



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2022

by S Crossen BA (Hons) PgCert PgDip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3284550

Footpath Outside Brook House Primary School, 881 High Road London N17 0EY

- 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/2021/1530, dated 4 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is Removal of existing BT phone box & installation of a proposed replacement BT street hub & associated display of advertisement to both sides of unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The address on the application form and plans refers to the site as being on footpath off High Road, while the Council refer to Footpath Outside Brook House Primary School 881 High Road. The address on the appeal form refers to Footpath Outside Brook House Primary School 881 High Road, so I have used this address in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is on a wide footpath directly outside of a school next to a busy main road. It is in a prominent position near to a road junction and school drop off area. The appeal site is next to other street furniture including a bin, bus stop, lighting column, large planter and round bollards which stop vehicles accessing the footpath.
5. The appeal site is between two areas characterised by commercial development. Its immediate surroundings are characterised mainly by residential and learning non-residential institutional uses, the character here is different to the other parts of High Road which include more advertising due to the presence of significant amounts of commercial development. There are some nearby signs and adverts though, but these predominantly directly relate to uses of land or buildings they are positioned on. The telephone box included some non-illuminated advertising related to other businesses. The proposed BT

Street Hub would replace the existing public telephone box and would include a black frame housing an illuminated display which forms a significant proportion of the structure. The street hub would be higher and wider than the existing telephone box with less depth, and the greatest mass would be orientated to face oncoming highway traffic.

6. The design of the unit is better suited to displaying adverts than any of the other nearby structures which currently accommodate advertising. The design due to its illumination, colour, size, scale, orientation, and its position located on a prominent corner maximizes its prominence to highway and footpath users and does not reflect the character and appearance of this part of High Road. For these reasons the design would not integrate with its immediate surroundings, be a harmful and incongruous addition to the street-scene, detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I give neutral weight to the suggested benefits identified by the appellant that the Street Hub would reduce street clutter because it replaces an existing telephone box.
8. I note the reference in the appellants statement to other appeals for similar development, however the locations of these developments were in areas of different character to the appeal site, one replaces two telephone boxes, seen in the context of existing digital advertisements, and the other, located near to a major transportation interchange.
9. I note there is a large digital advertisement to the North on the side of a building above "Jerky's" as identified by the appellant, however this advert is some distance away from the appeal site and in the context of a shopping centre and does not form part of the character of the appeal site.
10. I acknowledge the benefits highlighted by the appellant, including Wi-Fi, access to public services, accessibility options, use of renewable energy, charging facilities, emergency call button, use of display for awareness messaging, environmental sensors, improved 4G and 5G coverage and free council advertising. In addition, I acknowledge that the Framework supports high quality communications and paragraph 114 states that it is essential for economic growth and social well-being. I acknowledge the appellants case that the advertising covers the costs of these services, but the evidence before me is insufficient to suggest that these services are required or why they cannot be funded through other means, which would allow a design less harmful to the character and appearance of the area, an issue I have given great weight to.
11. I therefore conclude that the development is contrary to Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan, Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026 adopted March 2013, consolidated with alterations since 2017, policies DM1 and DM3 of the London Borough of Haringey Development Management DPD Plan July 2017 (DPD) and Policy D3 of the London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021. These policies, amongst other things, seek development to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality.
12. The Councils reason for refusal also refers to DM12 of the DPD which relates to new housing and residential extensions. Given the nature of the development, Policy DM12 does not appear to be directly relevant, and I have not therefore had regard to it.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge there are nearby listed buildings and a conservation area. Conflicting evidence has been submitted which indicate that the appeal site is adjacent the North Tottenham Conservation Area or within it. The Council has not raised any concern that the development could affect a heritage asset and I have no evidence before me which suggests otherwise. In any case I am dismissing the appeal on the main issues for the reasons given above so need not consider the impact on heritage assets further.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Crossen

INSPECTOR

