



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 November 2025

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3372626

Outside No 197 Edgware Road, opposite Varley Parade, London NW9 6LP

- 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 Simon Warner of British Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
- The application reference is 25/1662.
- The development proposed is a Street Hub 3 unit.

Appeal B Ref: APP/T5150/H/25/3372627

Outside No 197 Edgware Road, opposite Varley Parade, London NW9 6LP

- 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 Simon Warner of British Telecommunications PLC against the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
- The application reference is 25/1663.
- The advertisement proposed is 2x digital internally-illuminated, intermittent display screens to BT Street Hub.

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a Street Hub 3 unit outside No 197 Edgware Road, opposite Varley Parade, London NW9 6LP in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/1662, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of the Advertisement outside No 197 Edgware Road, opposite Varley Parade, London NW9 6LP in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 25/1663. 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 in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

3. I have been appointed to determine two appeals at the same site, relating to a proposal for a new BT Street Hub. Appeal A relates to an application for planning permission for the kiosk structure, while Appeal B relates to an application for advertisement consent for the integrated digital display. Notwithstanding the different forms of words used on the two decision notices issued by the Council, and the slightly different emphasis thereby placed on matters of concern, the issues in both appeals are essentially the same. While I have of course assessed each

proposal on its own merits, in order to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two appeals together except where clearly stated otherwise.

4. The appeal site address was given as “Edgware Road, Outside No. 197, opposite Varley Parade, London” (along with a National Grid reference) on both the planning and advertisement consent application forms. I have used an amended version of the address based on that used on the decision notices issued by the Council, to remove the misspelling of the street name, and to include the postcode.
5. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (“the Regulations”) set out that powers shall be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. While I have therefore had regard to relevant policies of the 2022 Brent Local Plan (“the BLP”) and the London Plan 2021, they have not been determinative in Appeal B.

Main Issues

6. The decision notice issued by the Council in each case gave a single reason for refusal which encompassed matters of appearance/visual amenity and safety. The main issues in the appeals are therefore the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance or visual amenity of the area; and
 - Pedestrian and highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance/visual amenity

7. The appeal site is an area of the footway on the western side of Edgware Road, outside Nos 195 and 197. The site is within Colindale Town Centre, which extends for some way along the street; the area close to the site is characterised by two- and three-storey buildings with shops and other commercial premises on the ground floor. There is a light-controlled pedestrian crossing around 10m to the south of the site, with a variety of other street furniture – including pedestrian guardrails at the edge of the footway, litter and recycling bins, a bus shelter, and lighting columns – nearby. There is also a row of street trees set within the pavement.
8. The proposed Street Hub unit would be set approximately 2m from, and perpendicular to, the edge of the footway. It would be a freestanding structure, approximately 3.0m high, 1.2m wide and 0.4m deep, clad in powder-coated aluminium panels in a dark grey finish. The hub would provide free Wi-Fi and telephone calls, among other services. There would be two digital screens, one on each side of the unit, which would be of tempered and toughened laminated glass; these would display advertisements.
9. The overall width of the footway at the point where the hub would be installed is around 9m. No 197 has a street trading licence, which allows goods to be displayed on shelving underneath the shop canopy; this means that the effective width of the footway is reduced by about 2m. Nevertheless around 5.7m of clear width in total would be retained. The other street furniture described above is generally well-spaced, so that it does not dominate or unacceptably clutter the area. The hub unit

would have a slim profile, and its modern design and dark finish mean that it would not be an unduly prominent or intrusive feature in the streetscene.

10. Shopfronts nearby have a range of internally- and externally-illuminated signage, and some shops also use pavement signs ("A-boards" and similar). There are poster panels on the bus shelter, and a free-standing poster display a short way north of the site. On the other side of Edgware Road are electric vehicle charging stations which incorporate digital advertisement panels on either side and, while these are not in the same borough (they are within Barnet, and so would have been approved having regard to different development plan policies), they nevertheless help to define the character of the area. The area has a vibrant nature in keeping with its status as a suburban district centre; some advertisements would be an expected and normal part of that character. The advertisements I saw do not dominate the area either by sheer volume, or by being garish or otherwise intrusive. The appeal site is reasonably well-separated other street advertisements, so the proposal would not lead to a harmful concentration of advertising in the locality.
11. The submitted Design and Access Statement suggested that as part of the proposal two existing BT telephone kiosks would be removed, that the scheme would therefore represent "a 2-for-1 swap on street furniture" which would assist in decluttering the street. The two "sacrificial kiosks" identified are on Chamberlayne Road near Kensal Rise Station; while they are still within the borough of Brent, that is several miles from the appeal site. Any net decluttering benefit which might therefore arise would not be felt in the vicinity of the appeal site, and thus it is not a factor weighing significantly in my decision. Nevertheless, for the reasons I have set out above I am satisfied that the installation of a Street Hub unit here would not amount to causing harmful cluttering of the street.
12. Taking all this together, in respect of Appeal A I conclude that the development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policies DMP1 and BD1 of the BLP or Policy D8 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is of acceptable in location, siting, scale, materials, detailing and design so that it complements the locality; that advertisements minimise intrusive lighting, and that unacceptable cluttering of streets is avoided.
13. In respect of Appeal B, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the area. I have taken into account the same development plan policies I have just referred to, insofar as they are material.

Pedestrian and highway safety

14. The first element of the Council's concern in relation to public safety is that the proposed hub would impede safe use of the footway by constraining pedestrian movement. I have described above the generous width of the footway, and indeed in its appeal statement the Council acknowledged that "the overall footway width in this location is generous and is sufficient to accommodate existing pedestrian flows past a large piece of street furniture in relative comfort". Based on everything I have seen I am satisfied that the proposed hub unit would be unlikely to have a materially detrimental effect on safe and comfortable pedestrian circulation.
15. The second element of the Council's safety concern is that drivers travelling along Edgware Road might be distracted by the illuminated digital advertisement.

Edgware Road passing the appeal site is reasonably straight, although the carriageway meanders slightly within the confines of the building lines on either side so that vehicles heading north pass through a very gentle right-hand sweep. For such drivers the digital screen on the south side of the hub unit would be off to their left, but it would be set well back from the edge of the footway. For drivers heading in the opposite direction, the north-facing display screen would be on the far side of the road well off to their right, and likely to be less prominent. In both cases, drivers would, or should, be attuned to the town centre environment and expecting to see advertisements, and those proposed here would not be in intrusive or distracting positions.

16. In respect of turning manoeuvres, the site is a reasonable distance from the nearest junctions along Edgware Road (with Woodfield Avenue and Springfield Mount to the south, and with access to the parking areas in front of Colin Parade and Varley Parade to the north). The proposed installation would not obstruct sight lines for drivers of vehicles wishing to turn off, or enter, the main road, so the advertisements would therefore be unlikely to represent a significant distraction.
17. Taking all of these points together, in respect of Appeal A I conclude that the development would not result in harm to highway and pedestrian safety. It would not therefore conflict with Policy BT1 of the BLP, or with Policy T2 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to support active and sustainable travel, and to improve street safety, comfort, convenience and amenity.
18. In respect of Appeal B, I conclude that the proposed advertisements would not have a harmful effect on public safety. I have taken into account the same development plan policies I have just referred to, insofar as they are material, and the provisions of Paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") which requires consideration of public safety in respect of advertisements.

Other Matters

19. The Council's appeal statement included a list of cases elsewhere in the borough where appeals relating to proposals for Street Hub units had been dismissed. I was not provided with any further details of those appeals, including the decision letters, so have nothing before me to indicate whether they are comparable to this case or not. They do not therefore carry significant weight in my decision here.

Conditions

20. The Council suggested a number of conditions in the event of my allowing the appeals, which I have considered in the light of the tests set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. They did not specify whether the suggested conditions should be applied to the planning permission or to the advertisement consent, and I have therefore exercised my own judgement on this matter.
21. For Appeal A, as well as the standard time limit condition (1), in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (2).
22. For Appeal B, the appellant suggested in the Design and Access Statement that a 10-year advertisement consent should be granted. However, the arguments put

forward for this did not, in my view, amount to a substantive justification for a departure from the five-year period set out in the standard conditions. I have imposed conditions relating to the overnight brightness of the display screens (1) and to the control of images and suchlike (2) in the interests of amenity. A condition prohibiting the use of images resembling road traffic signs and signals (3) is imposed in the interest of highway safety.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that both appeals should be allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector

Schedule of Conditions – Appeal A

- 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 installed and operated in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:
 - Site Location Plan 24006904_PLN_LOC_1.1
 - Proposed Site Plan 24006904_PLN_SI_2.1
 - Elevation Plan 24006904_PLN_EL_3.1
 - BT Street Hub unit dimensions
 - Planning, Design and Access Statement – Dalcour Maclaren BRT-126
 - BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan Version 3
 - Street Hubs Noise Management Plan – V2.1 February 2025
 - Professional Lighting Guide 05/23 *The brightness of illuminated advertisement including digital displays* – Institute of Lighting Professionals

Schedule of Conditions – Appeal B

- 1) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisements permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 600 candelas per square metre (cd/m²) between dusk and dawn.
- 2) The minimum display time for each advertisement image shall be 10 seconds and the change between advertisement images shall take place over a period no greater than one second with no sequencing, fading, swiping or merging of images. The advertisement shall not include any features which would result in interactive messages or advertisements being displayed.
- 3) No images displayed shall resemble official road traffic signs, traffic lights or traffic matrix signs.