



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 February 2026

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3376336

Priory Road, Outside No. 161, London N8 8NB

- 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 (BT Telecommunications PLC) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application ref is HGY/2025/2143.
 - The development proposed is: the proposed installation of a BT Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y5420/H/25/3376334

Priory Road, Outside No. 161, London N8 8NB

- 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 (BT Telecommunications PLC) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application ref is HGY/2025/2321.
 - The proposal is: the proposed installation of a BT Street Hub 3 unit.
-

Decision Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed installation of a BT Street Hub 3 unit at Priory Road, Outside No. 161, London N8 8NB in accordance with the terms of the application, ref HGY/2025/2143, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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 carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:
 - Site Location Plan - 24006940_PLN_LOC_1.1
 - Proposed Site Plan - 24006940_PLN_SI_2.1
 - Elevation Plan - 24006940_PLN_EL_3.1
 - BT Street Hubs Beyond Connection Product Statement V2.1 February 2025
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be managed in accordance with the management measures detailed in the BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan Version 3 for the lifetime of the development.

- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be managed in accordance with the management measures detailed in the BT Street Hub Noise Management Plan V2.1 February 2025 for the lifetime of the development.

Decision Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted to display digital advertisements via 2no. digital display screens incorporated in street hub unit at Priory Road, Outside No. 161, London N8 8NB in accordance with the terms of the application, ref HGY/2025/2321. The consent is granted for ten years from the date of this decision and is subject to five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the 2007 Regulations) and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The minimum display time for each advertisement shall be 10 seconds, and the advertisement display panels shall display static images only.
 - 2) The interval between successive advertisements shall be no greater than 1 second and the complete display shall change without effect.
 - 3) No content on the digital display screens shall resemble traffic signs, as defined in Section 64 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
 - 4) The advertisement shall be equipped with a dimmer control and photocell which shall constantly monitor ambient lighting conditions and adjust sign brightness accordingly. The display shall include a mechanism to freeze the image in the event of a malfunction.
 - 5) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisements permitted by this consent shall not exceed 600 candelas per square metre during daylight hours, or 300 candelas per square metre between dusk and dawn.

Preliminary Matters

3. 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.
4. 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 Development Management Development Plan Document (2017) (DPD) into account, these have not been determinative.
5. The description of the proposal for appeal B within the application form related to the hub structure and not the advertisements. As such, I have used the description within the decision notice for the purposes of my decision as this is more accurate.

Main Issues

6. 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

7. The appeal site is located on a section of pavement along Priory Road. The part of the highway that forms the junction between Farrer Mews and Priory Road and the four-way junction to the West, has two distinct characters. The eastern section appears far more green with buildings recessed from the highway and minimal street furniture giving the street scene a wide and open feel. The western section comprises a terrace of shop fronts adjoining the pavement with additional floors above with a greater level of foot traffic.
8. Whilst the buildings forming the parade are reasonably attractive, there is a notable amount of signage associated with the commercial premises in addition to street furniture such as cycle hoops, bins, a grit bin, and a bus shelter with digital advertising displays, reflective of its more commercial character. The existing street furniture and proximity of the adjacent buildings means that this section of pavement makes a limited contribution to the openness of the street scene.
9. The proposal would have a relatively slim profile to reduce its overall bulk, its height and width would be commensurate with the side profile of the nearby bus stop facilitating its assimilation with the surrounding street furniture. Further, its position towards the outer part of the highway would mean that it would be approximately in line with the surrounding street furniture such as the bus stop, and viewed within this context by those travelling along the highway. This, in combination with the relatively wide section of pavement, would maintain an existing moderate gap between the street furniture and the commercial premises. The retention of this gap and alignment with surrounding street furniture would minimise the proposal's contribution to any perceived additional visual clutter and effect on the buildings forming the parade, preserving the character and appearance of the street scene.
10. Consequently, in respect of Appeal A, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore not conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies D3 and D8 of the London Plan, Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2013) (Local Plan), and DM3 of the DPD. Together these require development to respond to the existing character of a place and respect local context.
11. In respect of Appeal B, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not result in harm to the visual amenity of the area. As far as they are relevant, I have taken into account Policy D8 of the London Plan and DM3 of the DPD.

Highway/ Public Safety

12. The existing street furniture's location, including that of the proposal, towards the edge of the pavement in combination with the relatively wide footway, would continue to provide ample space for passing pedestrians. This would include those using wheelchairs, prams, the elderly or those with impaired vision, to pass freely along the footway between the furniture and the shop fronts. As such I do not consider that the proposal would unacceptably reduce footway space or harm pedestrian safety.
13. The Planning Practice Guidance acknowledges that advertisements are intended to attract attention. This in and of itself is not a prohibitive factor of advertisements.
14. The hub would be located along a section of highway that is fairly wide and straight, offering good visibility along it for passing road users and pedestrians. It would be relatively close to two junctions, bus stops and lanes, and a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights at the four way junction further along Priory Road. The hub would be recessed from the edge of the pavement so as to continue to offer good visibility along the highway for those using the nearby pedestrian crossing. In combination with the open linear character of the highway, the proposal would allow good visibility for pedestrians and motorists giving them sufficient time to react and safely navigate any potential hazard, even considering the high level of foot traffic. Further, given the commercial nature of this area and the existence of other advertising, the proposal would be seen in this context and not appear as an isolated and prominent feature, therefore minimising any distraction to passing motorists and pedestrians.
15. The proposed advertisement would be designed to draw attention. However the significant distance to the traffic signals at the four way junction further along Priory Road mean that it is unlikely to conflict and distract from these.
16. Research¹ has identified that static and video adverts can affect drivers' visual behaviour and driving performance. However, in this well-lit location the use of illumination would not appear unduly distracting or as an unusual and overly prominent feature. Moreover, illumination levels, display times, restrictions on moving imagery, could all be controlled through condition were I minded to allow the appeal. In combination with its relatively modest scale, the proposal would be unlikely to distract pedestrians and road users to an extent so as to cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
17. Crashmap records indicate there have been five instances of slight injury incidents in the vicinity of the appeal site in a 25 year period. Given my findings that the hub would not be unduly distracting, it would be unlikely to increase the risk of incidents in this location.
18. To conclude, in respect of Appeal A, for the reasons outlined above the scheme would have an acceptable effect on highway safety. It would therefore not conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies D8 and T4 of the London Plan, and Policies DM3 and DM54 of the DPD. Together these require development to not increase road danger, and not cause a hazard to pedestrians or road users.

¹ Transport Research Laboratory Report PRP 409 - Investigating driver distraction: The effects of video and static advertising, June 2009

19. In respect of Appeal B, for the reasons outlined the proposed advertisement would ensure public safety. As far as they are relevant, I have taken into account Policy D8 of the London Plan and DM3 of the DPD.

Other Matters

20. Whilst the proposal may be part of a wider rollout of such schemes across Haringey, each proposal must be determined on its own merits.
21. The subject of any potential advertising is not something I can consider as part of this appeal.
22. There is limited substantive evidence before me to demonstrate a direct link between the proposed hub and human health, including eye and mental health. Furthermore, if the appeal were to be allowed a planning condition could be used to limit illumination from the advertisement to an acceptable level.
23. There is limited substantive evidence before me to suggest the hub would be energy intensive. Further, the appellants submission outlines how the hub would be powered by 100% renewable carbon- free energy.
24. Little substantive evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed hub would directly increase this risk of anti-social behaviour and crime. Additionally, any use of the free Wi-Fi would likely be for relatively short periods of time, preventing any prolonged loitering. The provisions of the BT Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan, provides for call restrictions and prioritises any contact from the police. A planning condition requiring compliance with this plan would reduce the risk of anti-social behaviour and crime associated with the BT street hub.

Conditions

25. For Appeal A, in addition to the standard time-limit implementation condition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans and documents in the interests of certainty.
26. A condition is also imposed to ensure the structure is managed in accordance with the Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan to ensure ongoing maintenance and management of the hub in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and to ensure that the development does not increase crime and disorder.
27. Street hubs provide free phone calls via a speaker and microphone system. Therefore, I have imposed a condition for the proposal to operate in accordance with the Noise Management Plan to safeguard the living conditions of surrounding residents.
28. For Appeal B, in addition to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations, I have imposed conditions restricting the luminance and brightness of the advertisement at different times of day and in response to ambient lighting conditions, requiring static images and controlling the frequency and nature of their changeover as well as requiring a safety mechanism in the event of a fault. These are necessary, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and highway safety.

29. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the advertisements do not resemble traffic signs, in the interests of highway safety.

Conclusion

30. I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR