Borough of Islington.
 - The development proposed in each case is a public call box.
-

Appeal A - Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3231157

Public Highway, opp. 155 Farringdon Road, London EC1R 3AL

- The application Ref: P2018/3669/PRA, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2018.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3231154

Public Highway, City Road adj. Kestrel House, London EC1V 8EL

- The application Ref: P2018/3638/PRA, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2018.
-

Appeal C - Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3231123

Public Highway, adj. 163 Old Street, London EC1V 9NH

- The application Ref: P2018/3658/PRA, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2018.
-

Appeal D - Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3231163

Public Highway, 70 Finsbury Pavement, Moorgate, London EC2A 1SA

- The application Ref: P2018/3644/PRA, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2018.
-

Appeal E - Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3231136

Public Highway, Worship Street corner City Road, London EC2A 2AH

- The application Ref: P2018/3665/PRA, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2018.
-

Appeal F - Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3231140
Public Highway, 171 Essex Road, London N1 2DE

- The application Ref: P2018/3654/PRA, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2018.

Appeal G - Ref: APP/V5570/W/3231129
Public Highway, 21 Essex Road, London N1 2SA

- The application Ref: P2018/3655/PRA, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2018.

Appeal H - Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3229455
Public Highway, Canonbury Road Adjacent Dixon Clark Court, London N1 2UR

- The application Ref: P2018/3277/PRA, dated 1 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2018.

Appeal I - Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3228720
Public Highway, Adjacent 2 Newington Green, London N1 4RF

- The application Ref: P2018/3250/PRA, dated 1 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2018.

Appeal J – APP/V5570/W/3231125
Public Highway, 288 New North Road, London N1 8SU

- The application Ref: P2018/3641/PRA, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2018.
-

Decisions

1. All ten appeals are dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visits were undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters and Background

3. The appeal relates to proposals by Maximus Networks Ltd for the installation of public call box at ten sites in the London Borough of Islington. Whilst each appeal relates to a different site, the proposed public call boxes on the sites are identical. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits, but as they raise similar issues, the cases are dealt with in a single decision letter.
4. On 25 May 2019, the Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development, Advertisement and Compensation Amendments) (England) Regulations 2019 came into force, amending the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO). This amendment removes the permitted development right to install a public call box under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO. However, transitional

and saving provisions at Part 5 of the 2019 Regulations provide that where an appeal has been made within 6 months of the date of notice of refusal of a prior approval application submitted before 25 May 2019, the planning permission granted by Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A continues to have effect in relation to a public call box as if the amendments made to the GPDO by the 2019 Regulations had not been made. That is the case in respect of the ten appeals before me.

5. As such, and as the appellant is an electronic communications code operator, the appellant is able to benefit from permitted development rights for a proposed call box under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO), subject to the conditions in part A.3 which requires the prior approval of the local planning authority in respect of the siting and appearance of the development.
6. The provisions of the Order require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on these matters. As such, considerations such as the need for a telephone kiosk and whether it may be used for advertising in the future are not relevant to this appeal. Accordingly, the main issues are set out below.
7. The High Court has considered the issue of the inclusion of advertising on public call boxes. A recent judgement in the Westminster case (*Westminster City Council v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government & New World Payphones Ltd* (2019) EWHC 176 (Admin)) considered the matter of dual purpose of advertisement display and telecommunications use. This judgement confirmed 'that the whole development for which prior approval is sought must fall within the class relied on, and no part of it can fall outside it'. The judgement went on to state that a development falls outside the scope of Part 16, Class A if it is not 'for the purpose' of the operator's network. Thus, if the development is partly for some other purpose beyond that of the operator's network, it cannot be development 'for the purpose' of the operator's network precisely because it is for something else as well. In that case the proposed call box was for a dual purpose of advertisement display and telecommunications use and therefore contained features that were for advertising and 'not at all there for the telecommunications function'.
8. In the case of the appeals before me, I have taken into account the submitted Opinion of Counsel regarding this matter and the design of the proposed public call box provided. It is apparent that the form and design of the proposed telecommunications apparatus is driven by its proposed functionality as a public call box. I have no evidence to suggest that the proposed development includes elements that are there for the purpose of advertising. Consequently, on the basis of the evidence provided in these appeals, I consider that the proposals are for the purpose of the operator's electronic communications network, and so are able to benefit from permitted development subject to the conditions in part A.3.
9. The principle of development is established by the GPDO 2015 and the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO 2015 do not require the development to be judged against the policies of development plan. Nonetheless, I have had some regard to the policies of the development plan,

