



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: 16 March 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3375813

Pavement o/s 239-241 City Road, London EC1V 1JT

- 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 Nathan Still (Infocus Public Networks Limited) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application ref is P2025/1470/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display, as illustrated in the attached documentation.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/H/25/3375814

Pavement o/s 239-241 City Road, London EC1V 1JT

- 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 Nathan Still (Infocus Public Networks Limited) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application ref is P2025/1468/ADV.
 - The proposal is for the installation of a multifunctional communication Hub including defibrillator and advertisement display, as illustrated in the attached documentation.
-

Decision

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. 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.
3. 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), and the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies (2023) (the Local Plan), into account as a material considerations, they have not been determinative.

Main Issues

4. The main issues for Appeals A and B are the effect of the proposal on:
- the character and appearance/visual amenity of the area; and
 - highway/public safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance/visual amenity

5. The appeal site is located on a section of pavement along City Road. This part of the highway is characterised by wide pavements and a four-lane road, creating a spacious street scene with the adjoining tall, modern buildings framing this. There is limited street furniture along the section of City Road between the junction with Dingley Road and the junction with Wharf Road, including a notable absence of advertisements within the footway. This serves to preserve the width of the street and contributes to its open character.
6. The proposal would be located within a section of pavement closest to the road. Given the limited street furniture and absence of advertising within the pavement, the proposal would appear alien and visually prominent when viewed by passing pedestrians and motorists. The use of materials reflective of some of the buildings adjoining the highway would do little to mitigate its obtrusive appearance within the street scene. Whilst conditions could control light levels, the illuminated nature of the proposed advertisement would further enhance its conspicuousness within the highway during non-daylight hours, exacerbating its discordance with the otherwise wide and open footway. Despite the area being highly trafficked and the proposed advertisement limited to one side of the hub, the proposal's prominent location within the footway and close to the road would result in it appearing a dominant feature within the street scene.
7. Whilst there are examples of advertising in the area, most notably within the petrol station forecourt opposite, these are not located within the footway and are significantly recessed from the road. As such the proposal is fundamentally different in nature to these and would therefore not be viewed in the same context.
8. Consequently, in respect of Appeal A, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies D3, D4, T2 of the London Plan, and Policies PLAN1, DH6, and ST3 of the Local Plan. When read together, these require development to enhance local context and positively respond to local distinctiveness and character, and not have a detrimental effect upon the character or appearance of the area.
9. With regard to Appeal B, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on visual amenity. As far as they are relevant, I have taken into account Policies D3, D4 and T2 of the London Plan, and Policies PLAN1, DH6 and ST3 of the Local Plan.

Highway/ Public Safety

10. The appeal site is located on the opposite side of the highway to a petrol station forecourt with multiple vehicular accesses between the junction with Dingley Road and the junction with Wharf Road, including a pedestrian crossing within the vicinity. Whilst vehicle speeds appear to be limited to 20 miles per hour, this section of the highway comprises four lanes and when combined with the number of vehicle accesses and junctions, and the pedestrian crossing, a high level of concentration is required for motorists navigating it.
11. The proposal is located within the pavement, close to its edge, near the carriageway. Whilst only on one side of the hub, combined with the limited amount of street furniture, the proposal would be highly visible when viewed by motorists traveling North-West along the highway. The size of the proposed advertisement, its proximity to the road, and absence of other advertisements within this section of pavement or within such a close proximity to the road, would result in it appearing dominant and distracting for road users. Even if illumination levels were limited through condition, given the absence of luminated advertisements within the footway, the proposal would appear more prominent at night and thus the level of distraction would be enhanced. Coupled with the level of concentration required to navigate this section of highway, the proposal would result in an unacceptable effect on highways safety.
12. The proposal would be located within a wide section of pavement, leaving ample room for pedestrians to pass. Nonetheless, whilst it would not obstruct the footway, this is a neutral factor and weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
13. To conclude, in respect of Appeal A, for the reasons outlined above, the scheme would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. It would therefore conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies T2 and T4 of the London Plan, and Policies DH6, T1, and T2 of the Local Plan. When read together these require development to not increase road danger.
14. In respect of Appeal B, for the reasons outlined, the proposed advertisement would have a harmful effect on public safety. As far as they are relevant, I have taken into account Policies T2 and T4 of the London Plan, and Policies DH6, T1, and T2 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

15. The appeal site lies outside of, and a reasonable distance from, the Moorfields Conservation Area (the CA) boundary. Given this distance, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the significance of the CA, through potentially being sited within its setting. The absence of any historically designated buildings nearby and not being located within the CA do not justify the above identified harm.
16. The appellant contends that the proposal would provide free calls; free wi-fi and device charging; wayfinding; access to emergency services; air quality sensors; pedestrian flow monitoring; in-built CCTV cameras; investment to support public services; and promote public awareness. It would additionally utilise 100 percent renewable energy and be cleaned by rainwater. An inbuilt defibrillator, which is accessible 24 hours a day would also be provided, and I note the number of uses of the defibrillators on the Hub network cited by the appellant. My attention has additionally been drawn to the Framework, particularly the need for advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure. Nonetheless, given the scale of

the proposal, these benefits are limited. Further, there is no evidence before me as to why a less harmful scheme could not achieve the above.

17. The appellant suggests that an existing kiosk outside of the appeal site will be removed as part of the proposal, although I note some uncertainty from parties as to which kiosk specifically. Whilst I note the Council have provided a suggested condition to secure this, it fails to identify the specific kiosk and would therefore be imprecise. Even if this could be secured through condition, both of these kiosks are located within areas containing more street furniture and neither are illuminated. As such, their removal would have a minor effect on the character and appearance of the area within which they are located, and this benefit would be limited. Therefore, with regard to Appeal A, the above combined benefits would not amount to material considerations that would indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeals A and B should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR