



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3284552

Footpath off Great Cambridge Road, Tottenham, N17 7LH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Bella Noakes of British Telecommunication PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/1667, dated 4 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "*removal of existing BT phone box and installation of a proposed replacement BT Street Hub and associated display of advertisement to both sides of the unit*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposed street hub would be positioned on a relatively wide section of pavement next to a local shopping parade. The site is currently occupied by an existing BT phone box which has an advertisement on its eastern side.
4. The existing phone box is a modest structure that is an unobtrusive feature within the street. By virtue of its size and colour it has a relatively recessive appearance, particularly in views along the footway. In contrast, the proposed street hub would be both wider and taller than the existing phone box and would contain large, illuminated screens on either side, which are intended to accommodate advertisements. Its height, width, and luminance would result in a far more prominent and imposing feature than at present. In this regard, it would dominate views along the pavement and would create a large discordant feature that would draw the eye. Whilst it would have a relatively slimline shape, and a reduced footprint compared to the existing phone box, this would not significantly mitigate its visual impact.
5. There is an existing advertisement nearby positioned a short distance along White Hart Lane. However, that is a static 'poster and paste' advert at the back edge of the footway, which is set back significantly from the junction. It is far less prominent than the appeal proposal and is not positioned in the

middle of the footway. The other advertisements in the surrounding area are traditional small-scale shop fronts which have a separate appearance.

6. My attention has been drawn to recent appeal decisions¹ elsewhere in London that relate to similar proposals. The full details of those cases, including their surrounding context, are not before me. However, I note that one proposal is described as being in a town centre location, and the other as being outside a busy central London station. That is not the case here. I have therefore come to my own view on the appeal proposal.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development is of high quality design, which respects its local context and character, and relates positively to neighbouring structures.

Other Matters

8. Whilst not a reason for refusal, the Highway Authority objected to the proposal on safety grounds at application stage. However, as I have found that the appeal fails against the main issue this matter is not determinative in this case.
9. The proposal would not significantly narrow the existing footway, which would remain generous in width in this location. Accordingly, I do not consider that it would cause any significant obstruction to pedestrian movement.

Overall Balance and Conclusion

10. As set out above, the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to the development plan in this regard. Set against this, it would provide ultrafast wifi, free public calls, public information, USB ports for rapid charging, and expanded network coverage. It would also provide a faster and more reliable connection than the existing installation, although it is unclear whether it would address any existing gap in network coverage in this area. The proposal would also provide a direct 999 emergency calls button and would be powered by 100% renewable energy.
11. However, in the circumstances of this appeal, I consider that these benefits do not outweigh the visual harm arising from the proposal. Accordingly, the material considerations in this case do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Z5630/W/18/3209582 & APP/Z5630/H/18/3209488 (linked cases), APP/N5660/W/18/3199793