



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 February 2026

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th April 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6002191

Outside No 1 Eversholt Street, London NW1 1BJ

- 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 British Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application reference is 2025/0921/P.
- The development proposed is the removal of an existing InLink Unit, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit.

Appeal B Ref: APP/X5210/Z/25/3376537

Outside No 1 Eversholt Street, London NW1 1BJ

- 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 British Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application reference is 2025/4345/A.
- The advertisement proposed is two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of an existing InLink Unit, and the deployment of a replacement Street Hub 3 unit outside No 1 Eversholt Street, London NW1 1BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 2025/0921/P, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of two digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit, outside No 1 Eversholt Street, London NW1 1BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 2025/4345/A. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the additional conditions in the attached Schedule

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

3. I have been appointed to determine two appeals at the same site, relating to a proposal for a new BT Street Hub. Appeal A relates to an application for planning permission for the hub itself, while Appeal B relates to an application for advertisement consent for the integrated digital display.

4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (“the Regulations”) set out that powers shall be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. While I have therefore had regard to relevant policies of the 2017 Camden Local Plan (“the CLP”), they have not been determinative in Appeal B.

Main Issues

5. The first main issue in Appeal A, and the sole main issue in Appeal B, is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance or visual amenity of the area.
6. For Appeal A only, there are three further main issues. These are:
 - Whether the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on safe and efficient pedestrian movement;
 - The impact of the proposed development on crime and public safety; and
 - Whether adequate provision would be made for maintenance of the proposed Street Hub unit.

Reasons

Character and appearance/visual amenity

7. The appeals relate to a site within the adopted public highway, on the footway on the west side of Eversholt Street. It is in a very busy area, immediately adjacent to Euston railway station, in front of the large office block 1 Eversholt Street, and with a variety of other offices, shops, hotels, commercial and institutional premises nearby. There is an existing BT InLink unit on the site, which provides free public Wi-Fi, free UK calls, USB charging, an emergency services button and a range of other digital services for those in the vicinity. The InLink unit has two digital display screens, one on each side, which carry advertising. The proposed development is the replacement of the existing InLink unit with a new Street Hub 3 unit, which again would have two digital display screens carrying advertising.
8. The area is one where, as might be expected, there is already a considerable amount of street furniture; as well as the existing InLink unit, there is traffic and pedestrian signage, traffic signals with associated equipment cabinets, lighting columns and, a short way south of the appeal site, two telephone kiosks (of different sizes and designs, reflecting the fact that they are owned by different operators). There are also mature street trees set in the footway along the western side of Eversholt Street. The railway station, shops, pubs and offices have a variety of additional signage; in short, the area is visually “busy”.
9. The new Street Hub 3 would be around a third wider, and slightly taller, than the existing unit. However, it would have a slim profile, with a modern design and dark finish which would sit reasonably comfortably in front of the dark stone cladding of No 1 Eversholt Street and the dark brickwork and cladding of Euston Station which, in most views, would form its backdrop. Furthermore, the unit would be approximately aligned with the two mature street trees either side of the site (around 4.8m to the north and 6.0m to the south); I address matters related to pedestrian movement below, but the trees would limit the visibility of the hub unit

along Eversholt Street in both directions, and from Woburn Place to the south of Euston Road.

10. The area of the new display screens would be around 90 percent larger than those on the existing InLink unit, a considerable increase in size; however, other street furniture, and the two mature trees in particular, would again provide a significant degree of screening in both directions. Neither the hub unit nor the digital screens would be unduly prominent or intrusive features in the overall streetscape, nor would they be unexpected or incongruous elements in this busy central London setting.
11. I acknowledge that the Council is concerned that the introduction of a new hub at this location would run contrary to its aim of decluttering the public realm. However, notwithstanding the increase in the unit's physical dimensions compared to that already at the site, the siting would be such that it would not lead to an unacceptable increase in visual clutter at this location.
12. I have had regard to the 2020 dismissed appeals relating to the proposed replacement of one of the other operator's telephone kiosks referred to in paragraph 8 above¹. I note that scheme would have involved the introduction of a digital advertising panel where there was not one previously (and, indeed where there is currently none), so it is not directly comparable to the proposal before me, and I am satisfied that different decisions are justified here.
13. Taking all this together, in respect of Appeal A I conclude that the development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy D1 of the CLP which, among other things, seeks to ensure that new development respects local character. In respect of Appeal B, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the area; I have taken into account the same development plan policy insofar as it is material in this respect.

Pedestrian and highway safety

14. As I have described above, the existing InLink unit is between two mature trees a short distance away on either side. The effect of this siting, which I was able to observe for a reasonable period during my site visit, is that the unit does not significantly interrupt the obvious desire line for pedestrians moving north-south or vice-versa along Eversholt Street.
15. While the proposed replacement Street Hub 3 unit would be slightly wider than the existing unit, there would remain around 3.9m of clear space between it and the nearest edge of the No 1 Eversholt Street building. I acknowledge that this would fall below the 5.3m footway width sought for "high flow areas" by Transport for London's *Pedestrian Comfort Guidance* to which the Council referred, but it would still exceed the "minimum effective footway width" of 3.3m sought by the guidance. In any event, the mature trees either side of the appeal site are an equally significant (and, presumably, more permanent) constraint on the width of the footway at this location; I am satisfied that the proposed hub unit would not have a significant additional impact in this respect.

¹ PINS Refs: APP/X5210/W/20/3253727 and APP/X5210/Z/20/3252945

16. I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on safe and efficient pedestrian movement. There would therefore be no conflict with Policies A1, C6 and T1 of the CLP which together, and among other things, seek to ensure that development meets the highest practicable standards of accessible and inclusive design, and prioritises walking (among other sustainable means of transport) by providing high-quality footpaths and pavements of adequate width. I also find no conflict on this matter with Policy G1 of the CLP which identifies areas for growth and development in Camden, which was referred to on the decision notice, but which does not obviously relate to this main issue.

Crime and public safety

17. The Council has described installations such as telephone kiosks and communication hubs as “crime generators” and focal points for anti-social behaviour. The Metropolitan Police’s Crime Prevention Design Advisor (“the CPDA”) commented that areas around transport hubs, especially main stations such as Euston, often see higher levels of crime and anti-social behaviour, and that opportunistic thefts from the person are prevalent. They also noted that the seating in front of No 1 Eversholt Street could offer opportunities for would-be criminals to observe people using phones at or near the appeal site, and that mobile phone snatches were often carried out by people on bicycles or scooters.
18. The CPDA also noted that the two other phone boxes nearby (described in paragraph 8 above) had been damaged, including by being graffitied, while the Council commented that the “free calls” facility at existing InLink units had been used to coordinate drug dealing, though this was also couched in general terms rather than specifically related to the unit currently at the appeal site.
19. I address matters related specifically to the maintenance and cleaning of the proposed unit below. However, while I do not seek to downplay the harmful impacts of street crime and anti-social behaviour, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that those issues would be increased as a result of the proposed development. Indeed, as the proposed Street Hub 3 unit would replace an existing unit, and would provide a comparable range of services, I consider that it would be likely to be broadly neutral in this respect.
20. As such, there would be no significant adverse effect on crime and public safety. I therefore find no conflict with Policy C5 of the CLP, which seeks to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour, and to promote safer streets and public areas.

Maintenance

21. I acknowledge the Council’s concern that a lack of maintenance for the proposed Street Hub 3 could lead to it falling into disrepair and detracting from the quality of the streetscene. The Council considered that maintenance of the installation could only be achieved through a section 106 agreement. I was directed on this matter to other dismissed appeals in Camden in which the matter of maintenance had been considered.
22. In respect of a proposal for a telephone kiosk outside Nos 216-217 Tottenham Court Road², an Inspector noted in 2020 that the “proposed maintenance regime would be likely to reduce the effects of [crime and anti-social behaviour such as

² PINS Refs: APP/X5210/W/20/3253878 and APP/X5210/Z/20/3253540

urination and vandalism or graffiti]”. Dealing with appeals in 2022 relating to a proposed Street Hub 3 unit outside No 39 Tottenham Court Road³, the Inspector commented that “there is no legal mechanism in place to ensure that an appropriate maintenance plan is implemented in perpetuity”.

23. I saw during my site visit that the existing InLink unit at the appeal site was operational, and appeared clean and well-maintained. Nevertheless, I accept that there is a significant risk that such units may become neglected over time to the detriment of the streetscene; indeed, as the CPDA observed, some graffiti and stickers could be seen on the other two telephone boxes nearby. I therefore consider that appropriate maintenance should be secured.
24. However, nothing which has been put before me indicates that this could only be secured by a planning obligation, and I note that in the 216-217 Tottenham Court Road decisions just referred to there is no indication that a planning obligation was before the Inspector (though those appeals were dismissed for other reasons). The *Street Hubs Beyond Connection* document (“the SHBC document”) submitted as part of the planning application states that Street Hub units are visited every two weeks for cleaning and checked for damage, and that emergency visits can also be arranged in response to remote monitoring. In view of my conclusion on the preceding main issue, as well as my observations on site, I am satisfied that maintenance can be secured by a condition requiring compliance with the submitted details in the SHBC document.
25. Subject to such a condition, I consider that adequate provision would be made for maintenance of the proposed Street Hub unit. As such, I find no conflict on this matter with Policies D1 and A1 of the CLP, which among other things seek to manage the impact of development so as to protect quality of life in the borough, and to ensure that development is of sustainable and durable construction, and secure and designed to minimise crime and antisocial behaviour.
26. I also find no conflict on this matter with Policy G1 of the CLP which, as I have described above, identifies areas for growth and development in the borough; with Policy C6 which relates to access for all; or with Policy T1 which seeks to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport. All three policies were referred to in the decision notice, but it has not been made clear how they relate to this particular main issue.

Conditions

27. The Council proposed a number of conditions in the event of my allowing the appeals, which I have considered in the light of the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. The appellant did not comment on the Council’s suggestions, though they had already put forward their own suggested conditions in the submitted Planning and Design Statement. Where necessary in the interests of effectiveness, I have made changes to the suggested wording or ordering of conditions.
28. For Appeal A, as well as the standard time limit condition (1), in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (2); for the reasons set out in my assessment of the “maintenance” main issue, this condition also includes

³ PINS Refs: APP/X5210/W/22/3297273 and APP/X5210/W/22/3297276

specific reference to maintenance as set out in the submitted SHBC document. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area, and to comply with Policy D1 of the CLP, I have imposed conditions relating to surfacing materials (3), and requiring the removal of the permitted Street Hub 3 unit when it is no longer required for telecommunications purposes (4).

29. For Appeal B, the appellant suggested in the Design and Access Statement that a 10-year advertisement consent should be granted. However, the arguments put forward for this did not, in my view, amount to a substantive justification for a departure from the five-year period set out in the standard conditions. I have not imposed the first five conditions suggested by the Council, which duplicated those set out in the standard conditions and are not therefore necessary. I have also not imposed the suggested condition relating to obstructing the footway or carriageway during installation and maintenance of the advertisement panels, as it has not been demonstrated that specific controls beyond those provided for in highways, street works and traffic management regulations would be necessary in this case.
30. I have imposed conditions relating to the brightness of the display screens (1) and to the control of moving and changing images, noises, and suchlike (2, 3, 4 and 5) in the interests of amenity and safety. A condition prohibiting the use of images resembling road traffic signs and signals (6) is imposed in the interest of highway safety.

Conclusion

31. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that both appeals should be allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector

Schedule of Conditions – Appeal A

- 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 installed in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Proposed Site Plan (Dwg: 24007222_PLN_SI_2.1, 20 February 2025)
 - Site Location Plan (Dwg: 24007222_PLN_LOC_1.1, 20 February 2025)
 - Elevation Plan (Dwg: 24007222_PLN_EL_3.1, 20 February 2025)
 - BT Street Hub Dimensions (submitted to LPA 4 March 2025)

Except where otherwise required by these conditions, the Street Hub 3 unit shall be operated and maintained in full compliance with the following approved documents for the lifetime of the installation:

- Planning, Design and Access Statement (Dalcour Maclaren, Ref: UK-000022)
 - Institute of Lighting Professionals Professional Lighting Guide 05/23 The brightness of illuminated advertisements including digital displays
 - BT Street Hubs Beyond Connection v2.1 February 2025
 - BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan Version 3
 - BT Street Hub Noise Management Plan v2.1 February 2025
- 3) All new or replacement surface materials should match as closely as possible the existing adjacent surface materials.
 - 4) The structure hereby permitted shall be removed from the land on which it is situated as soon as reasonably practicable after it is no longer required for telecommunication or electronic communications purposes.

Schedule of Conditions – Appeal B

- 1) The advertisement displays shall be statically illuminated and the intensity of the illumination of the digital signs shall not exceed 2000 candelas per square metre during the day and 600 candelas per square metre during the hours of darkness in line with the maximum permitted recommended luminance as set out by The Institute of Lighting Professional's 'Professional Lighting Guide 05: The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements Including Digital Displays, 2023.

The levels of luminance on the digital signs should be controlled by light sensors to measure the ambient brightness and dimmers to control the lighting output to within these limits.

- 2) The digital signs shall not display any moving, or apparently moving, images (including animation, flashing, scrolling three dimensional, intermittent or video elements).
- 3) The minimum display time for each advertisement shall be 10 seconds.
- 4) The interval between advertisements shall take place over a period no greater than one second; the complete screen shall change with no visual effects (including fading, swiping or other animated transition methods) between displays and the display will include a mechanism to freeze the image in the event of a malfunction.
- 5) No music or sound shall be emitted from the advertisements.
- 6) No advertisement displayed shall resemble traffic signs, as defined in section 64 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.