DPV Consult

Urban Innovation Company

Planning and Heritage Statement

Installation of Pulse Smart Hub with integrated digital screens and emergency functionality including provision of defibrillators.

- Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road, London, NW1 8AR
- Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street, London WC1B 4AR
- Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road, London EC1R 5DB
- Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road, London EC1R 5AR
- Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road, London, NW1 8AG
- Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road), London, NW6 2LJ

24 July 2024

Prepared by:

DPV Consult Limited
20 Clyde Road
London N22 7AE
www.dpvconsult.co.uk

DPV ref: DP/20075

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Planning Permission and Advertisement Consent is sought for the installation and operation of Pulse Smart Hubs ("Pulse Smart Hub") at the following locations:

    - Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road
    - Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street
    - Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road
    - Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road
    - Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road
    - Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)

2. The principle of the proposed hubs is established under the provisions of section 106 of the Electronic Communications Code and para. 17 of Schedule 18 of the Telecommunications Act 2023 given the development is proposed by UIC a telecommunications code system operator and has permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

3. The need to plan for greater investment in world-class digital infrastructure is critical to the continued social, economic and environmental success of this country and this has been brought into sharper focus by the recent Covid-19 pandemic.

    "This is why delivering world-class digital infrastructure to all Britons is a fundamental mission of this government - and our efforts to build it the modern equivalent in scale and ambition to the Victorians' construction of the railways. Our plan is for every corner of our country to get lightning fast connectivity, not only to give people real choices about where to live and work today but so they will not be left out of future technological revolutions because of poor infrastructure"

    - Julia Lopez MP, Minister of State for DSIT UK Wireless Infrastructure Strategy (Published 11 April 2023).

4. This is fully reflected in the digital strategies published by the Greater London Authority (GLA), recognising that investing in mobile technology will establish the City and more widely London as a digital place and destination for investment, jobs and new housing and business infrastructure.

5. Currently communication through our towns and cities is erratic, inconsistent and unreliable. This impacts not only the individual but also the wider community.

6. The Pulse Smart Hub, has been designed, developed and engineered by Urban Innovation Company (UIC), a code operator licensed under the Electronics Communications Code, to provide improved connectivity with access to information and services directed towards the specific needs of the local community, real-time data and direct access to emergency lifesaving equipment including a public access defibrillator. UIC was previously called Europayphone with responsibility for delivering and operating traditional telephone kiosks across Northern Ireland.

7. UIC is the only community-first smart street furniture provider in the UK, that delivers communication, connectivity, and lifesaving equipment specifically tailored to the local areas we serve. Unlike the big corporations, its small team dedicates itself to working closely with the public, third-sector stakeholders, and partners to ensure each network maximises the benefits it provides to address the needs of the community, both now, and in the future.

8. Pulse Smart Hubs are free-standing structures featuring a fully accessible interactive tablet along with larger digital display screens on two sides. Pulse Smart Hubs are free to councils, the public and taxpayer. UIC pays for the installation, operation and ongoing maintenance of the Hubs through paid-for advertising on the main screens.

9. The touchscreen provides the capability of free access to:

- Built-in Public Access Defibrillator.
- Built-in Nasal Naloxone opioid antagonist (a drug used under controlled conditions for the emergency treatment of a drug overdose)
- Emergency Safety button to support anyone who is vulnerable.
- 999 emergency service button.
- Free phone calls with a built-in speaker and receiver.
- Free Wi-Fi.
- Digital wayfinding / mapping.
- Wireless mobile phone charging.
- Hyper-local information on what's on, council services and helplines.

10. The design of the Pulse Smart Hubs has been developed over time and is a high quality, multifunctional piece of street furniture which maximises the services available to the public within a footprint smaller than a traditional public call box. The Internet of Things (IoT) technology and provision of open-source data provides endless potential applications that will see the use of the Hub evolve. The two proposed digital displays form part of the offer to local stakeholders and will be made available for a wide range of public uses. They are a key element of the proposal as they will support the advertising required to make the scheme viable without any capital or revenue costs to the Council or the public.

11. Furthermore, a minimum of 5% of total screen time on the main two digital screens is given over for free to local organisations, businesses and the community to use daily. In Belfast the screens have been used by Police Service Northern Ireland, Belfast City Council, City Centre Management, charities and tourism boards amongst others. Across a typical 18-hour window of screentime, 5% is equivalent to 650 free messaging spots per hub for the community to benefit from free of charge. UIC and its advertising partners also support creative formatting to help the local community make best use of the screens.

12. In comparison to other street furniture:

- The Pulse Smart Hub has a 66% smaller footprint than a standard kiosk design and is significantly smaller in width yet provides a multitude of additional services.
- The scale and footprint of the Pulse Smart Hub is the minimum required to accommodate the telecommunications and smart city equipment.
- The design sits comfortably within the streetscape, with either a modern or historic backdrop. For example, in Belfast, a Pulse Smart Hub is located directly next to the famous Grade B1 listed Old Town Hall.

13. In essence the Pulse Smart Hubs are redefining the role of the quintessentially and now largely redundant British payphone or telephone kiosk network to bridge the digital divide to make people better connected and feel safer in their community.

14. The first Pulse Smart Hub network was implemented in Belfast in 2019. Over the course of the last 5 years UIC has developed close partnerships, protocols and memorandums of understanding with the Belfast community including the police, public health including ambulance services, tourism boards, councils, City Centre management and charities to provide free daily support to the functioning of these organisations. Through these relationships UIC has been able to refine the functionality of the Pulse Smart Hubs to continually bring more benefits to the communities UIC serve.

15. Now the concept has been proven, fully established and the prototypes developed, UIC is bringing forward a network of Pulse Smart Hubs across towns and cities more widely across the UK.

16. Strategically positioned, the intention is for the Pulse Smart Hubs to create a telecommunications and services network, enhancing modern digital infrastructure, whilst improving public safety on the streets, with access to emergency services and lifesaving equipment.

17. A rigorous site selection process of the proposed locations was undertaken to ensure that collectively the Pulse Smart Hubs will deliver a comprehensive network of connectivity within the Borough whilst at the same time selecting locations that:

    - Avoid unacceptable harm to public amenity.
    - Avoid harm to the significance of streetscape and heritage assets or their settings.
    - Will not compromise safety and security or obscure highway sightlines and allow free movement along the public highway by all users, including people with disabilities, especially the visually impaired.
    - Will not adversely impact on trees on or near the proposed site, especially those protected by Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) or within conservation areas.
    - Are aligned, where possible, to areas of established “street furniture zones”, i.e. typically the section of pavement comprising amenities and elements such as pay phones, lighting and benches, bus stops and trees for the safety, comfort and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists.

18. It is submitted that very substantial weight should be afforded to the very significant benefits the strategically placed Pulse Smart Hubs will deliver in line with digital strategies and key policy objectives set out at national level, and at the regional – through the Greater London Authority and the London Plan - and through the Borough at the local level.

19. Furthermore, the proposed Pulse Smart Hub locations will not have a detrimental impact on:

    - Public amenity
    - Highway safety
    - Streetscape and heritage assets
    - Trees

20. The Council is respectfully asked to grant Planning Permission and Advertisement Consent for these applications.

Further Information

21. An introductory video introducing the Pulse Smart Hub and its many benefits as well as seeing further information about the Company including its work in Belfast can be accessed by clicking on:

    Home | Pulse Smart Hub

1. Introduction

1.1. These applications by Urban Innovation Company ("UIC") ("The Applicant"), a code operator licensed under the Electronics Communications Code, support proposals at locations for the installation of the Pulse Smart Hubs, a multifunctional telecommunication apparatus, under The Town and Country Planning Act (1990) (as amended) and for the subsequent display of illuminated content under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations).

1.2. Each proposal is considered on its own individual merits, seeking Planning Permission and Advertisement Consent as follows:

> ***"Proposal A: Planning permission for the installation of a Pulse Smart Hub with integrated digital screens and emergency functionality including provision of defibrillators.***

and:

> ***"Proposal B: Express consent for the installation of a digital display screen to the communication Hub to show illuminated content"***.

1.3. To avoid duplication this Planning Statement addresses the Planning and Advertisement Consent applications for the proposals having regard to the independent requirements of both the Town and Country Planning Act and the Advertisement Regulations. This Statement addresses matters of planning policy and benefits, questions of weight and concludes with an assessment of the appropriate planning balance as to whether the proposals are acceptable.

1.4. The Applicant's Design, Management and Operational Statement (DMOS) also accompanying this submission explains the evolution of the Pulse Smart Hub, the design and software detailing, the operation and day-to-day management of the Pulse Smart Hub once it is installed, along with case studies. The document also includes relevant technical appendices to support the planning applications.

1.5. The locations and proposals are described as follows:

- ***Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road***
  - Location 1: Proposal A Planning Permission
  - Location 1: Proposal B Advertisement Consent
- ***Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street***
  - Location 2: Proposal A Planning Permission
  - Location 2: Proposal B Advertisement Consent

- ***Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road***
  - Location 3: Proposal A Planning Permission
  - Location 3: Proposal B Advertisement Consent
- ***Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road***
  - Location 4: Proposal A Planning Permission
  - Location 4: Proposal B Advertisement Consent
- ***Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road***
  - Location 5: Proposal A Planning Permission
  - Location 5: Proposal B Advertisement Consent
- ***Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)***
  - Location 6: Proposal A Planning Permission
  - Location 6: Proposal B Advertisement Consent

Pulse Smart Hubs

1.6. Pulse Smart Hubs, designed, developed and engineered by UIC are designed to provide improved connectivity with access to information and services directed towards the specific needs of the local community, real-time data and direct access to emergency lifesaving equipment including a public access defibrillator.

1.7. They are free-standing structures featuring a fully accessible interactive tablet along with larger digital display screens on two sides.

1.8. The touchscreen provides the capability of free access to:

- Built-in Public Access Defibrillator.
- Built-in Nasal Naloxone opioid antagonist (a drug used under controlled conditions for the emergency treatment of a drug overdose)
- Emergency Safety button to support anyone who is vulnerable.
- 999 emergency service button.
- Free phone calls with a built-in speaker and receiver.
- Digital wayfinding / mapping.
- Wireless mobile phone charging.
- Hyper-local information on what's on, council services and helplines.

1.9. In essence the Pulse Smart Hubs are redefining the role of the quintessentially British payphone or telephone kiosk to bridge the digital divide to make people better connected and feel safe across their community.

1.10. The first Pulse Smart Hub network was implemented in Belfast in 2019. Now the concept has been proven, fully established and the prototypes developed, UIC is bringing forward a network of Pulse Smart Hubs across towns and cities more widely across the UK.

1.11. The intention is for the Pulse Smart Hubs to be installed and fully operational by the end of this year.

Main Issues

1.12. This Planning Statement addresses matters of planning policy and relevant development management considerations, concluding with an assessment of the appropriate planning balance as to:

- The principle of development and the public benefits.
- The effect on public amenity.
- The effect on streetscape and heritage assets or their settings.
- The effect on highway safety and security including impacts on highway sightlines and the free movement along the public highway by all users, including people with disabilities, especially the visually impaired.
- The effect on trees on or near the proposed site, especially those protected by Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) or within conservation areas
- If any harm is identified at any of the proposed locations whether that harm would be outweighed by public benefits.

1.13. This proposal is also informed by a full suite of plans, drawings and technical supporting information which this Planning Statement relies on in the application of the overall planning balance (**Appendix A**).

1.14. The DMOS, referred to above, is subdivided into 4 chapters. Chapter 1: 'Designed to serve the community" firstly explains the problems faced by individuals and community organisations including the police and other emergency services, paramedics, town centre management, tourism and charities where communication through our towns and cities is erratic inconsistent and unreliable. This impacts not only the individual but also the wider community in an age when reliable connection is as important as it has ever been, and that modern life requires people to stay connected.

1.15. Secondly, it describes how a network of Pulse Smart Hubs can bridge the digital divide to make people better connected and feel safe in their community by delivering a community-first network of smart street furniture with life-saving equipment in towns and cities across the UK. Finally, with reference to the Applicant's success in developing a network of Pulse Smart Hubs in Belfast the chapter provides a "live" case study example of how the Pulse Smart Hub uses smart technology to successfully connect with local communities.

1.16. Chapter 2: ‘The Pulse Smart Hub experience’ describes the smart hub experience with reference to:

- Key principles.
- The user experience.
- Design and functionality.
- Location and accessibility.
- Installation.
- Ongoing maintenance and management.
- Addressing antisocial behaviour.

1.17. Chapter 3: ‘The business and how we operate’ describes who the Applicant is, who founded Pulse, how it is funded and its core values and its commitment to community engagement.

1.18. The Technical Appendices found at the back of the DMOS provides technical guidance on the Hub’s power supply, internal central processing unit (CPU) operating temperatures, outdoor operating conditions, and finally on noise and lighting levels.

Report Structure

1.19. The remainder of this Planning Statement is broken down into the following sections:

- Section 2: ‘Site Context’: describes the site and surroundings of each of the proposed Pulse Smart Hub locations and references any relevant planning history.
- Section 3: ‘The Proposals’: summarises the proposals cross referencing directly with Chapter 2 of the DMOS.
- Section 4: ‘Planning Policy’: summaries the pertinent digital strategies, planning policies and legislative framework.
- Section 5: ‘Heritage Statement’: this section addresses the historic context and the significance of these heritage assets within the context of the proposals (where relevant) and assesses the impact of the proposed installation on these assets.
- Section 6: ‘Justification for the Proposals’: addresses the key issues in respect of the determination of the proposals having regard to national planning policy, the development plan and other material.
- Finally, Section 7: ‘Conclusions’: concludes with a summary as to why the proposals are acceptable within the context of planning policy and other material considerations.

2. Site Context

Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road

2.1. The application site is depicted on the Site Location Plan and Existing Site Photographs and would be sited on a part of the pavement on the northern side of Chalk Farm Road.

2.2. Details of a previous Prior Approval proposal for the installation of a telephone kiosk at the same location and granted on appeal in 2018 are set out in the Planning History section (see below). This includes the Inspector's evaluation of the proposals in the context of the site and surroundings. It is submitted that the physical environment has not materially changed since the 2018 decision.

Site Designations

2.3. It is located close to the Regents Canal Conservation Area and Roundhouse Theatre, which has been identified as a Grade II* listed building. The installation process will not require any substantive below ground excavation and as such the proposals will not have a deleterious impact under the street. The remaining designations are characteristic of the site's location within a central, commercial location where street furniture and advertisement content are widely seen.

Planning History

2.4. Prior approval was granted at the same location as the current proposals on the 23 July 2018 (APP/X5210/W/17/3180682)) following the council's decision to refuse planning permission for the installation of a public telephone box. A copy of this appeal decision is attached at **Appendix Bi**.

2.5. The phone box has not been installed, because it is massively outdated technology and no longer serves the original purpose for the community, and the Prior Approval has now expired. Nevertheless, the appeal decision is highly pertinent for the reasons explained below.

2.6. The Inspector's reasons for allowing the appeal are set out in paras. 7 to 19 of the Appeal Decision as follows:

> ***"Main Issue***
>
> ***7. The main issue is whether or not approval should be given in respect of the siting and appearance of the development, having regard to the character and appearance of the area, the setting of nearby heritage assets and the effect upon highway and pedestrian safety.***

Reasons

8. The proposed free standing telephone kiosk would have a broadly rectangular form with dimensions of 1.32m by 1.11m and a height of 2.45m. The telephone kiosk would be constructed with a powder coated metal frame and laminated glass. It would have an open side to allow wheelchair access and solar panels would be included at roof level.

9. The application site forms part of the pavement on the northern side of Chalk Farm Road. It is located close to the Regents Canal Conservation Area and Roundhouse Theatre, which has been identified as a Grade II* listed building.

10. The immediate area where the kiosk is proposed, is clear from other street furniture, but the proposal would be seen in the context of nearby cycle stands, bins and lampposts. It would however be sufficiently separate from other street furniture to not give rise to a cluttered appearance, albeit its larger scale to these other items and being somewhat larger than a standard telephone kiosk.

11. I recognise that the proposal would have a metal frame and large elements of glazing, but on the northern side of Chalk Farm Road, in the immediate surroundings to the appeal site, is a modern mixed-use building. The kiosk's modern and functional appearance would not appear as a substantial physical obstacle in this context. Although in my view, the appeal site does form part of the setting of the Conservation Area and listed building, the effect on their setting is lessened by the presence of, and the separation with the road. I

recognise the limited height and the transient nature of traffic, and also note the reference the Council makes to the surrounding fascia signs being flush to the building's façade. However, I was able to see the Grade II* listed Roundhouse Theatre on my site visit, and from my observations, the proposal would not be prominent in long views of the listed building. I do not therefore consider that the proposed kiosk would be unduly harmful to the setting of the listed building or the nearby Conservation Area. It siting and appearance would also not detract from the character and appearance of the area.

12. Concern has been raised in relation to the siting of the kiosk adjacent to an existing telephone box giving rise to safety issues, but I was not able to see any such existing telephone box that the Council make reference to on my site visit. The proposed kiosk, which would be largely glazed, would not unacceptably reduce sight lines (including of CCTV) or casual surveillance, as has been stated. I do not therefore consider that the siting and appearance of the kiosk would be harmful in terms of crime and anti-social behaviour.

