



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3374137

Pavement opposite 338-346 Goswell Road, London EC1V 7LQ

- 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 Mr Nathan Still on behalf of Infocus Public Networks Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/1464/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/H/25/3374139

Pavement opposite 338-346 Goswell Road, London EC1V 7LQ

- 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 on behalf of Infocus Public Networks Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/1463/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form but I have excluded superfluous information that is not an act of development.
4. The appeals relate to the same site and the same proposed development, namely a multifunctional communications hub which, amongst other things, would have an illuminated digital advertisement display. To avoid unnecessary repetition, both appeals have been dealt with in a single decision letter, but the appeals themselves have been considered based upon their own merits.
5. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require that applications for the display of advertisements are considered in terms of amenity and public safety. Whilst the reason for refusal for Appeal B refers to policies contained within the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies, adopted September

2023 (the SDMP), they are material considerations rather than being decisive in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

6. For Appeal A, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row Conservation Area and highway safety.
7. For Appeal B, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on visual amenity and public safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance/Visual Amenity

8. The appeal site is located on Goswell Road, opposite 338-346 Goswell Road and comprises an area of footpath, which currently contains some cycle parking stands. It is close to the junction with Friend Street. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of commercial and residential uses.
9. The appeal site is situated close to the Duncan Terrace/Colebrook Row Conservation (the CA) boundary. The boundary of the CA is situated on the opposite side of Goswell Road. As it is outside of the boundaries of this Conservation Area, the statutory duty within Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended does not apply. However, the proposed development would still be located within the setting of this designated heritage asset.
10. The significance of the CA lies in its predominantly residential character, primarily of late Georgian and early Victorian terraces. There are also important commercial uses in the area which contribute to its character. Overall, the area has a remarkable architectural consistency, homogeneity and historic interest, which gives the area its special character and appearance and demand sensitive policies for preservation and enhancement.
11. The proposed communication hub is of a simple design comprising a relatively slim, dark coloured metal frame. The front elevation comprises a public phone with a wireless charging shelf, defibrillator, accessible touch pad and touch screen covered over by a protective canopy, and toward the rear elevation a LCD advertisement display screen. The communication hub would have a footprint of approximately 0.42m² and maximum height of approximately 2.63 metres, width of approximately 1.3 metres and a depth of approximately 0.3 metres.
12. However, by virtue of its height and prominent location close to a busy junction, it would appear as an imposing and visually discordant feature within the street scene. Additionally, given its comparatively large-scale relative to other items of street furniture and its conspicuous position on the footway, the proposal would introduce unnecessary visual clutter, further detracting from the overall character and quality of the area.
13. I have had regard to the appellant's suggestion regarding controls which could be put in place in relation to levels of illumination and to require the display to be turned off between the hours of 11:59 and 06:00 each day. However, even with

such measures in place this would not adequately address the harm I have identified above.

14. Whilst I acknowledge that an existing telephone kiosk would be removed, it is currently positioned alongside other low-level street furniture and set against the backdrop of the wall and railings at City and Islington College. In contrast, the appeal proposal would be significantly more conspicuous than the kiosk it replaces and would introduce a discordant element along this part of the footpath.
15. Therefore, I find that in respect of Appeal A, that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the nearby CA. Thus, it would be contrary to Policy PLAN1 of the SDMP, Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 and the Urban Design Guide, which collectively require that the public realm is well designed and attractive.
16. With regard to Appeal B, for the reasons given, I find that the advertisement would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area. I have taken into account the policies of the development plan insofar as they are material, and the scheme would not comply with those policies referred to above.

Highway Safety/Public Safety

17. The appeal site is located on a wide stretch of the footpath close to the junction of Friend Street and a pedestrian crossing. This part of Goswell Road is a one-way street, so cars exiting the junction on Friend Street will be looking right towards the oncoming traffic, rather than towards the proposed hub. For these reasons, the proposed kiosk would not obscure views of oncoming traffic when exiting this junction.
18. I have had regard to the concerns of the Council and Transport for London with regards to the bright illumination of the adverts and change of display distracting drivers and increasing the risk of collision between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. However, the proposed kiosk would have a relatively small footprint and considering that the pavement is comparatively wide at this point, to my mind the hub would not interfere with the free flow of pedestrians to any harmful extent, nor to the safety of pedestrians using the footpath.
19. Therefore, I find that in respect of Appeal A, that the proposed development would not cause harm to highway and pedestrian safety. Thus, it would accord with Policy T1, T2, T4 and DH6 of the SDMP and Policies T2 and T4 of the London Plan, which seek, amongst other things, to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use by ensuring the public realm provides for the safety and convenience of all users.
20. In respect of Appeal B, I find that the advertisement would not have a harmful effect on public safety. Thus, there would be no conflict with Policy DH6 of the SDMP which requires amongst other things, advertisements to not restrict pedestrian movements.

Other Matters and Planning Balance

21. The proposals would provide a number of benefits to the local community. In summary these include free ultrafast Wi-Fi, free phone calls to landlines, access to charities and Council services, a defibrillator, wayfinding, device charging, public and community messaging, environmental monitoring, and access to public and

emergency services. This is supported by Paragraph 119 of the Framework. I also recognise the benefits of consolidating all of these uses into a single unit. Therefore, despite the limited scale of the proposal the benefits of it, and of particular importance the defibrillator, are matters that I attribute moderate weight to in favour of the proposal.

22. However, the proposed would harm the character and appearance of the area and I attribute significant weight to this harm. This would outweigh the stated benefits of the scheme.

Conclusion

23. For the above reasons, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
24. For the reasons given above the proposal would be detrimental to the interests of visual amenity. Therefore, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/V5570/W/25/3374137	Infocus Public Networks Limited
Appeal B	APP/V5570/H/25/3374139	Infocus Public Networks Limited