



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2026

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PGDip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6002887

Outside Visram House, Acton Lane, London NW10 7UF

- 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 Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OOPRDC).
- The application Ref is 25/0148/FULOPDC.
- The development proposed is the deployment of a Street Hub 3 Unit.

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5730/Z/25/3376962

Outside Visram House, Acton Lane, London NW10 7UF

- 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 OOPRDC.
- The application Ref is 25/0147/ADVOPDC.
- The development 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 dismissed.

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 at Outside Visram House, Acton Lane, London NW10 7UF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 25/0147/ADVOPDC. 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 Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the 2007 Regulations), and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule at the end of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal for Appeal B would be an integral part of the proposal for Appeal A. As such, to avoid repetition I have provided one reasoning section, detailing my findings for both appeals. Notwithstanding this, each proposal and appeal has been considered individually, and on its own merits.
4. In relation to Appeal B, OOPRDC's reason for refusal refers to development plan policies. However, the 2007 Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety, as appropriate to each case.

Therefore, although I have taken relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) into account, they have not been decisive considerations in my determination of that appeal.

5. The OOPRDC included hyperlinks in its statement, as all the relevant documents pertaining to these hyperlinks have not been provided, I have not been able to take them into account in the interests of fairness to all parties.

Main Issues

6. The main issues with respect to Appeal A, are whether the proposed development would prejudice future highway and public realm improvements; and the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
7. In respect of Appeal B, OOPRDC has not identified any harm to public safety, and I see no reason to disagree, therefore the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

Highway and public realm improvements

8. The appeal site is located on a wide pavement to one side of Acton Lane, near to the junction with Abbey Road, Park Royal Road, and Coronation Road. That junction is not aligned as a typical crossroads, and movements through the junction are controlled by traffic lights. I saw on my site inspection that the carriageway on Acton Road nearest to the appeal site had a single narrow lane, and beyond the appeal site (away from the junction) it had a dedicated cycle lane alongside the kerb line, leading towards Harlesden Station. I observed that this nearby junction, named as “Big X” within the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation, Local Plan 2018-2038, dated June 2022 (OOPRDCLP), was busy with constant movements on all sides, by pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.
9. OOPRDCLP Policy P6 says development should contribute and/or enable a high-quality public realm, healthy streets, along with new and improved connections and cycle routes in both directions along Acton Lane and at the Big X junction, including improved cycle links. The supporting text to Policy P6 says the Big X junction forms the basis of the local bus network and the primary walking and cycling routes, which connect to Park Royal centre, and to the six surrounding rail stations, and nearby town centres. However, at present it is said to be congested, movements through it are constrained by car parking, adversely affecting bus times and air quality, along with poor cycling links and a low-quality public realm. It adds that the junction should be re-designed, for amongst other reasons, to improve the public realm and by creating and improving cycle links. In addition, OOPRDCLP Policy SP10 says there should be a comprehensive and integrated delivery of infrastructure, to implement the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP), safeguard land required for its delivery, and to provide area-wide connections.
10. The OOPRDC say a study in relation to improvements to the Big X junction, which was commissioned by itself, the London Borough of Ealing (LBE), the London Borough of Brent, and Transport for London is due to report by Autumn 2026. It is also said that the LBE undertook consultation in October 2024,

regarding bi-directional cycle improvements on this side of Acton Road, which the submitted information shows would include the pavement area where the proposed hub would be sited, this project is now understood to be paused until feasibility work is undertaken.

11. Reference has been made to extracts and copies of plans from the Development Corporation's IDP, Public Realm, Walking and Cycling Strategy and the Park Royal Transport Strategy, relating to future works to the Big X junction. The OOPRDC also say that in August 2025, the Park Royal Big X Study was commissioned to develop walking, cycling and public realm improvements, which are said to have 3 design options, one of which is intended to be subject to public consultation later this year
12. The submitted Park Royal Liveable Neighbourhoods Bid, Supporting Document (1 of 2), dated November 2021 (PRLNB), shows the area where the proposed hub would be sited, as being part of a public realm improvement and part of a comprehensive re-design of the pavement in the immediate area. In addition, the PRLNB also shows a widened highway improvement along this part of Acton Road, which would result in the appeal site being subsumed into that widened road.
13. Whilst I do not have a complete suite of the supporting evidence, the extracts provided, along with the accompanying plans show recent and current work is being undertaken to develop the Big X junction, and to improve cycle links and the public realm, and I don't doubt that this part of the pavement, where the appeal site is located, would likely be required to deliver such highway and public realm improvements. Against this background of information and the requirements of the relevant planning policies I am suitably persuaded that the appeal site should be safeguarded from development to secure these improvements and allow wider public benefits.
14. The appellant has said that the relevant policies in this case are strategic in nature and should not be used regarding the micro siting of such a proposal, and the evolution of street furniture. Even considering the limited scale of the proposal, its siting would be likely to interfere with highway and other public realm improvements, particularly sought by the development plan for wider sustainable development reasons. It is noted that the appellant has said, if the appeal were to be allowed, they would work with the OOPRDC regarding the new works. That may be so, but there would be no certainty a satisfactory outcome would be achieved, nor should it be a justified reason to outweigh the conflict with the development plan in this case.
15. I have also been referred to extracts and summaries of OOPRDCLP Policy EU11, said to be supportive of smart technologies, and increased connectivity. However, I am not certain that the proposed site is the only location where the proposed hub could be located to deliver the public benefits referred to by the appellant, as a result, I attach limited weight to this point, and it has not altered my findings as set out above.
16. I therefore conclude that in terms of Appeal A, the proposed development would likely affect future highway and public realm improvements being made in the immediate area, which are likely to facilitate wider public benefits. In doing so, I find the proposed development would conflict with OOPRDCLP policies P6 and

SP10, in respect of the requirements which are set out above, in particular safeguarding land for the delivery of infrastructure, including for highway and public realm improvements.

Character and appearance/visual amenity

17. The proposed hub would be sited amongst mainly commercial and retail uses, within an urban context. The proposed hub would be approximately 1.2 metres wide and be 3 metres or so high. It would provide, advertising display screens to either side, free Wi-Fi, free phone calls, wayfinding, access to public services, connection to emergency services, public messaging, environmental monitoring, rapid charging and free phone calls.
18. It is acknowledged that the proposed hub would add to the limited street furniture on what is mainly a spacious pavement area. However, given the significant width of the pavement, and its proposed alignment with the nearby controlled crossing lights, lighting column and street tree, it would appear legible and not unacceptably add to the clutter of street furniture in this area. Furthermore, whilst there would be views of it from parts of Acton Lane, its separation distance from the Big X junction itself, would ensure its appearance would not be a prominent feature or readily visible from connecting roads.
19. Moreover, its limited scale, size, high-quality functional appearance, and its modest level of digital advertising, would not be inconsistent with the immediate mainly commercial area. Furthermore, the siting of the proposed hub on one side of the pavement, would not unacceptably harm any such openness of this area, and its limited scale would not be obtrusive, dominant, or harm the spacious layout of the pavement area.
20. In addition, with planning conditions, the proposed advertising could be restricted to be static, without any moving images or interactive displays, along with limitations on its level of illumination, ensuring there would be no harmful effects arising on the character and appearance or visual amenity of the area.
21. Notwithstanding the in-principle objection to its siting in respect of Appeal A, on this main issue I therefore conclude that in terms of Appeal A, the proposals would relate well to the character and appearance of the area, and in regard to Appeal B there would be no harmful effects on the visual amenity of the area. Although not determinative in relation to Appeal B, the proposals would also comply with the relevant parts of OOPRDCLP Policy D1, and Policy D8 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, dated March 2021, that require proposals to enhance the public realm and the existing character of the area, be well-designed and use high quality materials and finishes, and that advertisements have a positive effect on amenity. Furthermore, the proposal would comply with paragraph 135 of the Framework, insofar as it seeks to ensure development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive, and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

22. The appellant has said that as part of the proposal a legacy telephone box, approximately 15 metres from the appeal site would be removed, which would be a public benefit. That telephone box is located outside of the appeal site, and I

have no suitable mechanism before me to secure its removal as part of Appeal A, I therefore attach limited weight to that argument.

23. The submitted measures to address anti-social behaviour, noise, and lighting are noted, along with the site not being within a Conservation Area or near to listed buildings, nor that there would be harmful impacts from pedestrians using the pavement in the current arrangement. I have also been referred to several policies of the development plan, and other guidance and policy, including the Framework, the relevant Code of Practice and the London Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2050, that is said to be supportive in principle of the proposed hub and its associated functions. However, the development plan and the Framework must be read as a whole, and complying with part of them does not mean complying with them as a whole. In this case, the arguments put forward by the appellant in support of the proposal, even when taken collectively would not address the identified conflict above, in respect of Appeal A.
24. It is acknowledged that the proposal would provide public benefits, including free Wi-Fi, free phone calls, wayfinding, rapid connection to emergency services and public messaging capabilities, including for vulnerable persons accessing support. However, the small scale of the proposal, means the benefits are limited. Moreover, I am not persuaded that such services could not be provided nearby in a location that did not prejudice wider improvements.
25. I also note the conditions suggested by the appellant regarding Appeal A. However, these would not address the harm identified above regarding its location.
26. This decision, to allow Appeal B and dismiss Appeal A, would most likely mean Appeal B could not be implemented. This situation has arisen due to the differing planning considerations in respect of both appeals.

Conditions

27. For Appeal B, as well as the standard conditions for advertisements (referred to above), in the interests of public safety, conditions are also necessary: to prevent the display of any advertisements that contain moving images or special effects; to ensure a smooth transition between images and the length of time they are displayed; prevent any advertisement replicating traffic signs; and to ensure that there are no error messages displayed in the event of a breakdown. In addition, for reasons relating to both public safety and visual amenity, a condition is necessary to restrict the levels of luminance of the advertisements and ensure they respond to ambient light levels.
28. An extended 10-year time condition was suggested by the appellant; however, I was not persuaded on the information before me, that this would be reasonable in this case. Furthermore, it is not necessary to impose an approved plans condition on this advertisement consent.

Conclusion

29. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeal B should be allowed. However, the proposed development, the subject of Appeal A, conflicts with policies of the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no material

considerations, including the Framework and those raised by the appellant that would outweigh this conflict, Appeal A should therefore be dismissed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

Appeal B

- 1) There shall be no moving images or special effects (including noise, smell, smoke, animation, flashing, scrolling, three dimensional, intermittent or video elements) of any kind during the time that any message/advertisement is displayed.
- 2) The interval between successive displays shall be instantaneous (0.1 seconds or less), the complete screen shall change, there shall be no visual effects (including fading, swiping or other animated or interactive transition methods) between successive displays.
- 3) The display shall not change more than once every 10 seconds. The use of message sequencing for the same product is prohibited, and the advertisements shall not include features or equipment which would allow interactive messages or advertisements to be displayed.
- 4) The screen display shall be erected with a mechanism installed in order that, if the screen display breaks down or freezes, it defaults to a blank black screen to avoid any flashing error messages or pixilation.
- 5) The screen display panel shall at all times be fitted with a light sensor to adjust the brightness to changes in ambient light levels.
- 6) The intensity of the illumination of the two digital display screens shall not exceed 600 candelas per square metre (cd/m²) between dusk and dawn.
- 7) No images displayed shall resemble official road traffic signs, traffic lights or traffic matrix signs.

End of Schedule of Conditions