



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3373084

Outside No.55, Reggie's, Hillside, London NW10 8LY

- 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 BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/1689.
 - The development is the proposed deployment of a Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/T5150/H/25/3373085

Outside No.55, Reggie's, Hillside, London NW10 8LY

- 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 BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/1690.
 - The advertisement proposed is two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the proposed deployment of a Street Hub 3 unit at Outside No.55, Reggie's, Hillside, London NW10 8LY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/1689, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule at the end of this decision.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit at Outside No.55, Reggie's, Hillside, London NW10 8LY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/1690. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the 2007 Regulations), and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule at the end of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal for Appeal B would be an integral part of the proposal for Appeal A. As such, to avoid repetition I have provided one reasoning section, detailing my findings for both appeals. Notwithstanding this, each proposal and appeal has been considered individually, and on its own merits.

4. In relation to Appeal B, the Council's reason for refusal refers to development plan policies. However, The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, as appropriate to each case. Therefore, although I have taken relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) into account, they have not been decisive considerations in my determination of that appeal.
5. In regard to Appeal B, the Council's reason for refusal no.2 on its notice of decision is the same as its reason for refusal no.1, the appellant has suggested that this is a formatting error by the Council, which the Council has not disputed in its statement. As a result, Appeal B has been determined on the basis that reasons for refusal no. 2 was included by error.

Main Issues

6. The main issues with respect to Appeal A are the effect of the proposed development on highway safety and the character and appearance of the area.
7. In respect of Appeal B, the main issues are the effect of the proposed advertisement on public safety and the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

Highway safety/public safety

8. The proposed hub, which would include double sided digital advertisements, would be sited on a section of wide pavement (said to measure 5.5 metres in width) to one side of Hillside, a London Distributor Road and a bus route. It would be some 0.5 metres or so, at its closest to the carriageway edge, thereby retaining a minimum pavement width of approximately 4.1 metres. There is limited street furniture in this immediate section of pavement, other than lighting columns to either side of the appeal site, along with a bus stop and associated shelter, said to be some 20 metres or so away.
9. I saw on my site inspection that Hillside has two-way traffic movements along it. There are also controlled pedestrian crossing points to either side of the appeal site. Although only a snapshot in time, I also observed that traffic was mostly moving slowly along the road, possibly due to the nearby traffic lights. There were also only a small number of pedestrian movements along this side of the pavement in the early part of the afternoon, and based on my site observations they would appear to be substantially less than the 600-1,200 pedestrian movements per hour suggested by the Council on this part of the pavement.
10. I also observed on my site inspection that due to the position of the nearby bus shelter, pedestrians mostly walked along the opposite side of the pavement to where the proposed hub would be located. As a result, its location would be unlikely to obstruct pedestrian desire lines along the pavement. Furthermore, as the Council also accept, the retained generous pavement width would provide adequate space for pedestrians to comfortably use, including those with mobility issues and pushchairs to safely pass one another. The proposed position of the hub, to one side of the pavement would also not cause an unacceptable obstruction to cyclists. Therefore, its siting would not adversely affect pedestrian movements or active and sustainable travel movements along the pavement.

11. It is acknowledged that one of the main purposes of the proposed hub is to draw attention to its advertising. However, this section of Hillside is not a complicated part of the highway network for drivers to navigate, and the proposed hub would have a reasonably large separation distance from the junction with Shakespeare Road, and its siting and scale would not obstruct sight lines for drivers turning into or exiting Hilltop Avenue, nor would it obscure nearby road signs. In view of its limited size and scale, and taking into account other commercial advertising nearby, I am not convinced that the proposed location of the hub and its static advertisements (which could be restricted by condition) would be likely to cause an unacceptable distraction to passing drivers or cause obstruction to sight lines, nor would it be likely to create conditions prejudicial to highway, pedestrian or cyclist safety.
12. The Council has said the location of the proposed hub would adversely affect the Highway Authority's ability to manage the highway, although there has been no evidence to substantiate this statement or explain why, or how it would do so. From my own site observations, it would represent a relatively small footprint in a wide and spacious pavement and in view of my findings above, not have any unacceptable highway or public safety impacts. Consequently, that argument advanced by the Council has not altered my findings in this case.
13. It has been said that the colour and shape of advertisements on the proposed hub could display signs that confuse the layout of the highway. However, conditions have been suggested to ensure no advertisement resembles a road traffic sign, along with other measures, such as a short interval between advertisement changes, and regarding the duration of each single static advertisement, which should satisfactorily address such concerns and reasonably minimise any such risks.
14. I therefore conclude that in terms of Appeal A, the proposals would not be harmful to highway or pedestrian safety, and in terms of Appeal B they would not be harmful to public safety. Although not determinative in relation to Appeal B, I also find that in respect of both appeals the proposals would comply with the relevant parts of Policies D8, and T2 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, dated March 2021 (LP) and Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041, adopted February 2022 (BLP), insofar as they require proposals to be permeable by foot and cycle, safe, accessible, and not to have an adverse impact on the movement network. In addition, the proposal would comply with paragraph 117 of the Framework that requires development to create places that are safe and secure and give priority to pedestrian movements.

Character and appearance/visual amenity

15. The proposed hub would sit in front of commercial units, including a restaurant and retail uses, within an urban context. The proposed hub would be approximately 1.2 metres wide, 3 metres high and have a depth of 0.35 metres. It would provide amongst other things, free Wi-Fi, free phone calls, wayfinding, rapid connection to emergency services and public messaging capabilities, including for vulnerable persons accessing support.
16. Although the proposed hub would add to the limited street furniture in this area, given the significant width of the pavement, and the spaced arrangement of nearby structures, and its proposed alignment with the nearby bus shelter, it would appear

legible and not unacceptably add to the clutter of street furniture in this area. Moreover, its limited scale, size and high-quality functional appearance would harmonise with the frontages of nearby commercial units and blend in well alongside other structures, including the nearby bus shelter. Nor would its appearance be obtrusive, dominant, or harm the spacious layout of the pavement area. Through conditions, it could be restricted to static advertising, without any moving images or interactive displays, ensuring there would be no harmful effects arising to the character and appearance, and visual amenity of the area.

17. I therefore conclude that in terms of Appeal A the proposals would relate well to the character and appearance of the area, and in regard to Appeal B there would be no harmful effects on the visual amenity of the area. Although not determinative in relation to Appeal B, the proposals would also comply with the relevant parts of LP Policy D8 and BLP Policies BD1 and DMP1 that collectively require proposals to complement the locality, be of the highest architectural design quality, ensure the public realm is well-designed, and avoid unnecessary street clutter. Furthermore, the proposal would comply with paragraph 135 of the Framework, insofar as it seeks to ensure development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive, and sympathetic to local character.
18. In addition, in view of my findings above the proposals would be consistent with the submitted extracts of Principle 2 of Brent's Supplementary Planning Document 1 – Brent Design Guide, dated November 2018, and B1 of Brent's Supplementary Planning Guidance 8 – Advertisements (Other than shops) dated 2004, insofar as they seek to ensure proposals respond to existing context, respect character, and that advertisements on street furniture should make a positive contribution to the local environment and not add to general advertisement clutter.

Other Matters

19. The Council has referred to several refused planning applications, advertisement consents, and appeals that were dismissed said to be similar to these proposals. However, I do not have precise details of those schemes, nor any locational details before me, to properly compare them to these proposals, consequently I attach only limited weight to them. In addition, the Council's concerns about proposals from competing hub operators are noted, along with the comments that the Council's Highway team seek to resist such proposals in principle, although each application must be considered on its individual merits and in this case no unacceptable harm has been identified, nor has there been any conflict with relevant policies of the development plan been found.

Conditions

20. For Appeal A, I have imposed the standard implementation condition and a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty.
21. For Appeal B, as well as the standard conditions for advertisements (referred to above), in the interests of public safety, conditions are also necessary: to prevent the display of any advertisements that contain moving images; to ensure a smooth transition between images and the length of time they are displayed; prevent any advertisement replicating traffic signs; and to ensure that there are no error messages displayed in the event of a breakdown. In addition, for reasons relating to both public safety and visual amenity a condition is necessary to restrict the

levels of luminance of the advertisement's and ensure they respond to ambient light levels.

22. In respect of Appeal B, the appellant sought a condition for a 10-year temporary permission. However, I was not persuaded in this case that there were exceptional circumstances or convincing arguments to justify why it was reasonable to impose a longer temporary period than 5 years in this case.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Planning Conditions

Appeal A

- 1) The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: drawing no's 24006919_PLN_LOC_1.1 (site location plan); 24006919_PLN_SI_2.1 (proposed site plan); 24006919_PLN_EL_3.1 (elevation plan); and the submitted BT Street Hub Unit Dimensions.

Appeal B

- 1) There shall be no moving images or special effects (including noise, smell, smoke, animation, flashing, scrolling, three dimensional, intermittent or video elements) of any kind during the time that any message/advertisement is displayed.
- 2) The interval between successive displays shall be instantaneous (0.1 seconds or less), the complete screen shall change, there shall be no visual effects (including fading, swiping or other animated or interactive transition methods) between successive displays and the display will include a mechanism to freeze the image in the event of a malfunction.
- 3) The display shall not change more than once every 10 seconds. The use of message sequencing for the same product is prohibited, and the advertisements shall not include features or equipment which would allow interactive messages or advertisements to be displayed.
- 4) The screen display shall be erected with a mechanism installed in order that, if the screen display breaks down, it defaults to a blank black screen to avoid any flashing error messages or pixilation.
- 5) The screen display panel shall at all times be fitted with a light sensor to adjust the brightness of changes in ambient light levels.
- 6) The intensity of the illumination of the two digital display screens shall not exceed 600 candelas per square metre (cd/m²) between dusk and dawn.
- 7) No images displayed shall resemble official road traffic signs, traffic lights or traffic matrix signs.

End of Schedule of Conditions