



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 November 2025

by **L Fern BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/W1905/W/25/3372940

Footpath outside 90 High Street, Waltham Cross EN8 7BZ

- 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 Group Plc against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/25/0508/F.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1No. BT Street Hub Unit and associated advertisement panels on either side of the unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W1905/H/25/3372941

Footpath outside 90 High Street, Waltham Cross EN8 7BZ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by BT Group Plc against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/25/0509/AC.
 - The advertisement proposed is two digital 75 inch LCD display screen, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Decision

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Appeal A concerns the refusal of planning permission to erect a BT street hub. Appeal B concerns the refusal of express consent to display advertisements on the street hub. I have considered each on its own merits. However, as they raise similar issues, both appeals are combined within the same decision letter.
3. Ongoing highway and public realm works were being undertaken at the time of my site visit. However, no substantive details are before me of the final design or configuration. Furthermore, the appellant has submitted a photograph of the appeal site on Drawing No WLT-02 – Existing and Proposed Views. It is unclear when the photograph was taken. For the above reasons and for the avoidance of doubt, I have based my decision on: Drawing No WLT-02-B/001 – Existing Site Plan; Drawing No WLT-02-B/002 – Proposed Site Plan; Drawing No WLT-02-B/003 – Existing Site Elevation; and Drawing No WLT-02-B/004 – Proposed Site Elevation.

Main Issue

4. The main issue for Appeals A and B is the effect of the proposal on public safety, with specific regard to pedestrian movement.

Reasons

5. The appeal site forms a section of moderate width footpath running alongside the highway and includes an existing telephone box. Additional street furniture exists within the footpath, including a lamppost. The footpath was busy at the time of my site visit and was observed to be a principal pedestrian thoroughfare between the bus station and the shops and services on Waltham Cross High Street.
6. The proposal includes the replacement of the existing telephone box with a street hub unit with associated advertisement displays. The unit would be located further away from the wall between the bus station and the footpath than the existing telephone box and would also be a substantially wider installation.
7. The plans clearly show that the installation of the street hub unit would considerably reduce the usable width of the moderate sized footpath to approximately half. Thus, the proposal would create a cramped environment and a substantial pinch point that would impede the free flow of pedestrian movement in a location that has particularly high footfall.
8. Furthermore, the plans show that there is no raised kerb in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, only double yellow painted lines, which creates a significant hazard for pedestrians with visual impairments. The situation would be exacerbated by the proposed reduction in usable footpath width to the detriment of those with mobility challenges.
9. I acknowledge that there is an absence of detailed evidence regarding the planned public realm improvements and of Council guidance regarding minimum acceptable footpath widths. However, I have considered the details of the proposal before me and the site-specific circumstances observed on my site visit, which have led me to conclude that there would be harm accordingly.
10. Due to a combination of the scale and siting of the proposed street hub unit, it would be significantly harmful to public safety with specific regard to pedestrian movement. Appeals A and B would therefore be contrary to Policies DSC3 and TM2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (2020), which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development maximises permeability of the public realm, maintains ease of movement, and that the safety of all movement corridor users is not compromised.

Other Matters

11. The street hub would provide some public benefit, which would be funded by revenue generated from the sale of the advertisement space. A free publicly available internet service would be provided that would assist the surrounding urban community in becoming better digitally connected. Street hubs also provide the opportunity for improved 5G mobile coverage and speed, direct access to emergency services via a call button and the potential to house environmental sensors for ongoing monitoring purposes.
12. There is also the potential for some free advertising space to be gifted to local businesses and the local authority, which the appellant asserts have occurred in other street hub locations. However, I am mindful that there is no mechanism before me to secure such provision.

13. It is also acknowledged that the existing telephone box has become largely obsolete, and its replacement with a more modern installation would likely be of benefit to the aesthetics of the street scene in this instance.
14. Overall, I attribute moderate weight to the above benefits.
15. The appellant has expressed frustration regarding the conduct of the Council in responding to their pre-application enquiry and during the planning application process. However, these are not matters for my deliberation in the context of these appeals.

Conclusion

16. The proposal under Appeal A conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
17. For the reasons given above, Appeal B would harm public safety, and I therefore conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

L Fern

INSPECTOR

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/W1905/W/25/3372940	BT Group Plc
Appeal B	APP/W1905/H/25/3372941	BT Group Plc