
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3373501

Pavement o/s 273 Staines Road, Hounslow TW3 3JJ

- 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 NWP Street Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1175.
 - The development proposed is Installation of 1no. New Communications Kiosk with integrated advertising display, plus removal of existing Telephone kiosks.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/H/25/3373339

Pavement o/s 273 Staines Road, Hounslow TW3 3JJ

- 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 NWP Street Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1159.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1no. Digital advertisement display within proposed New Communications Kiosk.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed in accordance with the conditions attached within the schedule.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

3. The appeals relate to both a planning application and advert consent application for development at the same site pertaining to a telephone communications kiosk with advertisement to be incorporated into it. To avoid repetition, I have included the decisions for both appeals in one decision letter.
4. With regards to Appeal B, The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require decisions to be made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Factors relevant to amenity are stated by the Regulations to include the general characteristics of the locality, including features of historic or architectural interest.
5. The appellant informs me that they would also remove a third kiosk as part of the overall scheme, at a different site outside 13 Cromwell Road. However, this is not within the red line boundary of the appeal site with no mechanism before me to secure its removal. Therefore, I have discounted that particular site as part of my consideration.

6. There are no issues raised by the Council with regards to the proposal and effect on highway and public safety, and I have nothing before me to contradict these findings.

Main Issues

7. The main issue with respect of Appeal A is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.
8. The main issue with respect of Appeal B is the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

Appeal A - Character and Appearance

9. The appeal site is located in a backdrop of commercial activity close to a busy arterial route to Hounslow town centre and adjacent to residential properties in an area I would describe as a whole as mixed in nature and suburban in character.
10. The existing two telephone kiosks sit back-to-back at the back of the pavement behind a bus shelter and in front of the boundary treatment of Wivenhoe Court. These kiosks would be removed and consolidated by one telephone kiosk finished in black. The kiosk would be repositioned to be located close to where the existing bike racks are currently located and close to the gable end of a commercial unit at Number 273 Staines Road.
11. There would be a visual enhancement within the street scene as two outdated telephone boxes including one that I note was not functioning, would be replaced by an instantly recognisable telephone kiosk structure whilst including smart technology. The new kiosk would be unenclosed as an open plan feature for safety and accessibility reasons and resembles a contemporary style telephone box that would fit with the suburban context of the locality.
12. Therefore, the kiosk would meet the expectations of policy CC1 of the Local Plan in its character and context aims and the good design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, as policy CC5 of the Local Plan relates to advertisements, this is not relevant to Appeal A.

Appeal B - Amenity

13. The proposed digital screen on one side of the kiosk would be used to display commercial messaging and advertisements. Advertisements, including digital are not uncommon within the immediate vicinity as the appellant confirmed, and I verified this for myself whilst on site. I also saw for myself the large static Global gable-end advertisement display to the commercial unit above where the new kiosk would be positioned. Furthermore, there is a static advert incorporated into the bus stop shelter within close quarters. I also note that all three of these would be seen in context to one another.
14. Turning my attention to the amenity effects of the advert, this proposed screen with its bright digital display, that would change around every ten seconds would be a new feature in this locality where adverts are already present, but none of a digitally illuminated variety as this. In this location it would be visually jarring even if illumination levels can be adjusted in different environments.

15. It would be seen in the context of the other advert displays and combined with these displays, all seen within close quarters of one another, would lead to a visually intrusive cluttered appearance within the street scene. Therefore, the effect would be to adversely detract from the amenity of the local area.
16. The appellant also points to a separate kiosk at 155-159 Staines Road. This is currently in situ and is not seen within the same context as the appeal proposal. Even though heritage assets would not be compromised, this is neutral in the overall scheme of things and neither weighs for or against the proposal. Nor does the fact that the operator intends to replace other telephone boxes with the same modern technology in other parts of the Borough and elsewhere as each application is determined on its own individual merits. In addition, appeal decisions brought to my attention by the appellant are also assessed on their own merits. As is my duty, I must consider the proposal before me.
17. The appellant draws my attention to the fact that a previous consent for a kiosk with digital display was approved by the Council¹ that would replace the existing phone boxes. This was to be positioned outside 3-20 Wivenhoe Court in much the same location as the existing phone boxes. Whilst this may be the case, as I have assessed the proposal before me based on the facts on the ground, at the time of my inspection I could see no evidence that it has been implemented. In any case, that approval has since lapsed. Also, from the evidence before me, the appeal proposal is not located in precisely the same position as the previously approved kiosk.
18. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal would not accord with the aims of policy CC5 only in so far as amenity is concerned and Policy CC5 that requires adverts to be sensitively located, and the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 and the National Planning Policy Statement that advises adverts should be appropriately sited.

Other Considerations

19. The proposed kiosk would be multifunctional and would provide a modern device. It would provide some public benefits in the form of equipment for public wireless telecommunications services, wayfinding, rapid connection to emergency services and to specific help providers for vulnerable people, and public messaging capabilities. In green credential terms the appellant confirms they would plant a tree in an agreed location with the Council. These things considered, the overall public benefits are very limited and some of these communications means, do not solely rely on the kiosk incorporating a digital display for them to function.
20. Furthermore, whilst a defibrillator would be incorporated into the kiosk, and air quality monitoring, there is nothing before me to suggest these things cannot be achieved without the digital display in place. I am made aware of the Governments drive to improve communications technology, but as the proposal is small in scale means the benefits to the public are also limited. There would also be a management plan to ensure the kiosk is well serviced and maintained. However, this would be necessary even without a digital display in situ.
21. As a whole, the proposal is supported in terms of the effect of the kiosk, sans the digital display, on the character and appearance of the local area. Therefore,

¹ Application reference P/2016/3553

appeal A is allowed. The amenity effects I have identified earlier surrounding Appeal B lead me to an alternative decision.

Conditions - Appeal A

22. I have considered conditions in light of the National Planning Policy Framework and The Planning Practice Guidance referring to the 'six tests'. Conditions have been imposed to reflect the approved plans and time limit to implement in the interest of good planning. In order to ensure the existing telephone boxes are removed within an appropriate timeframe, a condition is therefore necessary.

Balance and Conclusion – Both appeals

23. I have come to the conclusion that the proposal would safeguard the character and appearance of the local area and therefore Appeal A is allowed. In respect of Appeal B, the harmful digital illumination and combination of adverts in close proximity would lead to visual clutter within the local area therefore, Appeal B should therefore be dismissed and advertisement consent refused.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

Appeal A - APP/F5540/W/25/3373501

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a New Communications Kiosk plus removal of existing Telephone kiosks at Pavement outside 273 Stains Road, Hounslow TW3 3JJ in accordance with the terms of the application ref P2025/1175. The permission is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: Site location plan; Site Plan; New Communication Kiosk Overview and Specification; Existing NWP Telephone kiosks Elevations Dwg no. PY4056/003; Proposed New Communications Kiosk Elevations Dwg no. NWP-KIOSK/001; Management Plan 2024; Fire Statement.
- 3) The kiosk shall not become operational until the existing phone kiosks have been removed in full and the land reinstated to the same condition as the adjacent land.

End of schedule