



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th August 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3362974

Pavement o/s 18 Albany Parade, High Street, Brentford TW8 0JW

- 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 Mr Richard Wilson of NWP Street Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4084.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1 no. new communications kiosk with integrated advertising displays, following the removal of existing telephone kiosks.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/H/25/3362963

Pavement o/s 18 Albany Parade, High Street Brentford, TW8 0JW

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Wilson of NWP Street Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4060.
 - The advertisement proposed is Installation of 1no. new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display, following the removal of existing telephone kiosks.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application sought consent for the “installation of 1no. new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display, plus removal of existing telephone kiosks”. However, the existing telephone kiosks are outside of the red line boundary. I have therefore used the description of development from the decision notice which reflects this position.
4. There are two appeals on this site. Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission for the provision of a communication kiosk. Appeal B is in respect of the refusal of advertisement consent for the digital advertising display. The kiosk and the advertisement are integral to each other, and both are the subject of these appeals. I have dealt with each case on its individual merits, but to avoid duplication both proposals are considered together in this decision, unless otherwise indicated.

5. In respect of Appeal B, the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 require that advertisement appeal decisions be made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance confirm this approach.

Main Issues

6. The main issues for both Appeals A and B is the effect of the proposals on the visual amenity of the area and on public safety.

Reasons

Visual amenity

7. The appeal site is located in a section of pavement located to the front of a multi storey building with commercial premises on the ground floor and residential use above, which runs along the busy A315 road. Along this section of the pavement there are a line of mature trees which are a distinctive feature of the street and softens the urban appearance. There are two existing red coloured telephone kiosks located approximately 60m from the appeal site in front of the Albany Parade car park which are set well back from the A315 road.
8. To the opposite side of the A315 there is a multi-storey building which has some commercial uses on the ground floor with residential above. There is also a Premier Inn hotel and McDonalds restaurant in proximity. Therefore, whilst there is a high proportion of residential dwellings, the surrounding area has a mixed-use character.
9. The location of the existing kiosks is to become an area of landscaping as part of the redevelopment of Albany Parade and therefore a new location is required. Street furniture along this section of the road is limited to lamp posts, street signage and Sheffield cycle parking stands, which are far less visually intrusive than the proposed kiosk. Whilst the proposed kiosk would have a smaller footprint its location away from the building line would have a more conspicuous appearance. Rather than being viewed against the context of the commercial premises it would be isolated within the pavement and would therefore add to the visual clutter of the street.
10. The proposed digital display would be positioned to one side of the kiosk and be approximately 1.64m in height and would portray static advertising images that change every 10 seconds. Whilst digital displays are commonly seen in urban areas, there are none in proximity to the appeal site and therefore the advertisement would be a visually striking addition given its position on the edge of the pavement. Although there is a bus stop near to the premier inn, I observed that this did not include advertisements. Whilst there are bus stops along Ealing Road which do contain advertisements these are not visible from the appeal site as they are some distance away and around the corner. As a result, I consider that the proposed advertisement would be a jarring and discordant addition to the street scene.
11. In relation to Appeal A, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the area. It thereby conflicts with Policies CC1, CC2 and CC5 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (LP) which seek amongst other things to

ensure that all new development supports high quality urban design, responds sensitively to the site, provides a high quality, safe and attractive public realm and has suitable regard for amenity.

12. In relation to Appeal B, I have taken into consideration the above-mentioned policies and Policy EC2 of the LP in so far as they are material to this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would harm visual amenity the proposal conflicts with these policies.

Public safety

13. Albany Parade faces onto the busy A315 road and there are dedicated cycle lanes which run along either side, which I observed were well used. As the site is proximate to a junction controlled by traffic lights it goes into two lanes near to the appeal site.
14. The Planning Practice Guidance states that whilst all advertisements are intended to attract attention, proposed advertisements at points where drivers need to take more care are more likely to affect public safety. However, it goes on to say that there are less likely to be road safety problems where the advertisement is on a site within a commercial or industrial locality. Despite not being located within a commercial centre, the site is located within an area which is mixed use in character.
15. The appeal site is less than 20m from a pedestrian crossing, however as there are no fixed structures separating the cycle lane from the pavement it is likely that pedestrians would continue to cross the road near to the appeal site. As the kiosk would be sited close to the pavement it would impinge on the sightlines of pedestrians crossing the road, thereby harming public safety.
16. Although the Council have raised concerns that the proposed kiosk would obstruct the path of pedestrians it would align with the Sheffield cycle stands and would therefore be within the street furniture zone. Moreover, the proposed kiosk would retain a clear footway zone of more than 2000mm which meets the requirements set out in the TfL Streetscape Guidance¹. Therefore, I do not consider that the proposal would harm the movement of pedestrians using the pavement area.
17. The daytime luminance of the proposed digital display would be 3500 cd/m² and 2500 cd/m² at night, and I note that this is within the recommendations set out by the Institution of Lighting Professionals Guidance and the rotating display would be switched off between midnight and 5am.
18. When approaching from the west, the forward visibility for cyclists and motorists is good, and traffic is restricted to 20mph. Nevertheless, the road is heavily trafficked, and the kiosk would be located close to where motorists may be looking to change lanes. Therefore, given its proximity to the edge of the pavement and that it would face towards the oncoming traffic, it would be a distraction to drivers, particularly because the advert would change frequently. Even a momentary distraction would increase the risk of accidents involving motorists moving between the two lanes or reacting to the traffic lights.
19. Accordingly, in relation to appeal A, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and CC5 of the LP which seek amongst other things to ensure that all

¹ TfL Streetscape Guidance Fourth Edition (2022 rev 2)

new development supports high quality urban design, responds sensitively to the site, provides a high quality, safe and attractive public realm and has suitable regard for public safety.

20. In relation to Appeal B, I have taken into consideration the above-mentioned policies and Policy EC2 of the LP in so far as they are material to this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would harm public safety the proposal conflicts with these policies.

Conclusion

21. Appeal A: the proposed development would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, Appeal A should be dismissed.
22. Appeal B: for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR