
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by **G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3359660

191 High Street, Hounslow TW3 1BL

- 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 Mr Nathan Still of IN FOCUS NETWORK LIMITED against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4086.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display, as illustrated in the attached documentation.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/H/25/3359659

191 High Street, Hounslow TW3 1BL

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nathan Still of IN FOCUS NETWORK LIMITED against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4075.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display, as illustrated in the attached documentation.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed, and Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The two appeals relate the same proposal on the same site. Appeal 'A' concerns the refusal of planning permission for installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display as illustrated in the attached documentation. Appeal 'B' concerns the refusal of express consent regarding the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display as illustrated in the attached documentation. I have considered each on its merits, however, as they raise similar issues, I have combined both decisions into a single decision letter.
3. The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) confirm this approach. I have taken account of the provisions of the development plan insofar as they are material to Appeal B. The Council determined that, with regard to Appeal B, the development would not harm amenity, and based on the information before me, I find no reason to conclude otherwise.

Main Issues

4. Taking into consideration the above matters the main issue of relevance for Appeal A is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.
5. The main issue of relevance for Appeal B is the effect of the proposed advertisement on public safety.

Reasons

6. The appeal site occupies a broad section of pavement along High Street, Hounslow, an area with a predominantly commercial character and a mix of uses. Based on the submitted information and my observations on site, the location experiences significant pedestrian and cyclist activity. The proposed communications hub would be positioned near the pavement edge, next to the cycle lane on High Street, which serves as a thoroughfare restricted to buses, delivery vehicles and bicycles only.
7. The immediate surroundings include a lamp post, wayfinding signage, litter bins, cycle hoops, and a bus stop. As the road and cycle lane operate in one direction and are restricted to specific users, the pavements are relatively wide. However, with limited formal crossing points nearby, and based on my site observations, pedestrians frequently cross informally over the cycle lane. A previous appeal for a comparable development in the vicinity was dismissed, with the Inspector making a similar observation. The location of the proposed hub has been revised following the dismissal of the previous appeal. However, although the proposed hub would be set approximately 1.5 metres back from the pavement edge, its position would obstruct sightlines between pedestrians and cyclists, as illustrated in the submitted images. The narrow gap between the hub and the cycle lane would significantly restrict visibility of oncoming cyclists and pedestrians, thereby increasing the risk of collisions. Even with the hub set back, pedestrians crossing immediately next to it would remain screened, leaving limited reaction time for both parties.
8. The advertisement would be positioned on the side of the hub opposite to the direction of cyclist travel, thereby reducing the likelihood of distraction for cyclists and pedestrians, although pedestrians would still potentially be distracted when approaching the hub from the opposite direction. Due to the location of the supporting structure, the hub would create conflict between pedestrians stepping out to cross and oncoming cyclists. Imposing conditions on illumination or image transitions, amongst other matters, would not address the underlying safety concern, as the hub itself would still obstruct visibility.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to highway safety. Insofar as they are material for Appeal B and with regard to Appeal A the proposal would conflict with Policies EC2 and CC5 of the Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume One (LP). These expect developments, amongst other matters, to demonstrate that adverse impacts on the transport network are avoided and that advertisements and associated structures do not adversely impact on pedestrian safety. Given that the proposal would harm highway safety, it therefore follows that the proposed advertisement would harm public safety.

Planning Balance

10. Paragraph 119 of the Framework recognises that advanced, high-quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. The Framework also supports the expansion of electronic communications networks. The proposed hub would provide a range of services, including access to online facilities, telephone calls, wayfinding, and device charging. It would form part of a wider network of apparatus utilising modern digital technology to deliver efficient, reliable, and free-to-use public services. In addition, the interactive screen could be made available to the Council to promote local initiatives, public events, and wayfinding. The inclusion of a defibrillator would provide important life-saving equipment, and there is likely to be some economic benefits during manufacture and installation.
11. These benefits weigh in favour of Appeal A. However, a similar hub with a defibrillator is located nearby, and others exist across the Borough, and this limits the weight afforded to the benefits of providing an additional hub in this location. Furthermore, it has not been substantively demonstrated that these benefits could only be realised at this specific site. Accordingly, the benefits attract limited weight. Even when taken cumulatively, the benefits would not outweigh the harm to highway safety. The proposal, insofar as it relates to Appeal A, conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. In terms of Appeal B, the proposal would cause harm to public safety.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed, and Appeal B should be dismissed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR