
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by **A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002290

Pavement o/s 338 Regents Place, Euston Road, London NW1 3BG

- 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 Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0918/P.
 - The development proposed is removal of an existing InLink Unit, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/Z/25/3376619

Pavement o/s 338 Regents Place, Euston Road, London NW1 3BG

- 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 Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2025/4344/A.
 - The advertisements proposed are two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Decisions

1. Both Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The two appeals relate to the same site and proposal and raise overlapping issues. I have therefore combined them in a single decision letter.
3. In relation to appeal B, the Advertisement Regulations require that decisions be made solely in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The development plan policies and guidance referred to by the parties are therefore not determinative in relation to this appeal, but I have taken them into account where relevant to the matters under consideration.

Main Issues

4. For Appeal A, the main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would achieve an appropriate level of community safety and security at the locality;
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The effect on pedestrian and highway safety.

5. For Appeal B, the main issues are:

- The effect of the advertisements on visual amenity;
- The effect of the advertisements on public safety.

Reasons

Community safety and security (Appeal A)

6. The site is part of an open forecourt within a busy commercial area. The Metropolitan Police indicate that this area experiences persistent levels of opportunistic theft from the person, which includes phone snatches. Such offences typically involve offenders approaching and leaving at speed on bicycles or e-bikes. Individuals using a Street Hub for calls, charging or interacting with the screen are stationary and often focused on their personal devices, which reduces situational awareness. Users are therefore inherently more vulnerable to this form of snatch-based offending.
7. The Street Hub unit would occupy an exposed position close to the carriageway. The adjoining road is straight and benefits from long sightlines, which would enable an offender to observe potential targets from a distance and plan an approach with minimal obstruction. Moreover, the kerb at this point is low and easily mountable, potentially allowing bicycles or e-bikes to move quickly between the carriageway and the forecourt. These characteristics would facilitate a rapid approach and escape, increasing the opportunity for snatch theft. In this context, a person engaged with the Street Hub would be at heightened risk.
8. While an existing unit is already present at the site, the proposal involves the installation of a new larger structure, which must therefore be assessed against Policy C5 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 (the CLP). This policy seeks to promote safer streets and public spaces and requires developments to demonstrate that appropriate community safety measures have been incorporated, particularly in locations where crime risks are known.
9. The appellant's Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan focuses largely on call-related misuse and generalised network-wide controls. It does not provide any site-specific assessment or mitigation directed at addressing the vulnerability of stationary users to rapid approach and escape by offenders on bicycles or e-bikes at this location. In these circumstances, the introduction of a new structure without a corresponding response to the identified local risk would fail to reduce, and would instead perpetuate, the conditions that facilitate these types of offences.
10. Although I do not consider that the increased width of the new unit would materially heighten concealment opportunities in this otherwise visually open environment, the absence of any site-specific mitigation addressing the vulnerability of the Street Hub users to opportunistic snatch-type theft is decisive.
11. Therefore, on the evidence before me, I conclude that the proposal fails to demonstrate that it would provide an acceptable level of community safety and security at this location, contrary to Policy C5 of the CLP. The Council also cited conflict with Policy T2 of the CLP, but the policy has little relevance to this main issue and I find no conflict with it.

Character and appearance (Appeal A & B)

12. The site is part of an open forecourt adjoining substantial multi-storey commercial buildings and a heavily trafficked arterial road. Although the replacement unit would be wider and contain larger digital screens, it would remain aligned with other street furniture and would not materially alter the perception of scale or introduce additional visual clutter. In the context of the broad forecourt and the surrounding contemporary development, it would be read as a small, modern element in a highly urban landscape.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposals would not harm the character or appearance of the area. As such, the development subject to Appeal A complies with the design objectives of Policy D1 of the CLP. For the same reasons, the advertisements would not adversely affect visual amenity.

Pedestrian and highway safety (Appeal A & B)

14. The replacement unit would remain within the established street furniture zone of a wide stretch of footway. On the evidence before me, the modest increase in width would not impede pedestrian flows or reduce the effective footway width to a harmful extent.
15. There is no substantive evidence that the digital screens would distract drivers or obscure visibility of the upcoming traffic signals. The presence of central carriageway railings further reduces the likelihood of pedestrians stepping out from behind the unit to cross the road at this point.
16. I therefore conclude that the proposals would not pose an unacceptable risk to pedestrian or highway safety. As such, the proposal subject to Appeal A complies with Policies G1, A1, C6 and T1 of the CLP, insofar as they relate to highway safety and pedestrian movement. For the same reasons, the advertisements would not adversely affect public safety in this regard. Again, while the Council cites Policy T2 of the CLP, it has little relevance to this main issue and I find no conflict with it.

Other Matters

17. The existence of consents for similar structures in other urban locations does not provide evidence that the appeal proposal would be acceptable on this site, nor does it diminish the weight that should be afforded to the Metropolitan Police's assessment of crime risk here. The appellant has not shown that those other locations exhibit the same combination of site characteristics or levels of opportunistic street crime identified in this case. For these reasons, the relevance of other permissions is limited.
18. The appellant also refers to the public benefits of the proposal, including wi-fi connectivity, free calls, opportunities for displaying community information, and the potential for the kiosk to support emergency calls. While such facilities may provide a degree of utility, the need for an upgraded unit at this exact location has not been demonstrated in a way that outweighs the identified harm. Although the National Planning Policy Framework supports developments that deliver social, economic and community benefits, it also requires that places are designed to be safe and do not facilitate crime. In this case, the principal concern relates to the absence of any site-specific mitigation addressing the pattern of opportunistic theft

in a vulnerable location. The appellant's generalised public benefits do not directly address or counteract that harm, and no detailed or site-specific evidence has been submitted to show that the benefits could only be delivered in this particular location. I therefore give limited weight to the appellant's arguments relating to technological need, network modernisation and the wider upgrade programme.

19. As the appeals are being dismissed on other grounds, it is not necessary for me to consider whether a maintenance agreement would otherwise have been required.

Conclusions

20. For the reasons given, the proposal subject to **Appeal A** would fail to provide an acceptable level of community safety and security, contrary to Policy C5 of the CLP. This harm is significant and outweighs compliance with other development plan policies and the modest benefits identified. Appeal A is therefore dismissed.
21. As the advertisements depend upon the installation of the Street Hub structure, and Appeal A is dismissed, **Appeal B** must also be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR