



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 26 February 2026

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5090/W/25/3374941

Outside No. 1336, High Road, London N20 9PH

- 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 BT Telecommunications Plc against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 25/2772/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the proposed installation of a Street Hub 3 Unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5090/Z/25/3374549

Outside No. 1336, High Road, London N20 9PH

- 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 BT Telecommunications Plc against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 25/2773/ADV
 - The advertisement proposed is the insertion of two internally illuminated digital LED screens, one on each side of the InLink unit.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. There are two appeals on this site. Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission for the provision of a Street Hub 3 unit. Appeal B is in respect of the refusal of advertisement consent for two internally illuminated digital LED screens one on each side of the street hub unit. The kiosk and the advertisement are integral to each other, and both are the subject of these appeals. I have dealt with each case on its individual merits, but to avoid duplication both proposals are considered together in this decision, unless otherwise indicated.
4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the regulations) require that advertisement appeal decisions be made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance confirm this approach.

Main Issues

5. For Appeal A, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the area and public safety.
6. For Appeal B, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisements on visual amenity.

Reasons

Character, appearance and visual amenity

7. The proposed hub would be located to the front of 1336 to 1340 High Road which is a three-storey brick-built property. This section of the high street has a wide pavement with areas used for outdoor seating in association with nearby restaurants and cafes. The appeal site is located to the front of a restaurant which has enclosed the outdoor seating area with timber planters and a large canopy cover with canvas side sections. Further along the high street there is an assortment of benches, planters, bins, signage and streetlights. There is a line of mature trees in the pavement along both sides of the road with large canopies, which soften the appearance of the high street. Whilst the appeal site is not in a designated conservation area, there is a regularity in the building lines, design of street furniture and trees which gives the High Street a pleasant, consistent appearance.
8. I observed that there is an existing 'Jolt' electric vehicle charging unit outside No. 1322, which has digital display signs to both sides. An older BT InLink device with digital displays is located outside No. 1302 High Road, approximately 100m south of the appeal site. There are further examples of digital displays outside No. 1369 and on bus shelters to the north and south of the site. Whilst there are several existing digital displays along the high street, due to the consistent building line, they are prominent features which are visible from some distance away and detract from the character and appearance of the street scene.
9. The proposed hub would be positioned next to the pavement edge, so the trees would provide little intervening screening. The hub and digital displays would be larger than existing structures and advertisements. Its scale, together with its location away from shop frontages would make it a prominent addition which would erode the pleasant, consistent appearance of the street scene. Furthermore, in combination with the existing advertisements on either side of the 'Jolt' hub, it would significantly add to the overall visual clutter along this part of the high street. Hence, I find that the proposal would lead to the proliferation of advertisements where the digital displays would dominate the public realm. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the street scene, resulting in unacceptable visual harm.
10. The proposed hub would provide free public wi-fi, free UK calls, USB charging, wayfinding assistance, an emergency services button and would also have features and capabilities including environmental sensors, insight counting and small cell mobile connectivity. Whilst I acknowledge these public benefits and that they would be funded by the advertisement revenue, I have given them limited weight as I have been provided with insufficient information to demonstrate that these benefits cannot be provided in a less harmful location with regards to visual amenity.

11. The appellant has referred me to approvals by the Council for the Clear Channel Advertising Unit (1369 High Road) and the InLink Advertising unit (1302 High Road). However, in both cases the proposal involved the replacement of existing units and therefore they are not directly comparable with the appeal scheme which is for an additional unit. I note that the proposal would result in the removal of an existing kiosk at Hampden Square, Brunswick Park. However, as this is some distance away it would have little impact in terms of reducing the visual clutter from the proliferation of digital displays in proximity to the appeal site and thereby does not overcome the harm that I have identified.
12. The appellant has also referred to the numbers of permissions granted for Street Hub 3 units across London. Nevertheless, any proposal must be assessed on its own individual merits in accordance with the specific case and site circumstances, which I have done.
13. Therefore, I conclude that in respect of Appeal A that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies CDH01, CDH03 and CDH09 of the Barnet Local Plan (2025), which amongst other things seek to ensure that proposals are of a high-quality design which respond to the distinctive local character and do not contribute to street clutter in the public realm.
14. With regard to Appeal B, I conclude that the proposed advertisements would harm the visual amenity of the area. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007, the policies of the development plan have been considered in so far as they are relevant and in this respect the scheme would conflict with the development plan.

Public safety

15. I acknowledge that the proposed hub would create an additional obstruction in the pavement. However, it would be situated in the outer section of the pavement where other street furniture is located. For this reason, pedestrians would be more likely to travel along the inner section of the footpath to avoid existing obstructions. The submitted plans show that a gap of approximately 3.6m would be retained between the proposed hub and the edge of the restaurant's outdoor seating wall. However, I observed that additional planters were placed past this wall and that the adjoining cafe also had its tables set out beyond that line.
16. The existing BT hub outside No. 1302, although smaller in scale, is also positioned in front of a premises with an outdoor seating area, separated from the wider pavement by the use of planters, and protrudes into the pavement to a similar extent to the proposed hub. The Department for Transport's guidance of pedestrian flow - 'Inclusive Mobility – A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure' (December 2021) states that 2m is the minimum gap that should be provided in a pavement as this allows enough space for two wheelchair users to pass one another. Whilst I note that this document is only guidance, I have not been presented with any evidence as to why the proposed gap would not be adequate, nor whether the existing BT hub has resulted in incidents of obstruction.
17. Although users of the hub may congregate next to the unit, there would still be ample space between the trees and road edge within the pavement for people to utilise the hub, including those using wheelchairs and prams without causing

obstruction. Therefore, based on the submitted evidence, I am satisfied that there would still be sufficient space for pedestrians, visually impaired pedestrians and wheelchair users to pass one another freely without resulting in harm to public safety.

18. For these reasons in relation to Appeal A, I conclude that the proposal would not result in material harm to public safety. It thereby accords with Policy T2 of the London Plan and Policies TRC01, CDH03 and CDH09 of the Barnet Local Plan, which amongst other things seek to ensure that proposals provide a safe and secure family and young people friendly environment for a variety of appropriate uses and do not cause harm to highway safety.

Other Matters

19. Although the Delegated Reports highlight concerns raised by the Council's Environmental Health Team and the Metropolitan Police in relation to the hub's potential to attract anti-social behaviour, this was not considered as a reason to refuse the application and therefore I have not considered this matter further.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above and having regard to all relevant material considerations, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR