



Appeal Decision

Site visits made on 22 August 2023

by Nigel McGurk BSc(Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2023.

Appeal A Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263

Pavement o/s 19-21 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 1BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3910/P, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297264

Pavement o/s 19-21 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 1BJ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/4348/A, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no. digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297265

Pavement o/s 30 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 1BX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3911/P, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal D Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297266

Pavement o/s 30 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 1BX

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
- The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2021/4353/A, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2022.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

- The development proposed is 2no. digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal E Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297333
Pavement o/s 220-224 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 7PZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3913/P, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal F Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297334
Pavement o/s 220-224 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 7PZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/4361/A, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no. digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal G Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297336
Pavement o/s Goodge Street Tube Station, Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 2HE

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3914/P, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal H Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297337
Pavement o/s Goodge Street Tube Station, Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 2HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/4371/A, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no. digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

Appeal I Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297772
Pavement o/s 88 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 4TH

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3915/P, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal J Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297773
Pavement o/s 88 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 4TH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/4375/A, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no. digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal K Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297774
Pavement o/s 164-167 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 7JE

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3916/P, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal L Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297775
Pavement o/s 164-167 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 7JE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/4376/A, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no. digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal M Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297776
Pavement o/s 155 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 7NQ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
-

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

- The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3917/P, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal N Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297777
Pavement o/s 155 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 7NQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/4377/A, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no. digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal O Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297779
Pavement o/s 132 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 5AZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3918/P, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal P Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297780
Pavement o/s 132 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 5AZ

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/4378/A, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no. digital 75-inch LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Appeal Q Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3297782
Pavement o/s Warren Street Underground Station, Tottenham Court Road, London, NW1 3AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/3919/P, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of 1no. new BT Street Hub, incorporating 75" LCD advert screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosk(s).
-

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

Appeal R Ref: APP/ X5210/W/22/3297783
Pavement o/s Warren Street Underground Station, Tottenham Court Road,
London, NW1 3AA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by BT Telecommunications PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2021/4381/A, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no. 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 dismissed.

Appeal C

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal D

4. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal E

5. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal F

6. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal G

7. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal H

8. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal I

9. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal J

10. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

Appeal K

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal L

12. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal M

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal N

14. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal O

15. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal P

16. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Q

17. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal R

18. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

19. I note that Appeals E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, O and P relate to sites that are located within a Conservation Area and that of these, Appeals G and H relate to a site within the setting of a Listed Building. Further, Appeals I and J relate to a site within the setting of a Conservation Area and Appeals C and D relate to a site within the setting of a Listed Building.
20. According to statute, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of these areas. National planning policy, as set out in the Framework, states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and that significance can be harmed or lost through development within their setting.
21. The proposals include the removal of existing phone kiosks. Whilst this would result in the freeing up of space and the removal of old-fashioned and generally unattractive features, if the phone kiosks are no longer being utilised there could be scope for their removal notwithstanding the applications the subject of these appeals. Whilst I have taken into account the fact that the removal of

phone kiosks would help to keep street furniture to a minimum and that this is a positive factor, it does not, in any of the cases before me, amount to such a benefit that it outweighs the identified harm arising.

22. In its reasons for refusal, the Council states that the proposed Street Hubs will harm the promotion of walking as an alternative to motorised transport.
23. As above, the proposals include the removal of existing phone kiosks and there is substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposals would not result in an overall reduction of useable, unobstructed pedestrian footways. Given this and the lack of any substantive evidence before me to the contrary, I am unable to conclude that the proposals would result in a detrimental impact on the promotion of walking as an alternative to motorised transport.
24. Also in its reasons for refusal, the Council states that the proposals would add to unnecessary street clutter which would increase opportunities for crime in an area which already experiences crime. Again, as above, the proposals would involve the removal of existing phone kiosks and there is related evidence before me to demonstrate that there would be no overall increase in street clutter.
25. Whilst I recognise that, by their very nature, the proposed Street Hubs would provide for people to stop and utilise them, so do the existing phone kiosks and further, it is not unusual for people to stop or pause along busy commercial high streets for any number of reasons and there is no substantive evidence before me such that I can reasonably conclude that the proposals before me would increase opportunities for crime.
26. In addition, also in its reasons for refusal, the Council states that in the absence of a legal agreement to secure the removal of existing phone kiosks and a maintenance plan for the proposed kiosks, the proposals would be detrimental to the quality of the public realm. However, where applicable, the applications apply for development that includes the removal of existing phone kiosks and further, it is clearly entirely in the interests of the applicant and/or Street Hub operator to maintain the Street Hubs as commercial assets. In this regard, I am also mindful that the Street Hubs can be monitored 24/7.
27. Given this and the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, I cannot conclude that, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure the removal of existing phone kiosks and a maintenance plan for the proposed kiosks, the proposals would be detrimental to the quality of the public realm.
28. The Council's decision notice for Appeal B refers to harmful visual clutter in respect of "*nearby conservation areas.*" However, the Council's decision notice for Appeal B makes no reference to any effects on heritage assets. Further, whilst the Council's decision notice refers to impacts on nearby Conservation Areas, the Council provides no substantive evidence to support its case in this regard.
29. During my site visit, I observed the site to be outside of any Conservation Area and I also noted that it is located some considerable distance away from the

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

Bloomsbury Conservation Area, such that I consider that the proposal would have no discernible impact on its setting. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate anything to the contrary.

30. The Council's decision notice for Appeal D refers to harmful visual clutter in respect of the "*nearby conservation area*." However, the Council's decision notice for Appeal C – relating to the same site as Appeal D, refers to harmful visual clutter to the "*conservation area*."
31. For clarity, I note that Appeals C and D relate to a site that is not located within any Conservation Area, but which falls within the setting of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area.
32. Also, the Council's reasons for refusal relating to Appeals C and D refer to harmful impacts on the setting of "*listed buildings*." However, there is only evidence relating to the appeal site being within the setting of a single Listed Building and I have taken this into account in determining the Main Issues, as set out below.
33. Also, I note that Appeals I and J relate to a site that is not located within any Conservation Area, but which falls within the setting of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. However, the Council's reasons for refusal relating to Appeal A refer to "*adjacent conservation areas*." For clarity, there is only one Conservation Area adjacent to the site, that being Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Main Issues

34. In its reasons for refusal, the Council draws attention to the location of a number of the appeal sites within Conservation Areas and/or within the setting of a Listed Building or a Conservation Area and states that each of the proposals subject to each Appeal would be harmful to visual amenity. It also considers that each proposal would be harmful to the setting of one or more Listed Buildings; and that the proposals the subject of Appeals A, B, E and F would be harmful to highway and/or pedestrian safety.
35. Taking all matters into account, I consider that the main issues for Appeal A are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.
36. For Appeal B, the main issues comprise the effect of the proposal on visual amenity; and its effect on public safety.
37. The main issues for Appeal C are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the setting of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the setting of 38 Tottenham Court Road, a Grade II Listed Building; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.
38. For Appeal D, the main issues comprise the effect of the proposal on visual amenity, including its effect on heritage assets (as identified in respect of Appeal C); and its effect on public safety.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

39. The main issues for Appeal E are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.
40. For Appeal F, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on visual amenity, having regard to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
41. The main issues for Appeal G are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the setting of 200-208 Tottenham Court Road, a Grade II Listed Building; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.
42. For Appeal H, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on visual amenity, having regard to the character and appearance of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area; and its effect on public safety.
43. The main issues for Appeal I are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the setting of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and on the setting of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.
44. For Appeal J, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on visual amenity, having regard to the character and appearance of the setting of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and the setting of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
45. The main issues for Appeal K are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.
46. For Appeal L, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on visual amenity, having regard to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
47. The main issues for Appeal M are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.
48. For Appeal N, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on visual amenity, having regard to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
49. The main issues for Appeal O are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.
50. For Appeal P, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on visual amenity, having regard to the character and appearance of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

51. The main issues for Appeal Q are the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area; and its effect on highway and/or pedestrian safety.

52. For Appeal R, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on visual amenity.

Reasons

Background

53. The appeals relate to proposals for the installation of new BT Street Hubs with 75-inch digital advertisement display screens plus the removal of associated BT kiosks at sites located along Tottenham Court Road in Camden.

54. Two planning applications were determined by the Council in relation to each of nine sites, one for full planning permission for a BT Street Hub and one for planning permission and consent to display advertisements.

55. The design of each of the BT Street Hubs proposed would be the same, comprising a modern free-standing structure with two large digital advertisement display screens – one to either side - and a user interface panel to the side. The main casing of the proposed unit would be aluminium and the advertising displays would have front tempered and laminated glass. The proposed interface panels and vent areas would be painted powder-coated aluminium.

56. The dimensions of each BT Street Hub, as set out by the appellant, would be 1.236m wide by 0.35m deep by 2.98m high. The proposed digital advertisements, measuring 1.67m by 0.95m, would form a large part of each side of the BT Street Hubs.

Appeals A and B

57. The appeal site is located towards the edge of the pavement along Tottenham Court Road outside a large bookshop. Tottenham Court Road in this location is a busy road, shopping street and commercial centre, with ground floor access to major retailers and to tall office buildings.

58. During my site visit, I observed there to be modern and attractive paving, a bus stop, four phone kiosks, street trees, in-ground lighting, bollards, waste-bins, telecoms boxes, bike racks and benches, all within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.

59. I also noted that the appeal site is located close to two existing digital advertisements along the same side of Tottenham Court Road, also set close to the pavement edge. These two advertisements appear physically different to one another and detract from the more attractive uniform and regular appearance of the area's modern paving, street trees and benches.

60. Further to the above, whilst the pavement in this part of Tottenham Court Road is wide, the presence of the street paraphernalia noted above results in that

area of paving between the in-ground lighting and the edge of pavement appearing "busy" to the extent that it appears unduly cluttered.

61. I find that the addition of a tall, solid BT Street Hub would introduce a dominant feature, designed to draw attention to itself, within an area where there is already a proliferation of street paraphernalia. This would add to the unduly cluttered appearance of the area.
62. Whilst two BT kiosks would be removed, I am mindful that two kiosks would remain in situ and I find that the visual appearance of the proposed advertisements to either side of the BT Street Hub would draw attention to the proposal to a considerably greater degree than do the kiosks that it would replace.
63. Further, I find that the harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed BT Street Hub and advertisements appearing notably different to the two non-matching advertisements currently in situ. The proposal would be seen in the context of these and would I find, jar with their appearance and result in an unattractive, irregular and visually intrusive row of large advertisements located in close succession - drawing attention themselves and away from any attractive, regular features of the pavement in this location.
64. In addition to the above, I consider that the proposed BT Street Hub and advertisements would, due to their prominent appearance close to the pavement edge, adjacent to a busy road, be likely to draw the eye of road users as they make their way along Tottenham Court Road. This would occur very close to a bus stop and within the vicinity of a pedestrian crossing. I find that this runs the risk of distracting both driver and pedestrian attention, resulting in a potential danger to highway users in a busy location where pedestrians are looking to cross the road.
65. In this regard, I note that the kiosks that the proposal is intended to replace are lower in height than the proposed BT Street Hub and unlike the proposal, contain transparent, glazed panels, providing for some through-visibility.
66. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and to Local Plan¹ Policies D1, D2 and D4 which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character. It would also harm highway safety, contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies A1, D4 and T1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect highway safety.
67. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity and would harm public safety, having regard to highway and pedestrian safety. Whilst I note that the proposed development would provide features of benefit to the community, these do not amount to something so material as to outweigh the harm identified and hence the decision below.

¹ Camden Local Plan (2017).

68. Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Appeals C and D

69. The appeal site is located towards the edge of the pavement along Tottenham Court Road near to the entrance to the Odeon Cinema. Tottenham Court Road in this location is a busy road and a commercial centre with buildings of three storeys and more, including ground floor retail and leisure uses and upper floor offices.
70. During my site visit, I observed the pavement along this side of Tottenham Court Road to narrow to almost half its width as one passes beyond the site in a northerly direction. Close to the appeal site and within a wide area of modern paving, there is a waste-bin, a small telecoms box and a tall, thin lamppost and some distance beyond these features, also within this wider area of paving, there is a bench, a street tree and bicycle racks. Well beyond these features and in no way visibly prominent from the appeal site, are two BT phone kiosks.
71. Taking the above into account, the area immediately around the appeal site is notably spacious, with little in the way of street paraphernalia and a wide and largely uncluttered pavement. This provides for a significant sense of openness and space.
72. I also noted during my site visit that the appeal site is located close to and on the opposite side of Tottenham Court Road to highly attractive, tall, brick-built and ornately decorated period buildings. These buildings are located within the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and provide a strong sense of the area's rich heritage.
73. In the absence of any similar large digital advertisements to that proposed in this location, I find that the development of the BT Street Hub, as proposed, would introduce an alien feature that would draw attention to itself and away from the impressive buildings across the road, to the detriment of the setting of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area.
74. The impacts of this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed advertisements, the very purpose of which would be to draw attention to themselves. The large digital panels would appear at a height in line with, as well as above and below, the vision of passers-by and would draw the eye to such an extent that they would appear as unduly dominant features.
75. The appeal site is also located within the setting of Number 38 Tottenham Court Road, a Grade II Listed Building particularly notable for its attractive multi-coloured stock brick, slate mansard roof with dormers, recessed sash windows and late 19th Century shop front. However, whilst I consider the Listed Building's façade to its Percy Street frontage to be impressive, the building appears non-descript and is dominated by a modern shop sign when seen from the appeal site. Consequently, the proposal would have no notable effect on the setting of No 38 Tottenham Court Road.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

76. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub and digital advertisements would serve to reduce the identified open and spacious attributes of the pavement in this location. The harm arising from this would be increased as a result of the proposed development being located close to the area where the pavement opens out as one travels along it from north to south, thus reducing the anticipation and experience of an important sense of space along a busy street.
77. Whilst I am mindful that, by introducing a tall BT Street Hub where none currently exists, the proposed development would, as above, reduce the spaciousness of the pavement in this location, I consider that the pavement is wide in this specific location and that the proposal would not result in any harm to public safety, with regards to highway and pedestrian safety.
78. Consequently, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the character and appearance of the setting of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area. This would be contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies D1, D2 and D4 which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.
79. The harm arising would be localised and in respect of the significance of the heritage asset, would be less than substantial. Public benefits may arise from the proposal in terms of access to free WiFi and related information. However, in this case, the public benefits identified do not amount to something that outweighs the harm identified.
80. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity, having regard to the setting of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area.
81. Appeals C and D are dismissed.

Appeals E and F

82. The appeal site is located towards the edge of the pavement along Tottenham Court Road, close to the entrance to a large four storey commercial building, with retail and banking uses to the ground floor. Tottenham Court Road in this location is a busy road and comprises a mixed use commercial centre.
83. The appeal site is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, notable for the presence of significant, architecturally attractive period properties set within spacious streets and providing a strong sense of the area's impressive heritage.
84. During my site visit, I observed that the pavement along the same side of Tottenham Court Road as the appeal site appears largely uncluttered. The presence of a street tree provides for a sense of greenery and a small telecoms box and a sitting area appear as minor features that do not detract from the spaciousness of the pavement in this area.
85. Similarly, further away from the appeal site, the presence of a highway sign and a street light with an attached advertisement and two glazed BT phone kiosks do not detract to any significant degree from an attractive overall sense of openness and spaciousness.

86. There are no similar large digital advertisements to the proposal before me in this location. In this regard, I find that the development of the BT Street Hub, as proposed, would introduce an alien feature that would appear so incongruous as to detract from the historic qualities of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
87. The impact of this would be exacerbated as a result of the large digital advertisements proposed, the very purpose of which would be to draw attention to themselves. The digital panels would appear at a height in line with, as well as above and below the vision of passers-by, drawing the eye to the extent that they would appear as unduly dominant features.
88. Further, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub and digital advertisements would dominate an otherwise largely uncluttered area of paving, where street paraphernalia is limited and of modest proportions and appearance. Consequently, the proposal would reduce the open and spacious attributes of the pavement in this location.
89. Whilst I am mindful that, by introducing a tall BT Street Hub where none currently exists, the proposed development would reduce the spaciousness of the pavement, I consider that the pavement is wide and largely uncluttered in this specific location and that the proposal would not result in any harm to public safety, with regards to highway and pedestrian safety.
90. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. This would be contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies D1, D2 and D4 which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.
91. The harm arising would be localised and in respect of the significance of the heritage asset, would be less than substantial. Public benefits may arise from the proposal in terms of access to free WiFi and related information. However, in this case, the public benefits identified do not amount to something that outweighs the harm identified.
92. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity, having regard to the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
93. Appeals E and F are dismissed.

Appeals G and H

94. The appeal site is located towards the edge of the pavement along Tottenham Court Road outside a fast food outlet and nearby to the entrance to Gode Street Underground Station. Tottenham Court Road in this location is a busy thoroughfare and a commercial centre. The site is within a mixed use commercial area largely comprising buildings of three to six storeys in height with retail and café/fast food uses at ground floor level and offices above.
95. The appeal site is located within the Charlotte Street Conservation Area, characterised by the presence of architecturally impressive period properties

complete with ornate detailing and presenting a strong sense of the area's significant heritage.

96. The appeal site is also located directly opposite to and within the setting of, 200-208 Tottenham Court Road, a Grade II Listed Building notable in particular for its Mannerist style with 13 bays, grooved panel pillars, full height pilasters to upper floors culminating in intricate Mannerist brackets supporting the parapet with geometrically patterned cast-iron railings and an inscribed clock on an elaborate wall bracket at first floor level.
97. During my site visit, I observed that the pavement along the same side of Tottenham Court Road as the appeal site appears relatively open and spacious due to the minimal presence of street furniture – being limited to an information sign of modest proportions, a telecoms box and a lamppost with an attached advertisement.
98. Directly opposite the appeal site, on the other side of Tottenham Court Road, whilst I observed there to be more street furniture, including a bus shelter and four phone kiosks, I noted that the glazed appearance of these features helped to maintain the area's strong sense of openness and spaciousness.
99. I also noted during my site visit that, in the vicinity of the appeal site, there are no large digital advertisements similar to the proposal before me. Taking this and all of the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub, with its large dimensions and impactful appearance, together with the proposed digital advertisement screens, designed to draw attention to themselves, would appear incongruous. The harmful impact of this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed Street Hub and advertisements being situated in a prominent location close to the pavement edge, away from any other such tall and attention-drawing feature.
100. Further, the proposed BT Street Hub and the proposed advertisements, in drawing undue attention by way of incongruousness, would detract from the setting of No 200-208 Tottenham Court Road. In replacing an empty area of pavement with a large and imposing structure, the proposal would also detract from the spacious qualities of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and the prominent digital screens would, I find, be detrimental to the appreciation of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area's identified attributes.
101. During my site visit, I noted that, as well as being situated very close to the entrance to Goodge Street Underground Station, the appeal site is in very close proximity to a pedestrian crossing. I find that the introduction of a large BT Street Hub with digital screens close to the pavement edge would likely draw the eye of road users as they make their way along Tottenham Court Road. This would occur very close to a pedestrian crossing within the vicinity of an entrance to an Underground Station and I find that this runs the risk of distracting both driver and pedestrian attention, resulting in a potential danger to highway users and pedestrians within an especially busy location where people are looking to cross a busy road.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

102. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the character and appearance of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and that it would harm the setting of 200-208 Tottenham Court Road, a Grade II Listed Building. This would be contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies D1, D2 and D4, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character. The proposed BT Street Hub would also harm highway safety, contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies A1, D4 and T1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect highway safety.
103. The harm arising would be localised and in respect of the significance of the heritage assets as a whole, would be less than substantial. Whilst public benefits may arise from the proposal in terms of access to free WiFi and related information, I find that, in this case, the public benefits identified do not amount to something that outweighs the significant harm identified.
104. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity, having regard to the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and 200-208 Tottenham Court Road, a Grade II Listed Building; and would harm public safety, having regard to pedestrian and highway safety.
105. Taking the above into account, Appeals G and H are dismissed.

Appeals I and J

106. The appeal site is located towards the edge of the pavement within a busy mixed use area along Tottenham Court Road. It is situated in front of a modern six-storey commercial building, with a bank to the ground floor.
107. The appeal site is located directly across Tottenham Court Road from and is within the setting of, the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, which is notable for the presence of significant, architecturally attractive period properties set within spacious streets. Indeed, during my site visit, I observed the opposite side of Tottenham Court Road to the appeal site to be notable for its row of architecturally impressive period commercial buildings set back from a wide, open and uncluttered pavement - providing a sense of spaciousness which allows for the appreciation of the rich architectural qualities of the buildings rising above.
108. Also during my site visit, I noted that the appeal site is situated within an open area of pavement between two impressive street trees, which themselves form part of a longer row of street trees spaced along the pavement on the same side of the road as the appeal site.
109. The street trees provide for an attractive sense of greenery within a densely developed area of central London. The appearance of the two street trees is further enhanced by the absence of any street furniture or clutter between them and only a small scale street furniture, such as cycle racks, within their immediate vicinity. This provides for a significant and welcome sense of spaciousness and makes a positive contribution to the setting of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

110. I find that the introduction of the proposed BT Street Hub and proposed digital advertisements into the area between the two street trees would have a significant impact on this notably spacious area. The scale and form of the BT Street Hub and digital screens would result in the development appearing unduly imposing and would diminish the area's existing sense of greenery and spaciousness.
111. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposal's location on a prominent site close to the pavement's edge, whereby the development would draw attention to itself as an unduly dominant feature.
112. The proposal would result in a currently green and spacious part of Tottenham Court Road becoming cluttered and appearing unduly dominated by an attention-grabbing feature and I find that this would detract from the identified qualities of the setting of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
113. Whilst I am mindful that, by introducing a tall BT Street Hub where none currently exists, the proposed development would reduce the spaciousness of the pavement in this location, I consider that the pavement is wide and largely uncluttered in this specific location and that the proposal would not result in any harm to public safety, with regards to highway and pedestrian safety.
114. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the setting of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. This would be contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies D1, D2 and D4 which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.
115. The harm arising would be localised and in respect of the significance of the heritage asset, would be less than substantial. Public benefits may arise from the proposal in terms of access to free WiFi and related information. However, in this case, the public benefits identified do not amount to something that outweighs the harm identified.
116. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity, having regard to the setting of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
117. Appeals I and J are dismissed.

Appeals K and L

118. The appeal site is located towards the edge of the pavement along Tottenham Court Road outside a bank and very close to the traffic-light operated junction with University Street, where there is a pedestrian crossing.
119. Tottenham Court Road in this location is a busy thoroughfare and a commercial centre, notable for the presence of tall buildings and a broad mix of uses.
120. The appeal site is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, characterised in this area by the presence of a wide range of architecturally impressive properties, affording a strong sense of the area's significant

commercial and mixed use heritage. Buildings are set back behind a wide pavement which, around the appeal site, is notable for its spaciousness and for the absence of any imposing street furniture.

121. During my site visit, whilst I observed there to be a small waste-bin, a thin lamppost, a highway sign and traffic lights, I noted that these comprise minimal additions to what is otherwise a particularly clutter-free area of paving. This affords the area a notably clear and spacious sense of openness, providing for breathing space along this busy street and in particular, providing for the appreciation of the grandeur of the street, with its wide open pavement and impressive buildings.
122. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub, with its large dimensions and impactful appearance, together with the proposed digital advertisement screens, designed to draw attention to themselves, would appear as an incongruous development, out of keeping with the uncluttered, open and spacious attributes of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
123. Further, I consider that the harmful impact of this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed BT Street Hub and its digital advertisements being situated in a prominent location close to the pavement edge, away from any other similar feature, such that its incongruity and its attention-drawing characteristics would appear unduly dominant.
124. As noted above, the appeal site is located very close to a junction and a pedestrian crossing. I find that the introduction of a large BT Street Hub with digital screens close to the pavement edge would be likely to draw the eye of highway users as they make their way along Tottenham Court Road. This would occur very close to a pedestrian crossing along a busy street. As well as introducing a visual barrier close to a busy junction and crossing point, the proposed development would therefore run the risk of distracting both driver and pedestrian attention, resulting in a potential danger to highway users and pedestrians within a location where people are looking to cross a busy road.
125. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. This would be contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies D1, D2 and D4, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character. The proposed BT Street Hub would also harm highway safety, contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies A1, D4 and T1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect highway safety.
126. The harm arising would be localised and in respect of the significance of the heritage asset, would be less than substantial. Whilst public benefits may arise from the proposal in terms of access to free WiFi and related information, I find that, in this case, the public benefits identified do not amount to something that outweighs the significant harm identified.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

127. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity, having regard to the Bloomsbury Conservation Area; and would harm public safety, having regard to pedestrian and highway safety.

128. Taking the above into account, Appeals K and L are dismissed.

Appeals M and N

129. The appeal site is located towards the edge of the pavement along Tottenham Court Road outside a bank and close to the traffic-light operated junction with Grafton Way, where there is a pedestrian crossing.

130. Tottenham Court Road in this location is a very busy thoroughfare and a commercial centre, characterised by the presence of tall buildings and a broad mix of uses.

131. The appeal site is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, which is characterised by the presence of a wide range of architecturally impressive period properties which afford a strong sense of the area's significant commercial and mixed use heritage.

132. Buildings are set back behind a wide pavement. Around the appeal site, the pavement is notable for its spaciousness and for the absence of any significant street furniture. This presents a clutter-free area of paving and affords a significant sense of spaciousness – providing for breathing space within a very busy location and allowing for the appreciation of the grandeur of the wide pavement and impressive buildings of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area along this part of Tottenham Court Road.

133. The proposed development, comprising a BT Street Hub, with its large dimensions and impactful appearance, together with proposed digital advertisement screens, designed to draw attention to themselves, would appear as an alien feature, out of keeping with the clean, uncluttered and spacious qualities identified above.

134. The harm arising from the proposed development would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed BT Street Hub and its digital advertisements being situated in a prominent location close to the pavement edge, away from any other such tall feature, such that the proposal's incongruous appearance and attention-drawing features would unduly dominate its setting.

135. As above, the appeal site is located close to a junction and pedestrian crossing. I consider that the introduction of a large BT Street Hub with digital screens close to the pavement edge would draw the eye of road users as they make their way along Tottenham Court Road. This would occur very close to a pedestrian crossing along a busy street, introducing a visual barrier close to a busy junction and a crossing point and would run the risk of distracting both driver and pedestrian attention in a location where people are looking to cross a busy road.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

136. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would result in a potential danger to highway users and pedestrians within in a particularly busy location.
137. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. This would be contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies D1, D2 and D4, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character. The proposed BT Street Hub would also harm highway safety, contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies A1, D4 and T1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect highway safety.
138. The harm arising would be localised and in respect of the significance of the heritage asset, would be less than substantial. Whilst public benefits may arise from the proposal in terms of access to free WiFi and related information, I find that, in this case, the public benefits identified do not amount to something that outweighs the significant harm identified.
139. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity, having regard to the Bloomsbury Conservation Area; and would harm public safety, having regard to pedestrian and highway safety.
140. Appeals M and N are dismissed.

Appeals O and P

141. The appeal site is located towards the edge of the pavement along Tottenham Court Road. Tottenham Court Road in this location is an extremely busy thoroughfare and commercial centre.
142. The appeal site is very close to a pharmacy and fast-food restaurant, a pedestrian crossing and Tottenham Court Road's junction with Warren Street. The site is also close to the entrance to Warren Street Underground Station and is directly opposite a large hospital.
143. The appeal site is located within the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area, characterised in this area by the presence of tall, grand 19th Century brick-built properties, affording a strong sense of the area's significant status and heritage.
144. The appeal site is set within a wide pavement in front of a tall red-brick building with impressive stone fenestration and ornamentation.
145. During my site visit, I observed that, despite its width, the pavement in the area around the appeal site appears somewhat cluttered. Whilst the presence of a large highway sign, an information sign, telecoms boxes, phone kiosks and the pedestrian crossing together amounts to a modest array of street furniture spread out over a relatively wide area and does not include any major obstruction, I find that the extremely busy nature of the pavement in this location still results in a cluttered effect.

146. In this regard, I noted during my site visit that pedestrians frequently appear to leave the pavement in order to avoid other pedestrians and/or street furniture and that this results in examples of pedestrians stepping out into the highway with some frequency.
147. Whilst the proposed development would see the removal of two phone kiosks, these are located directly between two telecoms boxes and consequently, there would only be minimal benefit in respect of the removal of clutter and little or no benefit in respect of the removal of obstacles to pedestrian movement.
148. The proposed BT Street Hub would be taller and more imposing than and would lack the transparent qualities of, the phone kiosks. Further, it would be located within one of the very few stretches of street furniture-free areas along this stretch of pavement. Resultantly, I find that the proposal would add to, rather than detract from, the cluttered appearance of the street in this location and that this would be to the detriment of the appearance of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area.
149. In addition, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub, with its large dimensions and impactful appearance, together with the proposed digital advertisement screens, designed to draw attention to themselves, would appear as an incongruous development, out of keeping with this part of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area, where there is no other such similarly dominant free-standing feature.
150. The harmful impact of this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed BT Street Hub and its digital advertisements being situated in a prominent location close to the pavement edge, away from any other tall digital advertisements, thus emphasising the proposal's incongruous appearance.
151. As identified above, the appeal site is located very close to a pedestrian crossing. I find that the introduction of a large BT Street Hub with digital screens close to the pavement edge would be likely to draw the eye of highway users as they make their way along Tottenham Court Road, very close to the pedestrian crossing. Resultantly, I find that as well as introducing a visual barrier close to a busy junction and crossing point, the proposed development would run the risk of distracting both driver and pedestrian attention, resulting in a potential danger to highway users and to pedestrians within an extremely busy location where people are looking to cross a busy road.
152. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the character and appearance of the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area. This would be contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies D1, D2 and D4, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character. The proposed BT Street Hub would also harm highway safety, contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies A1, D4 and T1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect highway safety.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

153. The harm arising would be localised and in respect of the significance of the heritage asset, would be less than substantial. Whilst public benefits may arise from the proposal in terms of access to free WiFi and related information, I find that, in this case, the public benefits identified do not amount to something that outweighs the significant harm identified.

154. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity, having regard to the Bloomsbury Conservation Area; and would harm public safety, having regard to pedestrian and highway safety.

155. Taking the above into account, Appeals O and P are dismissed.

Appeals Q and R

156. The appeal site is located close to the entrance to Warren Street Station in a prominent location adjacent to Tottenham Court Road's junction with Euston Road.

157. The area around the appeal site is mixed use and is characterised by the presence of tall commercial buildings around expansive areas of largely uncluttered paving, providing for major pedestrian movements across Euston Road and along Tottenham Court Road and Euston Road.

158. These expansive areas of pavement afford a significant sense of spaciousness. The area around the appeal site is also enhanced by the presence of street trees, which provide an attractive and welcome sense of greenery.

159. During my site visit, I observed that street furniture in the area appears to be kept to a minimum. As such, whilst there are electricity and telecoms boxes, an information sign and lampposts, none of these features either individually or cumulatively, dominate the street scene, or result in a cluttered effect that detracts from the area's identified qualities.

160. Whilst the proposed development would involve the removal of a phone kiosk, this is situated some distance away from the appeal site and appears neither intrusive nor prominent.

161. The proposed BT Street Hub would introduce a form of development unlike any other in this location. As such, it would appear as an incongruous and alien feature. The harmful impact of this would be exacerbated as a result of the imposing height, prominent location and attention-drawing nature of the proposed BT Street Hub and its digital advertisements.

162. Further to the above, I find that the proposed development would combine with an existing electric box, close to the appeal site, to result in the creation of an unduly cluttered effect, out of keeping with an otherwise uncluttered expanse of pavement. In addition to this, I consider that the proposal would draw attention to its alien form, which would appear in contrast to and detract from, the attractive greenery of the street trees along Euston Road in this location.

Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/22/3297263; APP/X5210/W/22/3297264;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297265; APP/X5210/W/22/3297266; APP/X5210/W/22/3297333;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297334; APP/X5210/W/22/3297336; APP/X5210/W/22/3297337;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297772; APP/X5210/W/22/3297773; APP/X5210/W/22/3297774;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297775; APP/X5210/W/22/3297776; APP/X5210/W/22/3297777;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297779; APP/X5210/W/22/3297780; APP/X5210/W/22/3297782;
APP/X5210/W/22/3297783.

163. As noted above, the pavement is wide in the vicinity of the appeal site. The appeal site is also set well back from the road and taking these factors into account, I consider that the proposal would not result in any harm to highway safety.

164. Taking everything into account, I find that the proposed BT Street Hub would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the NPPF and to Local Plan Policies D1, D2 and D4, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character. The proposed advertisements would harm visual amenity.

165. For the reasons given above, Appeals Q and R are dismissed.

Conclusions

166. I conclude that, for the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, Appeals A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q and R should fail.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR