
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 9 January 2026

by **P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3375445

Pentonville Road, opposite No. 200 York House, London N1 9UZ

- 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 Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/0679/FUL.
 - The development proposed is removal of an existing InLink Unit, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/H/25/3375442

Pentonville Road, opposite No. 200 York House, London N1 9UZ

- 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 Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/0680/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal A Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for removal of an existing InLink Unit, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit, at Pentonville Road, opposite No. 200 York House, London N1 9UZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2025/0679/FUL, 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 the following approved plans:
Site Location Plan – 24006856_PLN_LOC_1.1
Proposed Site Plan – 24006856_PLN_SI_2.1
Elevation Plan – 24006856_PLN_EL_3.1
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the schedule of materials in the approved document titled “Street Hubs – Beyond Connection. Street Hub Product Statement, V2.1, February 2025”, and retained as such thereafter.

- 4) The development hereby permitted shall at all times be operated in full accordance with the approved document titled “BT Street Hub – Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan (Version 3)”.
- 5) If any damage to the surrounding pavement arises from the installation, operation, or maintenance of the development hereby permitted, the affected area shall be reinstated to its pre-existing condition within seven days of the damage occurring.

Appeal B Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit, at Pentonville Road, opposite No. 200 York House, London N1 9UZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2025/0680/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 following additional conditions:
 - 1) The illumination levels of the displays shall be capped by an automatic brightness control system to ensure that luminance does not exceed 600 candelas per square metre during the day and 300 candelas per square metre at night, adjusting in real time to ambient lighting conditions. This system shall be operational at all times.
 - 2) The digital display screens shall be limited to static images only. No movement, animation, flashing, scrolling, three-dimensional, intermittent or video effects shall be displayed.
 - 3) The minimum display time for each piece of content on the digital display screens shall be 10 seconds.
 - 4) The interval between each piece of content on the digital display screens shall take place over a period no greater than one second. The complete screen shall change with no visual effects between displays, and the display shall include a mechanism to freeze the image in the event of a malfunction.

Preliminary Matters

3. Appeals A and B concern proposals for the installation of a pavement-mounted ‘BT Street Hub’ (the Street Hub). Appeal A seeks planning permission for the structure itself, and Appeal B seeks express advertisement consent for its integrated double-sided digital advertisements. The Street Hub is proposed to replace an existing ‘BT InLink Unit’ (the InLink Unit).
4. The appellant’s submissions present two alternative siting options, indicating a willingness to proceed with either. The appellant was asked to clarify which option was being pursued for the purposes of the appeals and subsequently confirmed that they should proceed based on the initially submitted drawings, and that those plans formed the basis of the Council’s decisions. I have therefore determined the appeals on that basis.
5. The appeal site is near to, but not within, the King’s Cross Conservation Area (the CA). In determining both appeals, I have had regard to the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990,

which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.

Background and Main Issues

6. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the 2007 Regulations), together with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG), establish that advertisements may be controlled only in the interests of amenity and public safety.
7. Although Appeals A and B are determined under different legislative regimes, the Council's reasons for refusal substantially overlap. Both appeals principally concern the visual effects of the proposals and matters of highway and public safety. I therefore address these common matters together, while applying the specific statutory tests relevant to each appeal.
8. The main issues in Appeal A are:
 - whether the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the setting of the CA; and
 - whether the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on highway safety.
9. The main issues in Appeal B are:
 - whether the proposed advertisements would have an acceptable effect on the visual amenity of the area, including whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the setting of the CA; and
 - whether the proposed advertisements would have an acceptable effect on public safety.

Reasons

Character, appearance and visual amenity

10. The appeal site lies within a busy, predominantly commercial stretch of Pentonville Road, where the existing InLink unit sits among a range of street furniture and other features, including street trees and a nearby multi-functional communication hub with a digital display and defibrillator.
11. The CA boundary lies a short distance to the west along Pentonville Road and encompasses the area immediately east of Kings Cross Station. Its significance is derived from the historic impact of the Victorian railway expansion, which shaped the surrounding pattern of development. This legacy is evident today in the largely intact street layout and the variety of architectural styles which respond to the imposing scale and architectural presence of the station building.
12. The proposed Street Hub would be marginally wider, deeper and taller than the existing InLink unit, extending slightly further into the footway but no closer to the carriageway. Its overall footprint would remain broadly comparable, resulting in only modest changes in its profile in street and side views.

13. The surrounding streetscape is already visually varied, with substantial pedestrian movement, commercial activity and numerous items of street furniture. In this context, the slight increase in massing would not materially alter the established character of the area, and the generous width of the footway would ensure that the unit would not introduce a visually intrusive presence.
14. Although the enlarged digital displays would be more noticeable than those on the existing unit, their effect is read within the context of the nearby consented communication hub, which already forms part of the visual baseline. The Street Hub's contemporary design and modest footprint would sit comfortably within this setting, with the intervening street trees providing a welcome visual break between structures. In this context, I am not persuaded that the proposal would result in an unacceptable proliferation of digital advertisements or street clutter.
15. The proposed Street Hub would be sited further away from the edge of the CA than the existing separate communication hub. Against that established baseline, and noting the CA's mixed urban character, the proposal would not draw undue attention or detract from the area's visual qualities. Consequently, the significance of the CA would be preserved.
16. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposals would not harm the character and appearance of the area for the purposes of Appeal A, nor visual amenity for the purposes of Appeal B. In the case of both appeals, the significance of the CA would be preserved. Insofar as they are material considerations relevant to the appeals, the proposals would accord with Policies D3, D4 and T2 of the London Plan, March 2021 (the LP), and Policies PLAN1, DH6 and ST3 of the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies, September 2023 (The ILP), as well as the guidance within the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, January 2017 (the UDG). Collectively, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that development and advertising are designed and sited so as to protect and enhance local character, avoid visual clutter, and maintain a high-quality, safe and attractive streetscape, responsive to its context. The advertisements subject to Appeal B would also accord with the relevant provisions of the 2007 Regulations.

Highway and public safety

17. The Street Hub would be only marginally wider than the existing installation. Based on my observations of the site and the established presence of the InLink Unit, as well as the nearby communication hub to the west, I am not persuaded that this minor change would materially affect visibility or vehicle manoeuvring in relation to the Calshot Street junction.
18. Neither the Council nor the Transport for London (TfL) comments provide any substantive or site-specific evidence, such as collision data, measured sightlines or visibility splays, to demonstrate that the proposal would impair driver awareness or create additional road danger. In an already visually active urban environment with existing street furniture, signage, lighting and commercial frontage activity, I am not convinced that the Street Hub would materially alter conditions for road users or compromise highway or public safety.
19. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposals would not result in harm to highway safety for the purposes of Appeal A, nor to public safety in respect of Appeal B. Insofar as they are material considerations relevant to the appeals, the

proposals would accord with Policy T4 of the LP, and Policies PLAN1, DH6, T1, T2 and T4 of the ILP. These policies collectively seek to ensure that development and associated advertising do not give rise to unacceptable transport or public-safety impacts by maintaining safe sightlines, avoiding driver distraction, protecting pedestrian and cyclist movement, and preventing additional road danger. The advertisements subject to Appeal B would also accord with the relevant provisions of the 2007 Regulations.

Conditions

20. All advertisements granted express consent are subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.
21. The PPG confirms that additional conditions can be imposed where they are supported by specific and relevant planning reasons. I have considered the conditions suggested by the main parties for both appeals against the requirements of the Framework and PPG, amending or omitting them where necessary to ensure full compliance with those tests.
22. For Appeal A, conditions relating to the statutory time limit and a list of approved plans are necessary in the interests of certainty. Conditions specifying approved materials and requiring the surrounding pavement to be reinstated in the event of damage caused during installation or operation are necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. A further condition requiring the Street Hub to be operated in accordance with the submitted Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan is necessary in the interests of preventing antisocial behaviour and crime.
23. For Appeal B, in addition to the standard conditions of the 2007 Regulations, conditions are necessary to control the intensity of illumination, prevent moving images and visual effects, secure a minimum display period between transitions, and prohibit images resembling traffic signs, all for reasons of amenity and public safety. The appellant's request for a 10-year consent period is not supported by any substantive justification, and in the absence of compelling evidence to depart from the default 5-year period set by the 2007 Regulations, I am not persuaded that such a condition would be reasonable.

Conclusions

24. For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed, subject to the conditions in my formal decisions.

P Storey

INSPECTOR