any related guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) only in so far as they relate to matters of siting and appearance.

Main Issues

10. The main issues are:

- a) The effect of the proposal's siting and appearance on the character and appearance of the surrounding area (all Appeals); and
- b) The effects of the proposal's siting on public safety (Appeal A, F, G, H & I only).

Reasons

11. The proposed public call boxes are relatively simple, thin, freestanding structures with a canopy which serves as a shelter, and is made of the solar panels that will power the payphone. In addition, the widest faces of the call box incorporate photovoltaic glass to maximise the energy generating potential. LED lighting strips on the outside edges of the call box are included for safety purposes, solely to identify the edge of the structure on the pavement during hours of darkness and will be in a customisable contrasting colour. The submitted details indicate that the overall colour of the kiosk is customisable, but would typically be 'gun metal' grey or black, and will have a 'sheen' through the integral use of toughened glass and photovoltaic glass in the structure.

Appeal A: opp 155 Farringdon Road

Character and Appearance

12. The appeal site is located on Farringdon Road on a narrow section of pavement in front of an NCP multi-storey car park. The appeal site borders the Clerkenwell Green Conservation Area, whose character and appearance stems from the traditional, tightly-built form, and variety of land uses present. Whilst not within the Conservation Area, the proposal would be visible in views to and from the Conservation Area. The section of pavement is busy with pedestrian footfall, and a high volume of vehicular traffic, including frequent bus movements was noted during my site visit. The pavement surrounding the appeal site contains a large number of existing features including a cash machine and call box, street trees, a bus stop, shelter and signage, cycle parking facilities, traffic signs and lampposts. The siting of the proposal would introduce a further element creating clutter on this section of pavement. The modern design of the proposed kiosk with photovoltaic glazing would be inconsistent with the materials and architecture of the buildings in the adjacent Conservation Area and this contrast would detract from their setting.

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area including the setting of the Clerkenwell Green Conservation Area. The harm to the setting of the conservation area is not outweighed by the public benefits of the communications equipment.

Public safety

14. The width of the footway in this location is 4m. The appellant states that the chosen location was based upon a clear methodology derived from the

Transport for London document Pedestrian Comfort Guidance 2010 (TfL Comfort Guidance) taking matters such as visual congestion, clutter, pedestrian flows into account. However, the primary test provided by the appellant for establishing the suitability of the appeal site, suggests that the footway should be 5.3m in width. As such, the appellant's own evidence indicates that the siting of the proposal is inappropriate in this location.

15. Due to the position of the proposed call box on a narrow strip of pavement with high footfall, in close proximity to a busy bus stop and shelter it would unduly restrict pedestrian movement and increase the risk of overcrowding on the pavement, which would be unacceptable given the busy vehicular route. Therefore the siting of the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to pedestrian safety.

Appeal B: City Road adj Kestrel House

16. The appeal site is located on a relatively wide section of pavement in front of a small hedge and high rise block of flats (Kestrel House) along the A501. It is a prominent location and the call box would be visible from various points along the highway. There is an existing call box and a number of lampposts and signposts located on the pavement in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, but the pavement area does not currently appear cluttered or restricted.
17. Despite its neutral design, given the prominent location of the proposed call box, it would be very conspicuous to pedestrians and road users. It would also be viewed in conjunction with the existing call box, resulting in a grouping of relatively large items of street furniture of contrasting designs. The development would therefore harm the open and uncluttered appearance of this section of pavement.
18. For these reasons, the siting and appearance of the proposed call box would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
19. The site is opposite the Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row Conservation Area. The Council raise no concerns in respect of the effect of the development on the setting of this conservation area, and I have no reason to consider otherwise.

Appeal C: adj 163 Old Street

20. The appeal site is situated on a wide section of pavement in front of a block of flats. On the opposite side of the road are tall commercial buildings. Whilst the pavement width in this location is generous, there is a large amount of existing street furniture in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, including street trees, two broadband cabinets, lampposts and signposts, a smart bench, speed camera and a call box resulting in a cluttered appearance. There is also a bus stop in close proximity. The siting of the proposal would introduce a further item of street furniture leading to a cluttered appearance at this section of pavement.
21. For the above reasons, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

-
22. The site is close to the boundary of St Luke's Conservation Area. The Council raise no concerns in respect of the effect of the development on the setting of this conservation area, and I have no reason to consider otherwise.

Appeal D: 70 Finsbury Pavement

23. The appeal site is located on a wide section of pavement in front of a Marks and Spencer retail store, close to the junction with Ropemaker Street. Railings separate the pavement from the busy A501. Commercial and retail buildings are also located on the opposite side of the road.
24. There are a number of pieces of existing street furniture in the vicinity of the appeal site, including a call box, a bin, lampposts and road signs, railings and broadband cabinets. There is also a road side flower stall. The area is busy, with pedestrians passing the appeal site as well as shoppers entering and exiting Marks and Spencer.
25. It is noted that the neutral and modern design of the proposal is in keeping with the commercial surroundings in this area. However, it is considered that the siting of the proposal is not acceptable in this location given the amount of existing street furniture and the presence of a flower stall as the proposal would introduce a further feature that would result in a cluttered feel to this busy section of pavement.
26. For the above reasons, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
27. The site is close to the boundary of Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area. The Council raise no concerns in respect of the effect of the development on the setting of this conservation area, and I have no reason to consider otherwise.
28. The Council have indicated that planning permission has been granted for a similar proposal in this location, however I have not been provided with the details of this case, particularly the appearance of the kiosk, so cannot make a comparison. I have, in any case, reached my own conclusions on this proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.

Appeal E: Worship Street corner City Road

29. The appeal site is located on an expansive area of pavement at the corner of Worship Street and City Road in front of public house. It is located within the Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area, which displays a cohesive character of late-Victorian, Edwardian and more modern buildings. There is a Grade II listed building on the opposite side of Worship Street, directly facing the appeal site.
30. Existing street furniture is present nearby in the form of lampposts and formal cycle parking stands. There are railings separating the pavement from Worship Street and City Road which were used for informal cycling parking at the time of my site visit. The pub has tables and chairs outside, although there was ample separation distance between the seating area and the appeal site. Despite these numerous features, given the large size of the space, the pavement area in this location has a spacious feel and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

-
31. The call box's modern design, with photovoltaic glazing, will be inconsistent with the surrounding style and architecture of nearby buildings, in particular the listed building directly opposite. It will also be highly visible to pedestrians and road users in this location at the corner of two busy streets. The proposed call box would introduce a conspicuous feature leading to a cluttered perception. Due to the prominent location of the proposal, its siting opposite the listed building and its inconsistency with the surrounding architecture, its siting and appearance would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the listed building and the Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area. Due to the small scale of the proposed development, this harm would be less than substantial. However, the harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the communications equipment.

Appeal F: 171 Essex Road

Character and Appearance

32. The appeal site is situated on a wide section of pavement close to the junction of River Place and Essex Road in front of River Place Health Centre. There are a number of items of street furniture on this section of pavement, including cycle parking stands, a bin, lampposts and street signs which are well spaced apart. There is also a flower stall on the pavement adjacent to the appeal site location. There is a Grade II* listed building (Mecca Bingo hall) on the same side of Essex Road in close proximity to the appeal site. The listed building is in a neo-classical style which differs from the architectural style of other buildings on the road making it a prominent focal point.
33. The proposed call box would lead to a sense of clutter on the pavement, reducing the spacing between the present street furniture and, hence, disrupting the rhythm. The scale of the call box differs to the surrounding street furniture in terms of its width and would appear to be a prominent and incongruous addition. The proposed call box's modern design, with photovoltaic glazing, would also be inconsistent with the materials and neo-classical architecture of the listed building. As such, the siting and appearance of the call box would detract from the quality of the public realm and unacceptably harm the character of this part of the street scene, including the setting of the listed building. Due to the small scale of the proposed development, the harm to the setting of the listed building would be less than substantial. However, the harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the communications equipment.
34. Whilst the appeal site is close to the Canonbury Conservation Area, the Council raise no concerns in respect of the effect of the development on the setting of this conservation area, and I have no reason to consider otherwise.

Public safety

35. The pavement width in this location is ample and according to the appellant, meets the requirements of the TfL Comfort Guidance and TfL Streetscape Guidance. It is noted that the width measurement is disputed by the Council who state that some of the pavement is private land and used by the flower stall. Although the flower stall does restrict the width of the pavement to a degree, any private ownership was not apparent and, in practice, pedestrians use the full width of the unobstructed pavement.

-
36. With regard to the location of the proposed call box restricting and diverting views of traffic signage, I agree with the assertion of the appellant that call boxes, like other street furniture, are typical of a major city and not a unique occurrence. The proposal should therefore not be a distracting influence to drivers in this case.
 37. On the basis of the above, I do not consider the siting of the proposal would be harmful to public safety.
 38. Although I do not find there to be detrimental harm to public safety, this lack of harm would not outweigh the harm created by the proposal in relation to the character and appearance of the area.

Appeal G: 21 Essex Road

Character and Appearance

39. The appeal site is located on a busy, narrow section of pavement in front of a Nuffield Health centre. Whilst the Council state in their evidence that there is an existing phone kiosk on the appeal site and the proposal is to replace this with a new call box, it appears that the proposed call box location is further along the pavement than the existing call box. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis the proposal would be in addition to the existing call box.
40. The properties along this stretch of Essex Road have leisure, commercial and retail uses at ground floor, with residential flats above. The street furniture in the vicinity of the appeal site consists of street trees and lampposts and the existing phone kiosk. These features are well spaced and the pavement area does not feel cluttered.
41. There are 2 Grade II listed buildings on the opposite side of the road facing the appeal site (28 and 30 Essex Road) which are mostly constructed of stock brick. The appeal site is located adjacent to the Duncan Terrace/Colebrook Row Conservation Area and close to The Angel Conservation Area. The Duncan Terrace/Colebrook Row Conservation Area mainly consists of late Georgian and early Victorian residential terraces displaying architectural consistency and The Angel Conservation Area mainly comprises a historic commercial area.
42. The proposed call box would create a cluttered environment at this section of the pavement, reducing the spacing between the present street furniture and, hence disrupting the rhythm. The scale of the call box differs to the surrounding street furniture in terms of its width and so it would appear to be a prominent and incongruous addition.
43. The call box's modern design, with photovoltaic glazing will be inconsistent with the surrounding style and architecture of nearby buildings, in particular the listed buildings directly opposite. This contrast would cause harm to the setting of the listed buildings, and the cluttered appearance would detract from the setting of the nearby Conservation Areas.
44. For the above reasons, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area including the setting of the listed buildings opposite the site and the Duncan Terrace/Colebrook Row Conservation Area and The Angel Conservation Area. Due to the small scale of the proposed development, the

harm to heritage assets would be less than substantial. However, the harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the communications equipment.

Public safety

45. The width of the footway in this location is 4.4m. The appellant states that the chosen location was based upon a clear methodology derived from the TfL Comfort Guidance. However, the primary test provided by the appellant for establishing the suitability of the appeal site, suggests that the footway should be 5.3m in width where the footfall is high, such as in this location. As such, the appellant's own evidence suggests that the siting of the proposal is inappropriate in this location.
46. Due to the position of the proposed call box on a relatively narrow strip of pavement with high footfall, it would unduly restrict pedestrian movement and increase the risk of overcrowding on the pavement, which would be unacceptable given the adjacent busy vehicular route. Therefore the siting of the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to public safety.

Appeal H: Canonbury Road adj Dixon Clark Court

Character and Appearance

47. The appeal site is situated on a relatively wide area of pavement in front of Dixon Clark Court, a residential block of flats, there are railings separating the pavement from an area of green space containing grass and trees in front of the flats.
48. The appeal site is adjacent to the Highbury Corner gyratory which is heavily trafficked. There is a segregated cycle lane immediately adjacent to the appeal site which extends from the gyratory along Canonbury Road. The appeal site is also situated immediately next to a signalised cycle and pedestrian crossing. In addition to the traffic lights controlling the cycle and pedestrian crossing and the railings, there is also a road traffic sign in close proximity to the appeal site. Nonetheless, this section of pavement generally has an open and uncluttered appearance.
49. The appeal site is situated opposite the Upper Street North Conservation Area and close to the Canonbury Conservation Area. The predominant character of the Canonbury Conservation Area is residential and the Upper Street North Conservation Area mainly comprises a historic commercial area. To the west of the site, on the opposite side of Canonbury Road is a terrace of listed buildings (19-25 Compton Terrace).
50. Despite its neutral design, given the prominent location of the proposed call box, it would be very noticeable to pedestrians and road users, especially in the context of the adjacent area of green space which provides a sense of openness. It is considered that the development would therefore harm the open and uncluttered appearance of this section of pavement.
51. With regard to effects on heritage features, it is considered that due to the distance, the relatively small scale of the proposal and the intervening buildings between the appeal site and the Canonbury Conservation Area, there will be no effect from the development on the setting of this Conservation Area. However, the call box's modern design, with photovoltaic glazing, will be inconsistent

with the surrounding style and architecture of the listed buildings and the Upper Street North Conservation Area.

52. Therefore the siting and appearance of the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area including the setting within which the listed buildings are experienced and the setting of the Upper Street North Conservation Area. Due to the small scale of the proposed development, this harm would be less than substantial, but it is not outweighed by the public benefits of the communications equipment.

Public safety

53. The pavement width in this location is ample and according to the appellant, meets the requirements of the TfL Comfort Guidance and TfL Streetscape Guidance. However, due to its bulk and position immediately adjacent to a pedestrian and cycle crossing and cycle lane on an extremely busy gyratory, it would be a distracting feature which would be unacceptable given the busy vehicular thoroughfare and signalised crossing. Therefore, the siting of the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to public safety.

Appeal I: adjacent 2 Newington Green

Character and Appearance

54. The appeal site is situated on an area of pavement adjacent to the south side of a grassed square (Newington Green) and opposite No. 2 Newington Green. The section of pavement on this side of the square is fairly narrow and does not contain any street furniture.
55. The appeal site is located within the Newington Green Conservation Area, the focus of which is Newington Green. This historic area of open space is now a formal garden set in the middle of a busy traffic island. The buildings which face and relate to the green are varied, but include several groups of buildings of historic and architectural interest. Despite the variety, there is generally an appropriate scale and consistency of materials to the buildings and their relationship to the green.
56. Despite its neutral design, given the prominent location of the proposed call box, it would appear as a stark and conspicuous feature to pedestrians, road users, and residents. It is considered that the development would therefore harm the open and uncluttered appearance of this section of pavement.
57. The call box which is of modern design with photovoltaic glazing will be inconsistent with the surrounding style and architecture of nearby buildings and the historic Newington Green. Given the bulk and height of the proposed call box, the siting adjacent to the park will disrupt the historic relationship between the buildings and the open character of the green.
58. On this basis the siting and appearance of the proposal will result in harm to the character and appearance of the area including the Newington Green Conservation Area. The harm to the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. However, this harm is not outweighed by the public benefits of the communications equipment.

Public safety

59. Whilst the pavement in this location is narrow, due to the low footfall, it meets the requirements of the TfL Comfort Guidance and TfL Streetscape Guidance. On this basis, I do not consider the siting of the proposal would be harmful to public safety.
60. Although I do not find there to be harm to public safety, this lack of harm does not outweigh the harm created by the proposal in relation to the character and appearance of the area.

Appeal J: 288 New North Road

61. The appeal site is located outside No. 288 New North Road, a mid-rise residential block, close to the junction with Ecclesbourne Road and Popham Road, where there is a signalised pedestrian crossing. Though there is some existing street furniture in close proximity to the appeal site including an existing phone kiosk, a row of lampposts and traffic lights associated with the junction, these features are well spaced and the pavement area does not feel cluttered.
62. The proposed call box would create a cluttered environment at this section of the pavement. The scale of the call box differs to the majority of the surrounding street furniture in terms of its width and height and would appear to be a prominent and incongruous addition. As such, the siting and appearance of the call box would detract from the quality of the public realm and unacceptably harm the character of the area.

Other Matters

63. The appellant has referred to some appeal decisions, regarding similar proposals. However, I do not have the full details of those cases and so have considered each proposal before me on its own individual merits and the specific circumstances and context of each case.
64. The appellant suggests describing the call boxes as 'clutter' implies they are unnecessary, which is not a material consideration. However, need and clutter are different considerations, and whilst the need for the boxes in principle is not disputed, the effect of their siting on their context is a matter that needs consideration.
65. The appellant states the design of the call box has been designed to be less visually intrusive and dominant than a previous version design. However, consideration of the appearance of the box in its context, as well as its siting, go beyond just the design of the development.
66. The benefits put forward by the appellant in favour of the proposed call boxes, including the public benefits, have been taken into consideration. However, these do not outweigh the harm associated with these proposals.

Overall Conclusions

67. In each case, harm has been found in relation to the effect of the siting and appearance of the call box on the character and appearance of their surroundings. Harm has also been identified in relation to public safety in relation to Appeals A, G & H.

-
68. In my considerations I have had regard to Policy CS8 of Islington's Core Strategy (February 2011) (the 'Core Strategy'), Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (June 2013) (the 'Local Plan') and policy 7.4 of the London Plan (March 2016) (the 'London Plan') which all seek to ensure high quality design and protect local character. I have also had regard to Core Strategy Policy SC9 and Local Plan Policy DM2.3 which seek to ensure new development conserves and enhances the historic environment respectively, and Local Plan Policy DM2.7 which aims to ensure telecommunications equipment is appropriately sited to minimise visual effects and protect the character and appearance of the area. I have also accounted for Local Plan Policies DM8.1, DM8.2 and DM8.4, policies 6.10 and 7.5 of the London Plan and draft policies T2 and D7 of the London Plan Draft for Public Consultation (December 2017) which all generally seek to promote and prioritise opportunities for walking and cycling and ensure safe and efficient operation of transport infrastructure.
69. I have also had regard to the Islington Streetbook Supplementary Planning Document (2012), The Islington Urban Design Guide (2017), and the Transport for London Streetscape Guidance Third Edition (2017 Revision 1) which all advise on the design of development in the public realm.
70. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that all ten appeals should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

71. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's reports and on that basis all ten appeals are dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR