



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3372045

Pavement outside 11-13 Clapham High Street, London SW4 7TS

- 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 David Phillips (Urban Innovation Company (UIC) Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/01564/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the installation of "Pulse Smart Hub" with integrated digital screens.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5660/H/25/3372046

Pavement outside 11-13 Clapham High Street, London SW4 7TS

- 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 David Phillips (Urban Innovation Company (UIC) Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/01565/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of a double-sided, internally illuminated digital LED screen.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for Installation of a "Pulse Smart Hub" with integrated digital screens at Pavement outside 11-13 Clapham High Street, London, SW4 7TS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01564/FUL subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
2. Appeal B is allowed and express consent is granted for display of a double-sided, internally illuminated digital LED screen in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01565/ADV. 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 2007 Regulations and the additional conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. There are two appeals relating to the site, one for a proposed 'Pulse Smart Hub' and the other for a digital advertisement display. I have considered each on its own merits but have dealt with both in a single decisions letter.
4. I have utilised the description of the advertisement proposed in Appeal B from the decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposal than the description on the application form.
5. The Council's reasons for refusal in Appeal B refers to development plan policies. However, the 2007 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 the development plan policies, the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and the National Planning Practice Guidance into account, they have not been decisive considerations in my determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in respect of Appeal A are:

- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and;
- the effect of the proposal on pedestrian and public safety.

7. The main issues in respect of Appeal B are:

- the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity, and;
- the effect of the proposed advertisement on public safety.

Reasons

Appeal A - Character and appearance

8. The appeal site is situated along A3 Clapham High Street, close to Clapham North Underground Station. Along both sides of this section of the road are a mix of retail and other uses that together with a regular flow of pedestrian and vehicular traffic provide for a busy, commercial character.
9. The proposed hub would be situated between two bus shelters towards the edge of the pavement. A number of other smaller or more slender items of street furniture, including a lamp post and a bin are located within this space.
10. Whilst the proposal would result in the addition of another item of street furniture in a highly visible location, it would be between two bus shelters which have a comparable height but greater footprint than the proposal. Despite the proposed hub's solid form, it would have a slender depth, with its height and width not being dissimilar to the end panel on one of the nearby bus shelters. It would not therefore appear visually intrusive or overly modern.
11. The proposed hub would be seen in the context of these bus shelters, other street furniture items as well as in the backdrop of ground floor commercial frontages. As the proposal would be in an area of space and maintains a separation with the aforementioned street furniture items, it would not appear unduly cluttered.
12. Reference has been made to a prior approval scheme which was granted on appeal for a telephone call box at this same location, but given this proposal differs from the previously approved scheme, which was not installed, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would comply with Policies Q2, Q5, Q6 and Q17 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (Local Plan), which seek, amongst other matters, to sustain and reinforce local distinctiveness and ensure that visual amenity is not unacceptably compromised.

Appeal B – Amenity

14. A range of advertisements can be seen in the commercial area around the appeal site. The proposed double-sided advertisement, whilst being in a highly visible location, would be seen in the context of nearby shop fronts, many of which have modern frontages and associated signage. It would also maintain a separation with other street furniture items that contain advertisements and signage to avoid a perception of undue visual clutter.
15. Although the proposal would be illuminated on both sides, the area is well-lit and contains other illuminated advertisements. Subject to controls on the level of illumination, I do not consider that it would dominate the locality or appear incongruous.
16. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not be harmful to amenity. Although not determinative, the proposal would be contrary to Policies Q2, Q5, Q6 and Q17 of the Local Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, advertisements that are well integrated into their context and do not unacceptably add to street/visual clutter.

Appeals A & B - Pedestrian and public safety

17. The proposal would be sited in a linear zone close to the edge of the footway that contains a range of other street furniture items. The available footway width would be reduced from around 5.16m to 3.24m, but this would still be a generous width that would allow for comfortable passing by pedestrians, even if a member of the public is standing at the end of the proposed hub, using the facilities it provides.
18. As the proposed hub would be added in line with the existing paraphernalia referred to by the Council, the addition of the proposed hub would still allow for the safe movement of pedestrians, which at the time of my visit were moving in a linear manner along the pavement closer to the frontages of the ground floor commercial properties than towards the edge of the footway where street furniture items are located.
19. The Council has set out the potential for the proposed hub, due to its size and orientation, to provide opportunities for concealment. Although it is large enough to allow an individual to hide behind it as well as being a source of distraction, the appeal site is in a busy, well-lit area which provides for natural surveillance to both sides of the proposed hub. Traditional telephone boxes have been cited as spaces that give rise to crime and anti-social behaviour, but there is no substantive evidence before me that, the proposal, which would be an open structure, would give rise to crime and anti-social behaviour to the detriment of public safety.
20. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on pedestrian or public safety in relation to Appeal A or public safety on Appeal B. As such, in relation to Appeal A, it would not be contrary to Local Plan Policies Q3, Q17, T1, T2, T4 and T9 and Policy T4 of the London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, to encourage walking amongst other sustainable forms of travel and to design out opportunistic crime and anti-social behaviour. Although not determinative, the proposal would not conflict with these policies in relation to Appeal B.

Other Matters

21. Reference has been made to a previous appeal decision on the appeal site, but from the information before me, what is proposed on Appeal A is not directly comparable to the previous appeal which involved a prior approval application, and which comprised of a replacement telephone kiosk with no advertisements. I have determined the appeals before me on their own merits.
22. I have taken account of other matters raised, including the proposed hub having primarily been designed for the inclusion of two digital screens with other facilities being limited to the narrower side of the proposed hub. This matter does not however alter my conclusions on the main issues.

Conditions

23. I have considered the suggested conditions, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework.
24. On Appeal A, a condition requiring the removal of the development when no longer required is needed in the interests of character and appearance.
25. In addition to the standard conditions on Appeal B, and a condition requiring the advertisement hereby approved to be erected in accordance with the approved details, I consider conditions to control the intensity of illumination are necessary in the interests of public safety and amenity. Conditions are also required for public safety reasons to ensure the displays do not resemble traffic signs and to restrict visual effects.

Conclusion

26. The proposed 'Pulse Smart Hub' would accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
27. The display of the advertisement for the reasons set out, would not be detrimental to amenity or public safety.
28. I therefore conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

Appeal A

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Lamb-CHS2/2024/01, Lamb-CHS2/2024/02, Lamb-CHS2/2024/03, Lamb-CHS2/2024/04, Lamb-CHS2/2024/05 and Lamb-CHS2/2024/06.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be removed from the land on which it is situated as soon as reasonably practicable after it is no longer required for telecommunication or electronic communications purposes.

Appeal B

- 1) The advertisement hereby approved shall not be erected or maintained in any manner or use other than that approved by this consent. The advertisement shall be erected strictly in accordance with the approved plans.
- 2) No advertisement displayed shall resemble traffic signs, as defined in section 64 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 3) No visual effects of any kind are to be permitted to accompany the transition between any two successive messages. The replacement image must not incorporate any fading, swiping or other animated transitional method.
- 4) In the hours of darkness, the advertisement display luminance shall be no greater than 300cd/m² in accordance with the recommended maximum night time luminance value set out in Table 10.4 within the Institution of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) ‘Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays’ (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m².
- 5) In daylight hours, the advertisement display luminance shall be controlled in order to reflect ambient light conditions (to ensure it is neither too bright or too dull), and shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in Table 10.5 within the Institute of Lighting Professionals - Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) ‘Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays’ (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m².

End of conditions

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/N5660/W/25/3372045	Urban Innovation Company (UIC) Ltd
Appeal B	APP/N5660/H/25/3372046	Urban Innovation Company (UIC) Ltd