



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 16 March 2026

by R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3373211

Pavement o/s 142-148 Streatham Hill, London SW2 4RS

- 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 Richard Wilson of NWP Street Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/01740/FUL.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display to replace existing telephone kiosk, plus associated telephone kiosk removal.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5660/H/25/3373217

Pavement o/s 142-148 Streatham Hill, London SW2 4RS

- 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 Richard Wilson of NWP Street Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/01741/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1no. new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display to replace existing telephone kiosk, plus associated telephone kiosk removal.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The two appeals relate to the same proposal on the same site. Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission for the proposed communications kiosk ('the kiosk'). Appeal B concerns the refusal of express consent for the digital display which would be an integral part of the kiosk proposed in Appeal A. I have combined both decisions into a single decision letter as they are intrinsically linked and raise similar issues. However, I have considered each on its individual merits.
3. In respect of both appeals, the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 stipulate that control may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Therefore, whilst I have taken into account the development plan policies referred to by the Council, they have not been determinative in respect of Appeal B.

5. The decision notice referred to drawing PY4056/003, but the appellant has confirmed that the correct drawing in respect of the existing elevations is PY4056/001 and my decision is therefore based on this drawing.

Main Issues

6. Highway or public safety is not cited on the decision notice in respect of Appeal A and Appeal B. However, I observed on my site visit that the submitted Site Plan does not reflect the situation 'on the ground' given the recent installation of a separate, protected cycle lane and associated pavement works along Streatham Hill. The parties have been given the opportunity to comment on this matter, and further submissions were specifically sought on the effect of the proposal on highway safety. I have had regard to these submissions, where made.
7. Accordingly, the main issues in respect of Appeal A are:
 - whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill Conservation Area; and
 - the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with particular regards to pedestrians and cyclists.
8. In respect of Appeal B, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity, and on public safety.

Reasons

9. The appeal site is within the Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill Conservation Area ('the CA'), which is broadly linear and extends along Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill between Streatham Station and Telford Avenue. The significance of the CA is derived in part from the historic village centre around St Leonard's Church, but also from the late Victorian, Edwardian and inter-war commercial and purpose-built residential apartment blocks and other public buildings along its length.
10. The appeal site forms part of the pavement on the western side of Streatham Hill outside a recently built seven-storey development which comprises commercial and retail uses at ground floor with modern, predominantly glazed shopfronts. In recent years, significant public realm improvement works have been undertaken in Streatham, and the amount of street furniture and street clutter has been reduced. Along this short section of Streatham Hill, the pavement is reasonably wide, and I observed street furniture to be limited to road and directional signage, refuse bins, and lighting columns. Bus stands are sited on the opposite side of the cycle lane.
11. The proposed kiosk would remove an existing telephone box on a similar footprint. It would be an upstanding structure which, in addition to new telephone equipment, would include a defibrillator and a digital advertisement display. The kiosk would be sited close to the kerb edge and would broadly align with other street furniture, thereby reducing the extent and spread of any visual clutter, and the removal of the existing telephone box would ensure there would be no overall increase or proliferation of street furniture in the area.
12. Whilst of similar height, the kiosk would be noticeably wider than the one it would replace, and the introduction of an illuminated advertising display on one side would increase the prominence of the proposal in comparison. However, unlike the

old, poor-quality telephone box, it would have a modern, simple form which would complement the design of existing street furniture and recent public realm works.

13. The kiosk would be seen in the context of the long frontage of the Edwardian building on the opposite side of the road, which is within the Leigham Court Estate Conservation Area. However, it would be well separated from it by the carriageway, cycle lane and new pavement areas along Streatham Hill. Consequently, in views from either direction, the kiosk would not appear dominant or excessive in its proportions such that it would detract from this frontage, or the wider historic townscape. Rather, given its close siting, it would appear to integrate well with the modern shopfronts of the neighbouring seven-storey building.
14. Signage in the area is typically on building facades, but I nevertheless observed other freestanding digital advertisement displays along Streatham Hill and Streatham High Road including within the CA. The illuminated digital display on one side of the kiosk would increase its prominence within the streetscene when travelling along Streatham Hill from the south-west. However, it would not appear discordant alongside the commercial and retail buildings which are characteristic of this side of the road and feature large, modern shopfronts and prominent fascia panels with illuminated signage. Accordingly, subject to conditions to control levels of illumination, there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area, or to visual amenity, from the size, position or illumination of the digital display.
15. I therefore conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill Conservation area. Although not determinative in respect of Appeal B, it would accord with policies Q5, Q6, Q17 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021) (LP). Together, these require high-quality design that respects positive characteristics of conservation areas, enhances local distinctiveness and contributes positively to the local streetscene with attractive, uncluttered public realm.

Highway Safety

16. Streatham Hill (A23) is a busy road which connects Streatham to the south with Brixton and central London to the north, forming part of the Transport for London (TfL) Road Network. At the time of submission of the applications, the plans and photographs provided in evidence show that the west side of Streatham Hill comprised a row of parking or loading bays and two lanes of carriageway between the kerb edge and a central landscaped reservation. However, I observed on my site visit that the west side now consists of a new protected cycle lane which runs alongside the pavement. Beyond this is a further paved area accommodating two bus stands, which would be to the north of the proposed kiosk.
17. I appreciate that TfL is the body responsible for the works I have described, and that, subject to conditions, they did not object to the proposal at a time when the planned improvements should have been known. Nevertheless, 'on the ground' the pavement width has been reduced, and consequently the proposed kiosk would be positioned right on its kerb edge, all but abutting the protected cycle lane. This would create a pinch-point, and its proximity could cause a physical obstruction to cyclists using the lane, particularly if one is passing the other.
18. There would be an area of tactile paving to the south of the kiosk which demarks a crossing point over the cycle lane to the pavement area beyond. For pedestrians using this crossing, the proposal would not restrict visibility of cyclists approaching

from the south. However, the height, width and orientation of the kiosk would significantly interrupt intervisibility between cyclists and pedestrians crossing further to the north on the natural desire line closer to the bus stands. The proposal would therefore increase the risk of collision or conflict between the two, to the detriment of highway safety.

19. Whilst I appreciate the proposal would replace an existing telephone box, the display of the advertisement on the southern side of the kiosk may further distract cyclists using the protected lane, thereby exacerbating the harm to safety.
20. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to pedestrian, cyclist and public safety. Although not determinative in respect of Appeal B, it would conflict with LP Policy Q17 in so far as it requires that no advertisement shall harm highway/public safety.

Other Matters

21. My attention has been drawn to a prior approval and advertisement consent granted in 2018¹ for the replacement of the existing telephone kiosk at the appeal site with a 'New World Payphone' kiosk with integral illuminated digital panel. I accept that consistency in decision-making in the planning system is important. However, every case must be assessed on its own merits and circumstances at the time of each decision. For the reasons already given, the recent installation of the protected cycle lane and associated pavement works lead me to take a contrary view to the one previously taken.
22. In addition to the removal of the existing telephone kiosk on the appeal site, the submission details that existing kiosks at 54 Streatham High Road and 10 Leigham Hall Parade, Streatham High Road would also be removed. Although within the CA, these kiosks are located a reasonable distance away from the appeal site and are physically and visually unrelated to it. Whilst it may enhance the setting of nearby listed buildings, it has not been shown that the removal of these redundant kiosks is predicated on the installation of the appeal proposal. The benefits of their removal have not therefore been determinative to this appeal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

23. I have had due regard to the benefits of the proposal. In respect of Appeal A, the proposed kiosk would align with paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) where it states that advanced, high-quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. It would provide new public telephone equipment, beneficial for those without access to a landline, personal mobile phone or portable battery charger, and it would include interactive wayfinding, a public information capability and wireless telecommunications services, including 4G/5G small cells. Further, it would have an integral defibrillator and feature measures to design out crime.
24. Nevertheless, when taken together, the above-mentioned benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to pedestrian and cyclist safety.
25. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety, with particular regards to pedestrians and cyclists. Appeal A conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material

¹ LPA Ref. 17/05685/G24 & 17/05679/ADV

considerations, including the Framework, to suggest a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Appeal B would cause harm to public safety.

26. For these reasons, both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

R Gravett

INSPECTOR