



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 23 January 2026

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3376256

Ferne Park Road, Outside no. 4, London N4 4ED

- 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 Ms Verity Cheyne (BT Telecommunications PLC) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HRG/2025/2132.
 - The development proposed is the removal of an existing telephone kiosk, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y5420/H/25/3376253

Ferne Park Road, Outside no. 4, London N4 4ED

- 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 Ms Verity Cheyne (BT Telecommunications PLC) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/2319.
 - The proposal is for the removal of an existing telephone kiosk, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Decision Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of an existing telephone kiosk, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit at Ferne Park Road, Outside no. 4, London N4 4ED in accordance with the terms of the application, ref HRG/2025/2132, 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 drawings and documents:
 - Site Location Plan - 24006934_PLN_LOC_1.1
 - Elevation Plan - 24006934_PLN_EL_3.1
 - Proposed Site Plan - 24006934_PLN_SI_2.1
 - BT Street Hubs Beyond Connection Product Statement V2.1 February 2025
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be managed in accordance with the management measures detailed in the BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan Version 3 for the lifetime of the development.

- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be managed in accordance with the management measures detailed in the BT Street Hub Noise Management Plan V2.1 February 2025 for the lifetime of the development.

Decision Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted to display digital advertisements via 2no. digital display screens incorporated in street hub unit at Ferme Park Road, Outside no. 4, London N4 4ED in accordance with the terms of the application, ref HGY/2025/2319. The consent is granted for ten years from the date of this decision and is subject to five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The minimum display time for each advertisement shall be 10 seconds, and the advertisement display panels shall display static images only.
 - 2) The interval between successive advertisements shall be no greater than 1 second and the complete display shall change without effect.
 - 3) No content on the digital display screens shall resemble traffic signs, as defined in Section 64 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
 - 4) The advertisement shall be equipped with a dimmer control and photocell which shall constantly monitor ambient lighting conditions and adjust sign brightness accordingly. The display shall include a mechanism to freeze the image in the event of a malfunction.
 - 5) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisements permitted by this consent shall not exceed 600 candelas per square metre during daylight hours, or 300 candelas per square metre between dusk and dawn.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above, there are two appeals on this site. They differ only in that Appeal A relates to planning permission and Appeal B to express advertisement consent. I have considered each on its individual merit. However, as they raise similar issues, I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated, to avoid duplication.
4. In respect of Appeal B, the Regulations and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) both make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account cumulative impacts. Regard does not need to be had to the development plan. Therefore, while I have taken relevant policies of the London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) (the London Plan), the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2017) (the Local Plan), and the Development Management Development Plan Document (2017) (the DPD) into account as a material consideration, they have not been determinative.
5. The description of the proposal for appeal B within the application form related to the hub structure and not the advertisements. As such, I have used the description within the decision notice for the purposes of my decision as this is more accurate.

Main Issues

6. The main issues for Appeals A and B are the effect of the proposal on:

- the character and appearance/visual amenity of the area, including the Stroud Green Conservation Area; and
- highway/public safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance/visual amenity including the Conservation Area

7. The appeal site is located within the Stroud Green Conservation Area (the CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
8. The CA comprises a shopping parade that retains a lot of its original pilasters and consoles, and in many cases the original shopfronts. There is an abrupt transition to residential properties to the north including a large green area, notably transforming the character of the street scene. As such, the significance of the CA is architectural and historic derived.
9. A further two stories are above many of shop fronts, with the built environment appearing tall and imposing flanking the highway. Facia signage is present above most of the shop fronts which are in keeping with such a commercial area. There is a notable level of street furniture along the shopping parade, including a bus shelter, street lighting columns, a number of cycle hoops, two phone boxes, a post box, and parking meter. The appeal site comprises a legacy phone box positioned between a post box and grit box and notably within close proximity of a bus shelter. This street furniture does not benefit the character of the area, nevertheless it does form part of the existing street scene.
10. Whilst marginally taller and wider than the existing phone box, the slim profile of the proposal would reduce its overall bulk such that it would not be unacceptably prominent in the street scene with a negligible projection further into the footway. Additionally, it would be set against the backdrop of the plethora of surrounding street furniture, most notably the bus shelter. The replacement of the existing phone box would mean that it would not add to the existing amount of street furniture and therefore would not result in any unacceptable clutter. The appearance of the advertisement displays within the hub would not be unusual in this commercial context and given their size, they would not appear prominent, set against the scale of the buildings in the immediate vicinity. The highway is well-lit by street lighting and as such, the illumination of the advertisements would not appear out of place or obtrusive. Overall, the scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
11. Consequently, in respect of Appeal A, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would therefore not conflict with the relevant provisions of SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan, Policy DM1, DM3 and DM9 of the DPD, and Policies D3 and D8 of the London Plan. When read together, these require development to reflect its local context and character and historic significance in addition to preserving the historic significance of conservation areas.

12. In respect of Appeal B, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not result in harm to the visual amenity of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As far as they are relevant, I have taken into account Policies HC1 and D8 of the London Plan, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan, Policies DM2, DM3, DM54 of the DPD, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). When read together these require advertisements to be sensitive to the surrounding street scene and conservation area, and avoid unsightly proliferation or clutter.

Highway/ Public Safety

13. The existing street furniture within the vicinity of the appeal site is predominantly located on the edge of the pavement, closest to the road. This allows for ample space between the furniture and the shop fronts for the high number of passing pedestrians. The slight increase in width of the proposal in comparison to the existing phone box retains adequate space for passing pedestrians including wheelchair users, notwithstanding any activities of the commercial premises within the footway. As such, I do not consider that the proposal would unacceptably reduce footway space or harm pedestrian safety.
14. The Planning Practice Guidance acknowledges that advertisements are intended to attract attention. This in and of itself is not a prohibitive factor of advertisements.
15. The section of highway within which the proposal would be located is relatively straight and wide, providing good visibility for pedestrians and road users. It would additionally be recessed from the roadside so as to not overhang and continue to allow good visibility for passing motorists. The proposal would be a moderate distance from a pedestrian crossing, junction, vehicle parking bays and bus stop. Nonetheless, the open linear nature of the highway allows motorists and pedestrians ample time to react to and safely navigate these potential hazards.
16. Whilst the proposed advertisement would be designed to draw attention, as set out above it is located in an area of good visibility giving highway users time to react. The area is well lit by street lights and lights from the windows of adjoining buildings, as such the use of illumination would not appear a distracting or unusual feature within the street scene. Further, illumination levels, display times, restrictions on moving imagery, can all be controlled through condition were I minded to allow the appeal. When combined with the relatively modest scale of the proposal in comparison to other street furniture such as the existing telephone box and bus shelter, the proposal would be unlikely to distract pedestrians and road users to an extent so as to cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
17. Whilst the Council refer to a number of slight injury accidents in the area, I am unaware of the specific details of these and whether they relate to the presence of advertising. Therefore, I can only afford this little weight.
18. To conclude, in respect of Appeal A, for the reasons outlined above the scheme would have an acceptable impact on highway safety. It would therefore not conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D8 of the London Plan, policies SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan, Policies DM1, DM3, DM54 of the DPD, and Chapter 12 of the Framework. When read together these require development to ensure both the movement function of the public realm are provided for, preserves a minimum residual footway width on main pedestrian roads, and to not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

19. In respect of Appeal B, for the reasons outlined the proposed advertisement would ensure public safety. As far as they are relevant, I have taken into account Policies HC1 and D8 of the London Plan, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan, Policies DM2, DM3, and DM54 of the DPD, and Chapter 12 of the Framework. When read together these require advertisements to not cause a hazard to pedestrians or road users.

Other Matters

20. Given I have found that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area, it would continue to allow the enjoyment of the area, including its aesthetic, by residents and the wider public.
21. Whilst the proposal may be part of a wider rollout of such schemes across Haringey, each proposal must be determined on its own merits.
22. Whether the proposed advertisement may display what some might consider unhealthy products, the subject of any potential advertising is not something I can consider as part of this appeal.
23. Concerns are raised regarding the effect of LED sources on human health, including eye and mental health. However, there is limited substantive evidence before me to demonstrate a direct link between the proposed hub and human health. Furthermore, if the appeal were to be allowed a planning condition could be used to limit illumination from the advertisement to an acceptable level.
24. Concerns have been raised that the proposal would be energy intensive, however, there is limited substantive evidence before me to demonstrate this. Further, the appellants submission outlines how the hub would be powered by 100% renewable carbon- free energy.
25. Concerns are also raised that the proposed hub could facilitate anti-social behaviour and crime. Whilst the risk of opportunistic crime exists in any public place, little substantive evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed hub would directly increase this risk. Additionally, any use of the free Wi-Fi would likely be for relatively short periods of time, preventing any prolonged loitering. Noting the provisions of the BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan, which provides for call restrictions and prioritises any contact from the police, a planning condition would reduce the risk of the BT street hub being used for crime to an acceptable degree.
26. I note the appellant has offered the removal of a second phone box some distance from the appeal site. Nevertheless, I have found the proposal to preserve the character and appearance of the CA/ visual amenity of the area, and have an acceptable highways impact, ensuring public safety. Therefore, the requirement of the removal of the second phone box would be unnecessary. Further, no condition to secure this is before me.

Conditions

27. For Appeal A, in addition to the standard time-limit implementation condition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans and documents in the interests of certainty. A condition is also imposed to ensure the ongoing maintenance and management of the hub in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and to ensure that the development does not increase crime and disorder.

28. Street Hubs provide free phone calls via a speaker and microphone system. Therefore, I have imposed a condition for the proposal to operate in accordance with the Noise Management Plan to safeguard the living conditions of surrounding residents.
29. For Appeal B, in addition to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations, which are not repeated in the attached schedule I have imposed conditions restricting the luminance of the advertisement, restricting the advertisements to static images and the frequency and nature of their changeover in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and highway safety.
30. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the advertisements do not resemble traffic signs, in the interests of highway safety.
31. In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety, I have also imposed a condition requiring a dimmer and a photocell to be installed. This condition also ensures, in the event of a fault, that the screen freezes the image.
32. I have imposed a condition limiting illumination to 300 candelas per square metre between dusk and dawn and 600 candelas per square metre during daylight hours in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and highway safety.

Conclusion

33. I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR