
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 March 2026

by **N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3377219 **Outside No 13 High Street, London N8 7PS**

- 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 of BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/2133.
 - The development proposed is the proposed removal of an existing telephone kiosk, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y5420/H/25/3376827 **Outside No 13 High Street, London N8 7PS**

- 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 of BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/2320.
 - The advertisement proposed is the proposed removal of an existing telephone kiosk, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The two appeals are for related proposals on the same site. Appeal A concerns the refusal of planning permission for the removal of an existing telephone kiosk and its replacement with the proposed Street Hub. Appeal B relates to the refusal of an associated advertisement consent for two digital display screens on either side, which would be an integral part of the proposed Street Hub sought under Appeal A. I have considered both on their individual merits, but as they raise similar issues, I have combined these cases into a single decision letter to avoid duplication.
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 a conservation area.
4. In respect of Appeal B, 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. Whilst the development plan policies referred to by the Council are not determinative, I have taken them into account only insofar as they are relevant to amenity and public safety in respect of Appeal B.

5. The address used on the application form for both appeals differs from that used in the banner heading above and the Council's decision notice, with the application form referring to '13 High Road' instead of '13 High Street'. However, the appellant's appeal form also references 'High Street', therefore based on this and the evidence before me, I have used this in my decision.

Main Issues

6. Having regard to the above, the main issues in relation to Appeal A are the effect of the proposed development on:
- the character and appearance of the area, including the Hornsey High Street Conservation Area (the CA); and
 - highway and pedestrian safety.
7. The main issues in relation to Appeal B are the effect of the proposed advertisements on:
- visual amenity; and
 - public safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance / Visual amenity

8. The appeal site comprises part of the pavement in an area occupied by an existing telephone kiosk within the CA. The CA covers the area of the High Street, which features a busier central area due to a mix of commercial uses with ground floor frontages, as well as traffic and pedestrian flows. From my observations on site, the significance of the CA is derived from the linear layout of the High Street, the scale and form of buildings and the open spaces at either end, which contribute to its architectural and historic interest.
9. In the area of the appeal site the street features Victorian development with locally listed buildings, a Victorian shopping parade and a public house opposite that positively contribute to the character of the area. The proposal would be sited to the front of a later three-storey infill building in comparison to other older and more traditional buildings in the immediate area. However, the appeal site contributes to the significance of the CA comprising a prominent position in the public realm and a main pedestrian route within the central part of the CA.
10. The buildings close to the appeal site feature modern shopfronts, advertisements and awnings. Other commercial premises in the area comprise a mix of more modern and traditional shop front designs with variations in signage and illumination. A bus shelter with what appeared to be a two-sided poster advertisement facing the appeal site is within the pavement nearby. Other street furniture in the immediate area of the site includes a low-level bollard, waste bin, telecommunication cabinets, taller street lighting columns and road traffic signage. Low-level free-standing advertisements, tables and chairs for adjacent premises were also evident, and a mature tree is within the pavement close to the junction with Myddelton Road.

11. Due to its appearance, the existing telephone kiosk is not a positive feature in the street scene. However, it occupies a modest footprint and is a generally lightweight structure featuring some glazing. Any visual harm within the street scene is therefore limited. The proposed Street Hub would be situated on the same section of pavement as the kiosk to be removed, close to the kerb in a highly prominent position.
12. The submitted plans show that the Street Hub would be taller and wider than the existing kiosk and it would be a modern design. Despite the proposed slimline profile, the proposal would appear as a more imposing, bulky and modern feature in this location compared to the kiosk. The illuminated digital displays to both sides would exacerbate its visual prominence in this area, which would be visible in views along both sides of the street. Despite not adding to the amount of street clutter in the area, the combination of the increased height and width, the modern appearance, as well as the digital displays, would result in an obtrusive and discordant feature within the street scene. This would be particularly notable given the apparent absence of similar structures and illuminated digital displays within the immediate area of the site and the CA.
13. Whilst the Street Hub would be close to existing commercial premises, the proposal would be materially different to the more modest form and appearance of the existing fascia and projecting signage to the shop fronts in this area. In addition, advertisements integrated with the bus shelters referred to by the appellant appeared to comprise static poster displays. Despite their size and visibility, these are part of a larger overall structure. They are also materially different in appearance to the proposed digital displays of the Street Hub, which would feature bright and frequently changing images. The presence of these and other shopfront advertisements would not mitigate the resultant adverse effects of the proposal or justify the harm in this location.
14. By virtue of its siting, size and design, the proposal would therefore appear as an unsympathetic and incongruous feature that would undermine the established character and appearance of the area and erode the appearance of the public realm. In addition, given its size and appearance, it would not be satisfactorily absorbed into the street scene in terms of visual amenity. Conditions to control luminance levels and operation of the Street Hub would not be sufficient to overcome the harm caused by the proposed installation and the display of the advertisements. The proposal would also be materially more harmful in terms of visual impact than any 'fallback' of the existing telephone kiosk remaining in place.
15. Consequently, the proposal would introduce a visually intrusive form of development into this location with a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, and the contribution it makes to the significance of the CA would be diminished. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, and it would harm its significance.
16. I conclude that the proposal would be materially harmful to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the area, and it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It would therefore conflict with Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 - 2026 (2017) (the LPSP), Policies DM1, DM3 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD (July 2017) (the DPD) and Policies D3 and D8 of The London Plan (March 2021) (the LP). Amongst other things, these policies aim for proposals to be of a design that

respects its local context, character and historic significance, improve the character and quality of an area, be of a high quality and sensitive to the surrounding street scene, that it conserves and enhances the significance of a heritage asset, and ensures the public realm is well-designed and related to the local and historic context.

17. The Council also refers to Policy HC1 of the LP in their reason for refusal on Appeal B. Amongst other things, this aims for proposals affecting heritage assets to conserve their significance. Whilst not determinative to Appeal B, given that it aims to protect amenity, it is material in this case. As I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal also conflicts with this policy.
18. Having regard to the scale of the proposal, and as the proposed change is localised in terms of the CA as a whole, the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, and the harm would be at the lower end of the scale in that respect. Regardless of the level of harm, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) at paragraph 212 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires the less than substantial harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I return to this heritage balance later in my decision.

Highway and pedestrian safety / Public safety

19. The predominantly commercial character of the area around the appeal site and the function of High Street as a main route contribute to a busy environment. I observed reasonably high levels of traffic and pedestrian movements in the vicinity of the appeal site during my site visit, which will likely fluctuate at different times of the day. The appeal site is close to an existing bus stop with a designated disabled parking area immediately adjacent and the entrance to the Greig City Academy opposite.
20. As well as the bus shelter, the existing telephone kiosk is a larger element of street furniture in this area in comparison to other features referred to above. The proposed Street Hub would be wider than the kiosk but would be slimmer in profile. Whilst the pavement is not particularly wide at this point, the Street Hub would be sited largely within the area occupied by the existing kiosk to the outer part of the pavement. Notwithstanding the busy pedestrian environment, I am not persuaded that the increase in the width of the Street Hub compared to the kiosk would unduly impede pedestrian flows or reduce the effective width of the pavement between the Street Hub and the adjacent buildings to a harmful extent.
21. The digital advertisements would be in a prominent location that would be visible on the relatively straight sections of road approaching the site from either direction. Even with the adjacent bus stop and parking space, as well as the provision for loading and parking on the opposite side of the road, this comprises a relatively straightforward arrangement with a generally low travel speed that does not present significant difficulties for drivers. There is limited evidence that the Street Hub and advertisements in this commercial setting would unacceptably distract motorists at this point with resultant harmful conflicts with pedestrians or cyclists. In this context, conditions to ensure images are static and to control illumination levels would be appropriate and would also mitigate potential adverse effects of driver distraction.

22. The site is reasonably close to the junction with Myddelton Road, which had lower levels of traffic than High Street at my visit and a barrier preventing vehicular access along its full length. There is no designated crossing point on High Street in the immediate area of the appeal site, with signalised crossings further to the east and west. Any pedestrians choosing to cross in the area around the appeal site would likely do so when the roads are clear. Consequently, there would be limited scope for the advertisements to distract drivers or restrict visibility and increase the risk of conflict with pedestrians. Given the position of the large tree within the pavement and the existing kiosk, the siting of the Street Hub would be unlikely to result in any significant or greater adverse impacts on visibility for drivers exiting or pedestrians crossing Myddelton Street.
23. Whilst I am mindful of the Council's Transport comments, I find no compelling evidence to sufficiently demonstrate that the proposal would result in unacceptable highway safety concerns in this instance.
24. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on highway, pedestrian and public safety. It would therefore accord with Policy SP11 of the LPSP, Policies DM2 and DM3 of the DPD and Policy D8 of the LP. Amongst other things, these policies aim to ensure that proposals create public realm that is easy and safe to use, protect safe and accessible pedestrian routes, and do not cause a hazard to pedestrian or road users.
25. The Council also cites Policy HC1 of the LP, Policy SP12 of the LPSP and Policies DM1 and DM9 of the DPD in the refusal reason for Appeal B. As these primarily relate to matters of character, appearance and amenity, and insofar as they are relevant to Appeal B, I do not find these to be determinative to this main issue.

Other Matters

26. The appellant highlights there have been applications approved across a number of London boroughs for existing InLink units to be removed and, in their place, install Street Hub units. I also acknowledge that similar hubs have been installed and used in other locations across the country. However, any proposal must be assessed having regard to its own site-specific case and circumstances.
27. The proposal also draws some support from the development plan, including provision of digital connectivity infrastructure as set out in Policy SI 6 of the LP. I have also had regard to information provided by the appellant demonstrating support for infrastructure delivery, relevant best practice and guidance. However, schemes will have different circumstances and site-specific characteristics, and my assessment has been made having regard to the effects of the proposal in this location. These matters do not alter my conclusion on the first main issue.
28. The appellant refers to partnership with the Local Authority and an advertising company and suggests different planning assessments and outcomes on proposals. I do not know the full planning circumstances of other advertisements referenced, and any suggestion of different assessments based on any partnership is not relevant to the planning merits of the proposal before me.

Heritage and Planning Balance

29. The appellant contends that the proposal would deliver a number of benefits. These include the replacement and upgrading of the existing telephone kiosk services to

provide free public Wi-Fi, free UK calls, USB charging, wayfinding assistance, an emergency services button, public service messaging and other digital services. Other features include environmental sensors, insight counting and small cell mobile connectivity, and I note the sustainable design credentials of the proposal. It would be reasonable to treat the above aims as being public benefits inasmuch that they would contribute to economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the Framework, and I give these moderate weight.

30. The appellant also refers to decluttering through the removal of another telephone kiosk further away from the appeal site and in a different site context within the CA. Whilst there would be some benefit in this respect, as it does not form part of the appeal site it is not clear how its removal could be secured through this appeal, therefore I give this limited weight.
31. There is also support within the Framework for advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure and the delivery and upgrade of high quality digital infrastructure. Nevertheless, the above public benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the great weight that I must give to the conservation of the designated heritage asset.

Conclusion

32. Notwithstanding my findings in respect of highway and pedestrian safety, the proposed development, insofar as it relates to Appeal A, would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole, and would not meet the requirements of the Framework. The material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
33. Notwithstanding my findings on public safety, for the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR