



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 12 January 2026

by **O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3373947

Craven Park Road, Outside no. 59, London NW10 4AE

- 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 Simon Warner of BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/1693.
 - The development proposed is the deployment of a Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/T5150/H/25/3373949

Craven Park Road, Outside no. 59, London NW10 4AE

- 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 Simon Warner of BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/1694.
 - The development is the proposed deployment of a Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Decisions

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

Background and Preliminary Matters

3. Appeal A relates to planning permission for a Street Hub 3 unit, a free-standing digital advertisement and display structure, which includes other related features such as USB charging. Appeal B seeks advertisement consent for the digital screens on either side of the hub. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits but, to avoid duplication, I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. The advertisement application subject to Appeal B was refused for only one reason, relating to pedestrian movement and highway matters. However, the Council and the appellant have commented on its effects on amenity and the character and appearance of the area. I shall therefore consider these matters as well. I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced as a result.
5. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 sets out the relevant considerations for Appeal B. In this case, these are amenity and public safety. The reason for refusal for Appeal B refers to Development Plan policies. However, as an advertisement application, the policies

are only relevant as material considerations, rather than carrying the degree of weight applicable to Appeal A.

Main Issues

6. In respect of Appeal A, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the character and appearance of the area, and (2) on the safety and convenience of highway users, including pedestrians. In respect of Appeal B, the main issues are (1) amenity and (2) public safety.

Reasons

Character, Appearance and Amenity

7. In the vicinity of the appeal site, Craven Park Road consists of commercial premises with residential uses above. Its character includes shopfronts with advertisements, giving the area a vibrant, retail character. The proposed hub and its digital screens would be located within the pavement, which at this point is fairly wide in appearance.
8. However, although slim, the hub would be tall and would have a large width. Its size and prominent position, perpendicular to the road, means that it would be a dominant feature hereabouts. It would add to the existing clutter of street furniture, including lampposts, sign poles, bus shelters and their advertisements. Furthermore, although no animated images are proposed, the illuminated large digital screens, and their rotation of static images, would draw the eye. Consequently, the hub would be a visually intrusive and incongruous feature in the street scene.
9. The site was host to up to two modern payphone kiosks historically. That said, these are no longer in place, and so are not decisive to my determination. An existing telephone box, located further along Craven Park Road, would be removed. Nevertheless, this kiosk has no digital screens and is not as physically or visually intrusive as the proposed hub. As such, its removal does not justify the proposal.
10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area (Appeal A) and amenity (Appeal B). On this basis, it would conflict with policy D8 of the London Plan (LP), March 2021, policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent Local Plan (BLP), February 2022, and the Council's undated Supplementary Planning Guidance 8. These require proposals to complement the locality, and for the public realm to be well-designed and attractive. They also seek to avoid poorly located street clutter, and require advertisements to make a positive contribution to the local environment. I shall consider BLP policies BT1 and BT2 below.

Highway Safety and Convenience

11. The proposal would result in a reduction in the usable width of the pavement. National Government guidance¹ advises that two metres is the minimum recommended width for footways. There is no dispute that this distance would be exceeded if the hub were installed. Even so, the guidance makes clear that footways should be made as wide as practicable. In addition, guidance specifically

¹ Inclusive Mobility – A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2011)

for London² recommends a footway width of 5.3 metres where there are high pedestrian flows. However, with the proposal in place, the submitted plans show only an available width of 4.6 metres.

12. Moreover, the frontage commercial premises have a private forecourt of two metres in width. This had the appearance of being part of the pavement at the time of my weekday lunchtime visit. Nevertheless, this space could in future be blocked by items such as seating or displays associated with the commercial premises, as has taken place previously. On this basis, the hub would potentially reduce the available width to around 2.6 metres. As a result, it would restrict the usability of the pavement, requiring pedestrians to navigate around it, and create a barrier for wheelchair users or the visually impaired, for example.
13. Consequently, the proposal would diminish pedestrian comfort and discourage active travel. The appellant argues that the higher Transport for London standard could not be met here, even without the proposed hub, given the private forecourt. However, this does not provide a good reason for reducing the available space still further. The hub would be broadly in-line with a sign pole and bus shelter nearby. That said, their positions are necessitated by the need to serve the bus stop and to front the road. As such, the presence of these items does not justify an additional obstruction to pedestrians.
14. The Council also raises concerns about the effect of the proposal on the drivers of vehicles using the highway, a distributor road and bus route. The location of the hub would be fairly close to signalised road junctions. Nonetheless, there is no dispute that the advertisements would accord with Transport for London's Guidance and Proposed Best Practice³, including by not conflicting with existing sight lines or signs, and being as close to the driver's natural eyeline as possible. Their luminance would accord with the relevant standards. Accordingly, I am not convinced that the proposal would pose an undue distraction to drivers, or risk harm to highway or public safety.
15. For the reasons given above, although the proposal would not adversely affect highway or public safety (Appeals A and B), in respect of Appeal A it would harm the convenience of highway users, including pedestrians. As a result, it would conflict with LP policy T2, and BLP policies DMP1 and BT1. These aim to improve street comfort and convenience, to prioritise active travel, and to avoid adverse impacts on the movement network. However, I find no conflict with BLP policy BT2, which relates to car parking.

Other Matters

16. The proposal would provide public wi-fi and free UK calls, which in other locations have been used to access services such as charity helplines. It would provide an emergency services button, USB charging, and other services such as capacity for air quality monitoring. Free screen-time would be made available for the Local Authority, to display public health messaging or transport updates, for example. These benefits would be funded by the advertisements.
17. The proposal can draw support from other LP policies, the London Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2050, the Code of Practice for Wireless Network Development in

² Transport for London Pedestrian Comfort Level Guidance Document (2010)

³ Guidance for Digital Roadside Advertising and Proposed Best Practice (2013)

England, and the Council's Digital Strategy 2022 to 2026. These provide general encouragement for improved online and digital connectivity, economic growth and the provision of infrastructure. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) gives similar support.

18. That said, the Framework discourages poorly sited advertisements, and aims to create places that are attractive and which minimise the scope for conflicts. As a matter of planning judgement, I conclude that the public advantages of the proposal would not outweigh the adverse effects, as set out above.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the Development Plan when read as a whole, as well as the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007. The material considerations do not outweigh the harm and conflict identified. I therefore conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

O Marigold

INSPECTOR