13. The Council have identified concerns in relation to the wheelchair accessibility of the proposal. They state that the appellant has referenced an older version of the British Standards, and that the kiosk would fail to comply with the current British Standard (BS) 8300, which includes guidance on payphones outside of buildings. I have not been provided with the full details of BS8300 but it has been stated that the proposed telephone controls would not be within the correct height range from the floor (0.75m-1m). Whilst this may be the case, I consider that the height of the telephone controls at 1.5m, would still be within the reach of a wheelchair user. Furthermore, it is not disputed that that the open design of the kiosk would allow for wheelchair access. As such, overall, despite the shortcomings identified, I consider that the siting and appearance of the proposal would not be unduly harmful in this respect.

14. The proposed kiosk would result in the loss of 1.8m of footway, but the Council have not set out how the clear footway would be reduced below the minimum threshold. The footway is according to the Council, around 5.3m wide, discounting the area used for parking. Following the proposal, there would remain around 3.5m. Taking into account the higher pedestrian flows that the Council refer to, the Council's Streetscape Design Manual sets out a minimum of 3m (in busy pedestrian streets), with the Transport for London's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance For London, setting out a 5.3m overall footway width (in high flow locations). I was able to visit the appeal site in the lunchtime busy period referred to by the Council, and was able to see some pedestrian movements where the appeal site is located. However, due to the presence of other street furniture and trees, which the proposal would broadly align with, most pedestrians used those sections of the footway closer to the adjacent buildings. Whilst there may not have been a Pedestrian Comfort Level Assessment undertaken, and it may be the case that pedestrian volumes increase in the future, I consider the footway would remain sufficiently wide to not impede pedestrian movements.

15. The appeal site would be adjacent to parking bays that are partly sited on the footway. The proposal would have dimensions that are greater than other street furniture, but from the information available before me, there would be sufficient room to not impede people getting in and out of their vehicles. The longer parking bays also allow for the appropriate parking of vehicles. There is also no substantive evidence before me that the proposed kiosk would interfere with any signals, cause a visual obstruction or unduly affect visibility splays.

16. The Council have made reference to the proposed Chalk Farm and Primrose Hill scheme which are intended to create a high quality place and improve

pedestrian comfort. They also refer to an option to create a cycle track. I have not been provided with any details of these schemes or their current status. Given the width of the pavement, I have no reason to consider that the siting of the proposal would be unacceptable in this regard.

17. Reference has been made to appeal decisions on other sites but I am not aware of the full circumstances and I can confirm that I have considered this appeal on its own merits.

18. Concerns have been expressed regarding the proposed kiosk being used for advertisements. The construction of a kiosk and the display of advertisements are distinct and separate matters requiring different applications. The appeal relates to the construction of a telephone kiosk only and not any advertisement consent that may otherwise be required. I have determined the appeal on that basis and, therefore, the matter of advertisements has not influenced this decision.

19. I, therefore, conclude that the proposed kiosk with respect to its siting and appearance would not harm the character and appearance of the area or highway and pedestrian safety, which justifies the grant of prior approval."

2.7. It is within this context that the siting of the Pulse Smart Hub should be allowed given the Inspector's conclusions that the siting of a bulkier telephone kiosk at the same location would not:

- Harm the character and appearance of the area including the Reents Canal Conservation Area or the Grade II* listed Roundhouse Theatre
- Unacceptably add to the clutter of street furniture and signage.
- Impede pedestrian flows or necessitate the use of the road as an alternative.
- Cause an undue obstruction on the public highway and would not compromise the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.

Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street

2.8. The application site is depicted on the Site Location Plan and Existing Site Photographs and would be located within a wide footway that is outside The Holborn Hotel which, itself, is within a commercial area.

2.9. Details of a previous Prior Approval proposal for the installation of a telephone kiosk at the same location and granted on appeal in 2018 are set out in the Planning History section (see below). This includes the Inspector's evaluation of the proposals in the context of the site and

surroundings. It is submitted that the physical environment has not materially changed since the 2018 decision.

Site Designations

2.10. The site is adjacent to the Kingsway Conservation Area and there are Listed Buildings around the junction, including St Martins College of Arts and Design, Victoria House, the Kingsway Tram Subway and Avenue Chambers. The installation process will not require any substantive below ground excavation and as such the proposals will not have a deleterious impact under the street. The remaining designations are characteristic of the site's location within a central, commercial location where street furniture and advertisement content are widely seen.

Planning History

2.11. Prior approval was granted at the same location as the current proposals on the 6 August 2018 (APP/X5210/W/18/3195372) following the council's decision to refuse planning permission for the installation of a public telephone box. A copy of this appeal decision is attached at **Appendix Bii**.

2.12. The phone box has not been installed, because it is massively outdated technology and no longer serves the original purpose for the community, and the Prior Approval has now expired. Nevertheless, the appeal decision is highly pertinent for the reasons explained below.

2.13. The Inspector's reasons for allowing the appeal are set out in paras. paras. 8 to 26 of the Appeal Decision as follows:

> ***"Main Issues***
>
> ***8. The main issues are considered to be whether or not approval should be given in respect of the siting and appearance of the development, with particular reference to (a) the character and appearance of the locality and (b) and the convenience of highway users.***
>
> ***Reasons***
>
> ***Character and Appearance***
>
> ***9. The appeal site is located within a wide footway that is outside The Holborn Hotel which, itself, is within a commercial area. To the west is a busy traffic light controlled junction. Around the junction are numerous items of street furniture, including bins, telephone kiosks of varying designs, traffic cameras, an information pedestal and various signs.***

10. The pavement where the kiosk is proposed is wide and spacious in character and. This appeal scheme would introduce a freestanding kiosk into the streetscene adjacent to various columns, street railings and a tree. By reason of siting, the appeal site can reasonable be claimed to be within the street furniture zone along this part of the footway. No details of any tables or chairs being temporarily placed outside the hotel have been provided and none were observed during the mid-morning site visit.

11. The appeal scheme would not project into the more open character of the pavement adjacent to the hotel and, as such, it would not be a conspicuous or unduly prominent addition to the streetscene. Instead, the appearance of the proposed kiosk would be assimilated into the pattern and arrangement of existing street furniture. The appeal scheme would not, therefore, either result in an unacceptable level of street clutter or be an incongruous addition to the streetscene along this part of Theobald's Road.

12. The site is adjacent to the Kingsway Conservation Area and there are Listed Buildings around the junction, including St Martins College of Arts and Design, Victoria House, the Kingsway Tram Subway and Avenue Chambers. Special regard is to be paid to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings and their settings. The Framework also 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.

13. By reason of the separation distance between the proposed kiosk and the Listed Buildings, together with the intervening roads and junction, the appeal scheme would not adversely affect the setting of these heritage assets. Views towards the Listed Buildings across the existing collection of street furniture associated with the traffic light junction would remain when walking along the footway from east to west. The glazed nature of the proposed kiosk would assist with maintaining views. For similar reasons, the setting of the Conservation Area would be preserved.

14. Accordingly, it is concluded that the siting of the kiosk would not detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of the locality. Further, it would not conflict with LP Policies D1, D2 and T1 insofar as that they are a material consideration to this appeal for prior approval. LP Policy D1 is concerned with high quality design in development which respects local context and character and also integrates well with the surrounding streets. LP Policy T1 refers to improvements to the pedestrian environment by supporting high quality public

realm improvement works and this is echoed in the SDM, CPG and SG which seek to minimise unnecessary street clutter.

Convenience of Highway Users

15. Although the pavement as measured is not as wide as initially identified by the appellant, there would remain a clear pavement between the proposed kiosk and the adjacent hotel frontage of some 5 metres. This width would be sufficient to ensure the comfort of pedestrians along this well used pavement and, as such, it would not conflict with the guidance contained in the SG, CPG and PCG. Further, because of its siting adjacent to the columns, street railings and tree, the proposed kiosk would be related to the street furniture zone which exists along this part of Theobald's Road rather than project into the pavement.

16. No temporary chairs or tables were observed to be placed outside the hotel. However, the narrowing of the pavement caused by the combination of the erection of the proposed kiosk and any tables and chairs would be similar to the width available between the street tree and the external seating area. The street tree already interrupts pedestrians who may seek to walk adjacent to the railings. Accordingly, this current interruption to the flow of pedestrians would not be materially changed by the siting of the appeal scheme.

17. Concern has been expressed about the potential for the proposed kiosk to obstruct visibility to the right for vehicles existing Old Gloucester Street. However, because of the proposed kiosk's siting away from the edge of the carriageway, the railing and other street furniture, there would be no material reduction in the current visibility splay for highway users. Further, the number of vehicles existing Old Gloucester Street is limited to those accessing the service area of the hotel and the car park of an adjacent office building.

18. On this issue, it is concluded that the siting of the kiosk would not unacceptably harm the convenience of other highway users. Further, it would not conflict with LP Policies T1 and T6 insofar as that they are a material consideration to this appeal for prior approval. These policies seek to provide high quality footpaths and pavements that are wide enough for the number of people expected to use them and promoting fair access for all. In respect of highway safety matters, no specific conflict has been identified with LP Policies G1 and A1 which are concerned with the delivery and location of growth in Camden and protecting the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours.

Other Matters

19. The Framework deals with supporting high quality communications infrastructure, including applications for prior approval, and requires that local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds. As the principle of development is established by the GPDO, some of the considerations raised by other parties, such as need for the proposed kiosk, are not relevant matters.

20. The appellant has referred to the principle of the development being supported by the Framework which encourages the development of telecommunication infrastructure to support sustainable economic growth. Furthermore, and subject to the location of the equipment, the kiosk would be accessible to those with impaired mobility and include solar technology as a power source.

21. The Council has referred to the number of kiosks within the surrounding area, including on the opposite side of the road and within the public realm to the east. However, these other kiosks are in locations with a different character and surrounding context. Both parties have provided appeal decisions but, in the absence of their detailed planning circumstances, I cannot be certain that these other schemes are directly comparable to the proposed kiosk. This appeal has been determined based upon the planning circumstances of the proposed kiosk.

22. The general concerns of the Police and others have been carefully noted but there is no specific evidence or reason to consider that the proposed kiosk's presence would encourage or increase crime or anti-social behaviour when taking into account that the design of the kiosk is not fully enclosed. Further, no details of CCTV cameras which might be obstructed have been provided and it was observed that the view towards the appeal site of the nearest traffic camera was already affected by the street trees. I am also mindful that there is nearby street lighting and natural surveillance of the appeal site, including from near-by cafés. This is a neutral matter in the determination of this appeal.

23. Although an amended drawing has been provided by the appellant, the Council has identified that the internal layout of the proposed kiosk does not accord with the updated version of BS8300 – Design of Buildings and their approaches to meeting the needs of disabled people. However, there are no reasons for me to consider that the appellant would not fully accord the provisions of BS8300. The internal change required to the location of the equipment would not materially alter the assessment made concerning the siting

and appearance of the appeal scheme. This is a neutral matter in the determination of this appeal.

24. Concerns have been expressed regarding the prospect of outside panels of the payphone kiosk being used for advertisements. The erection of a kiosk and the display of advertisements are distinct and separate matters requiring different applications. This appeal relates to the construction of a kiosk only and not any advertisement consent that may otherwise be required. I have determined the appeal on that basis and, therefore, the matter of advertisements has not influenced my conclusion.

Conditions

25. The grant of prior approval for the payphone kiosk is subject to the standard conditions set out in the GPDO, including an implementation timescale, removal of the structure/apparatus when it is no longer required for electronic telecommunications purposes and accordance with the details submitted with the application. No further conditions are necessary to make the proposal acceptable.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval granted subject to the standard conditions set out in Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO."

2.14. It is within this context that the siting of the Pulse Smart Hub should be allowed given the Inspector's conclusions that the siting of a bulkier telephone kiosk at the same location would not:

- Harm the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the Kingsway Conservation Area and the Listed Buildings including St Martins College of Arts and Design, Victoria House, the Kingsway Tram Subway and Avenue Chambers
- Unacceptably add to the clutter of street furniture and signage.
- Impede pedestrian flows or necessitate the use of the road as an alternative.
- Cause an undue obstruction on the public highway and would not compromise the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.

Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road

2.15. The application site is depicted on the Site Location Plan and Existing Site Photographs and would be sited on the pavement on the south side of the busy Clerkenwell Road close to its

intersection with Grays Inn Road and Theobalds Road. The kiosk would be positioned close to the pavement edge in front of No 133.

2.16. Details of a previous Prior Approval proposal for the installation of a telephone kiosk at the same location and granted on appeal in 2018 are set out in the Planning History section (see below). This includes the Inspector's evaluation of the proposals in the context of the site and surroundings. It is submitted that the physical environment has not materially changed since the 2018 decision.

Site Designations

2.17. The Hatton Garden Conservation Area covers approximately 20 hectares west of Farringdon Road. The installation process will not require any substantive below ground excavation and as such the proposals will not have a deleterious impact under the street. The remaining designations are characteristic of the site's location within a central, commercial location where street furniture and advertisement content are widely seen.

Planning History

2.18. Prior approval was granted at the same location as the current proposals on the 12 September 2018 (APP/X5210/W/18/3195374) following the council's decision to refuse planning permission for the installation of a public telephone box. It was determined at the same time as 1 other appeals (appeal B) which were all dismissed. A copy of this appeal decision is attached at **Appendix Biii**.

2.19. The phone box has not been installed, because it is massively outdated technology and no longer serves the original purpose for the community, and the Prior Approval has now expired. Nevertheless, the appeal decision is highly pertinent for the reasons explained below.

2.20. The Inspector's reasons for allowing the appeal are set out in paras. 5 to 17 of the Appeal Decision as follows:

> ***"Main Issue***
>
> ***5. The main issue is whether or not approval should be given in respect of the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk, with particular regard to whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, the effect on highway and pedestrian safety, and the effect on crime and anti-social behaviour.***
>
> ***Reasons***
>
> ***6. The location of the proposed kiosk is the pavement on the south side of the busy Clerkenwell Road close to its intersection with Grays Inn Road and***

Theobalds Road. The kiosk would be positioned close to the pavement edge in front of No 133, which has a retail frontage at ground floor, with a number of street trees immediately in front of this and neighbouring shops.

7. The Hatton Garden Conservation Area covers approximately 20 hectares west of Farringdon Road. Its historic character derives largely from its industrial, commercial and residential buildings of the late nineteenth to mid twentieth centuries, combined with an intricate street pattern. The area around this part of Clerkenwell Road is characterised by large multi-storied buildings with commercial and retail uses at street level and attractive Victorian facades above this, apparently in residential and office use.

8. There is a limited amount of street furniture along either side of this stretch of Clerkenwell Road. Three cycle stands are positioned parallel to the road adjacent to the location of the proposed kiosk, with a free-standing wayfinding column just beyond the stands. There are no other telephone kiosks visible within the immediately surrounding area.

9. While the kiosk would have a larger footprint than the adjacent stands and sign, as a piece of street furniture its position and scale would also be seen in the context of existing larger lighting columns and traffic lights. Its relatively slim frame and laminated glass panels means that it would not be a bulky or otherwise obtrusive visual addition in this location; and due to the limited existing street furniture it would not result in cumulative visual clutter.

10.The positive character and appearance of this part of the conservation area derives from the original upper storeys and historic facades of the large blocks either side of the road. The limited scale and modern appearance of the kiosk would be viewed not against this background but principally against the busy commercial street level with its retail and other signage, street furniture and high levels of vehicular and pedestrian traffic. As such, it would reflect and preserve, rather than harm, the character and appearance of the area directly related to its siting.

11.Turning to the effect on highway and pedestrian safety, I acknowledge that this is a heavily-used pedestrian route as I observed during the inspection. The kiosk would be positioned in line with the adjacent cycle stands and wayfinding column but due to its size, it would protrude further onto the pavement than these existing features. The Council indicates that detailed drawings were not provided to enable a full appreciation of the effects of the kiosk's position. However, the appeal submissions do include an illustrative diagram of the position of the kiosk and the remaining area of pavement. This information, all

the other submitted material and the site inspection enabled me to consider the effect of the proposal on its merits.

12.The main area of pedestrian usage is between the street trees and pavement edge. Due to its position slightly forward of the other trees, the tree opposite the wayfinding column results in a narrower gap than would be the case between the kiosk and the nearest opposite tree. As such, the position of the kiosk would not narrow this section of pavement more than is already the case with regard to the position of existing street furniture and trees. Moreover, the width of the remaining pavement would be no narrower than that further down Clerkenwell Road, eastwards beyond No 131, which carries similar pedestrian volumes.

13.The main parties and Transport for London (TfL) refer to the TfL Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, which provides recommended footway widths for different levels of pedestrian flow. In areas of high flow such as this the unobstructed pavement width should be no less than 3.3 metres. I observed that while the main desire line is between the trees and pavement, pedestrians do also use the area between the trees and shop fronts, providing additional capacity in an area of high usage. I consider, therefore, that the total width available with the kiosk in position would meet this recommended requirement.

14.Taking these findings as a whole, I conclude that the existence of the kiosk would not materially change the current situation to the extent that it would cause unacceptable harm to highway and pedestrian safety. While I note that there are aspirations for a scheme of public realm improvements within the site's vicinity, I am unaware of further details that would have a direct bearing on the proposal before me and, therefore, this matter cannot have a determinative effect on the appeal's outcome.

15.With regard to the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour associated with the kiosk, this is a busy commercial location, with a number of night-time uses nearby and which is open to surveillance. Moreover, the open design of the kiosk and use of glass panels means that users of the kiosk would remain largely visible from the surrounding public realm. Other kiosks within the wider surrounding area do not have a sufficient direct relationship with the proposed location that any cumulative effect would lead to greater risk of crime or anti-social behaviour occurring. While there may be examples of such behaviour related to other kiosks in the wider area, for the reasons given this is insufficient basis to assume that it will also occur in this specific location.

16.The Council refers to the existence of other telephone kiosks along Grays Inn Road and therefore questions whether the current proposal is required. However, as noted above, the principle of development is established by the GPDO and therefore considerations such as need for the kiosk are not a relevant matter.

17.Accordingly, for all the above reasons, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk would preserve the character and appearance of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area and would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on highway and pedestrian safety, or on crime and anti-social behaviour. Therefore, the appeal should succeed.

2.21. It is within this context that the siting of the Pulse Smart Hub should be allowed given the Inspector's conclusions that the siting of a bulkier telephone kiosk at the same location would not:

- Harm the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area.
- Unacceptably add to the clutter of street furniture and signage.
- Impede pedestrian flows or necessitate the use of the road as an alternative.
- Cause an undue obstruction on the public highway and would not compromise the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.

Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road

2.22. The application site is depicted on the Site Location Plan and Existing Site Photographs and would be located within a section of pavement on the northern side of George Street. on the south side of Clerkenwell Road, between its junctions with Leather Lane and Hatton Garden. The hub would be positioned in front of No 85, a six-storey building in commercial use.

2.23. Details of a previous Prior Approval proposal for the installation of a telephone kiosk at the same location and granted on appeal in 2018 are set out in the Planning History section (see below). This includes the Inspector's evaluation of the proposals in the context of the site and surroundings. It is submitted that the physical environment has not materially changed since the 2018 decision.

Site Designations

2.24. The appeal site is within the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, which covers approximately 20 hectares west of Farringdon Road. The installation process will not require any substantive below ground excavation and as such the proposals will not have a deleterious impact under

the street. The remaining designations are characteristic of the site's location within a central, commercial location where street furniture and advertisement content are widely seen.

Planning History

2.25. Prior approval was granted at the same location as the current proposals on the 12 September 2018 (APP/X5210/W/17/3180694) following the council's decision to refuse planning permission for the installation of a public telephone box. A copy of this appeal decision is attached at **Appendix Biv**.

2.26. The phone box has not been installed, because it is massively outdated technology and no longer serves the original purpose for the community, and the Prior Approval has now expired. Nevertheless, the appeal decision is highly pertinent for the reasons explained below.

2.27. The Inspector's reasons for allowing the appeal are set out in paras. paras. 5 to 16 of the Appeal Decision as follows:

> ***Main Issue***
>
> ***5. The main issue is whether or not approval should be given in respect of the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk, with particular regard to whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, the effect on highway and pedestrian safety, and the effect on crime and anti-social behaviour.***
>
> ***Reasons***
>
> ***6. The location of the proposed kiosk is the pavement on the south side of Clerkenwell Road, between its junctions with Leather Lane and Hatton Garden. The kiosk would be positioned in front of No 85, a six storey building apparently in commercial use.***
>
> ***7. The appeal site is within the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, which covers approximately 20 hectares west of Farringdon Road. Its historic character derives largely from its industrial, commercial and residential buildings of the late nineteenth to mid twentieth centuries, combined with an intricate street pattern. This part of the area generally reflects these broader characteristics, but there is a diverse mix of original and more modern buildings including above the commercial and retail uses at street level. No 85 is an older building, which makes a positive contribution to this part of the conservation area.***
>
> ***8. The kiosk would be positioned close to the pavement at a point where this widens considerably in front of No 85, moving westwards from Hatton Garden***

towards Leather Lane. There is limited existing street furniture in the immediately surrounding area, with cycle stands immediately to the west of the appeal location and lighting columns to the east. I acknowledge also that a Legible London sign nearby has been removed but will be replaced soon. The most significant feature in this regard is relatively large public toilets adjacent to the Leather Lane junction.

9. The kiosk would be highly visible in this open setting, but its relatively slim frame and laminated glass panels means that it would not be a bulky or otherwise visually incongruous addition. Moreover, due to the limited existing street furniture it would not result in cumulative visual clutter. From most surrounding views its modest scale would be framed by the substantive multi-storey buildings and its appearance would be appreciated against the busy commercial context at street level. From views to the north on the opposite side of Clerkenwell Road, the kiosk would be seen against the attractive, more muted backdrop of No 85. However, it would also be seen in the context of the much larger and bulkier public toilets nearby. As such, its siting and appearance seen against the scale and appearance of existing street features would not lead to such a material change that it would not preserve the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.

10.With regard to the effect on highway and pedestrian safety, I acknowledge that this is a heavily-used pedestrian route as I observed during the inspection. The kiosk would be positioned close to the pavement edge and in line with the adjacent cycle stands, but it would protrude further onto the pavement than these existing features. The Council indicates that detailed drawings were not provided to enable a full appreciation of the effects of the kiosk's position. However, the appeal submissions do include an illustrative diagram of the position of the kiosk and the remaining area of pavement. This information, all the other submitted material and the site inspection enabled me to consider the effect of the proposal on its merits.

11.The main parties and Transport for London (TfL) refer to the TfL Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, which provides recommended footway widths for different levels of pedestrian flow. In areas of high flow such as this the unobstructed pavement width should be no less than 3.3 metres. Even allowing for the forecourt area in front of No 85, with the kiosk in place the extent of remaining pavement would exceed this recommended width. This would allow for eastward and westward travelling pedestrians to pass each other utilising what would remain a broad extent of pavement area.

12.Those pedestrians using the desire line between the toilet block and road would not be caused significantly to divert their path because of the limited protrusion of the kiosk beyond the cycle stands. I was able to observe these effects at the inspection during a period of high footfall and I am satisfied that no harmful effects would result from the kiosk's siting in this location. I was also able to use the nearby pedestrian crossing close to the kiosk's location. Due to the straight stretch of road, set back of the kiosk and overall good visibility, the kiosk's position would not compromise the safety of pedestrians using this crossing. For similar reasons, its siting would not adversely affect highway safety with regard to driver visibility from the Hatton Garden and Leather Lane junctions.

13.I note that there are aspirations for a scheme of public realm improvements within the site's vicinity and specific reference is made to the Leather Lane/Farringdon scheme. However, I am unaware of further details or firm proposals that would have a direct bearing on the proposal before me, which in any case, I have found would not be unacceptably harmful with regard to its siting and appearance. This matter cannot, therefore, have a determinative effect on the appeal's outcome.

14.With regard to the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour associated with the kiosk, this is a busy commercial location with a wide pavement to the road frontage and a number of night-time uses nearby and residential occupancy above street level. Consequently, it is an area of public realm that is well-used and open to surveillance. Moreover, the open design of the kiosk and use of glass panels means that users of the kiosk would remain largely visible from the surrounding public realm. I am unaware of other kisoks within the vicinity that would have a bearing on this matter and I have no other reasons or evidence to suggest that the siting of the kiosk in this location will realise the concerns that have been raised. Similarly, examples of kiosks in other locations that have been subject to such criminal or anti-social behaviour are not a sufficient reason to find against the current proposal.

15.The Council also indicates that the kiosk would not be properly accessible to wheelchair users. However, the provisions of the GPDO require a local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its siting and appearance. As this matter, including compliance with any British Standards relating to accessibility, does not fall within the specific scope of these issues relating to prior approval, I cannot take account of it as having a direct bearing on the appeal's outcome. In reaching this view I have had full regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty.

16.Accordingly, for all the above reasons, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk would preserve the character and appearance of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area and would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on highway and pedestrian safety, or on crime and anti-social behaviour. Therefore, the appeal should succeed."

2.28. It is within this context that the siting of the Pulse Smart Hub should be allowed given the Inspector's conclusions that the siting of a bulkier telephone kiosk at the same location would not:

- Harm the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area
- Unacceptably add to the clutter of street furniture and signage.
- Impede pedestrian flows or necessitate the use of the road as an alternative.
- Cause an undue obstruction on the public highway and would not compromise the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.

Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road

2.29. The application site is depicted on the Site Location Plan and Existing Site Photographs and would be sited on the pavement area outside No 27 Chalk Farm Road and opposite the entrance to Camden (Stables) Market.

2.30. Details of a previous Prior Approval proposal for the installation of a telephone kiosk at the same location and granted on appeal in 2018 are set out in the Planning History section (see below). This includes the Inspector's evaluation of the proposals in the context of the site and surroundings. It is submitted that the physical environment has not materially changed since the 2018 decision.

Site Designations

2.31. The site is located within the Regents Canal Conservation Area. The installation process will not require any substantive below ground excavation and as such the proposals will not have a deleterious impact under the street. The remaining designations are characteristic of the site's location within a central, commercial location where street furniture and advertisement content are widely seen.

Planning History

2.32. Prior approval was granted at the same location as the current proposals on the 19 December 2018 ('Appeal F' under appeal ref. APP/X5210/W/17/3202786) following the council's decision to refuse planning permission for the installation of a public telephone box. It was determined

at the same time as the successful appeal at Location 6 (Appeal K) (see below) along with 10 other proposals. A copy of this appeal decision is attached at **Appendix Bv.**

2.33. The phone box has not been installed, because it is massively outdated technology and no longer serves the original purpose for the community, and the Prior Approval has now expired. Nevertheless, the appeal decision is highly pertinent for the reasons explained below.

2.34. The Inspector's reasons for allowing the appeal are set out in paras. 19 and paras. 49 to 51 of the Appeal Decision as follows:

> ***"Main Issues***
>
> ***19. The Council's reasons for refusal are almost identical in terms of the proposal subject to each appeal. I therefore consider that the main issue for each of the Appeals A - L is whether or not approval should be given in respect of the siting and appearance of the development, with particular regard, as appropriate, to whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the relevant Conservation Area; its effect on Listed Buildings; and to include, where relevant, the effect upon highway and pedestrian safety.***
>
> ***…….***
>
> ***Appeal F***
>
> ***49. The proposed kiosk would be sited on the pavement area outside No 27 Chalk Farm Road and opposite the entrance to Camden (Stables) Market. It would be positioned between two small trees towards the front of the pavement. There is a bicycle stand to the north of one tree and a bus shelter (apparently disused) a few metres to the south. Chalk Farm Road is a busy road and bus route. The Market lies within the Regents Canal Conservation Area (RCCA), the boundary of which is on the opposite side of the road from the appeal site. There are listed buildings also on the opposite side of the road, but in this case, I do not consider that the proposed kiosk would form part of, or have any impact on, their setting, being across a busy main road and partly screened by trees. For similar reasons, I do not consider that the kiosk would have any harmful impact on the character or appearance of the RCCA.***
>
> ***50. Whilst the road is busy in terms of traffic usage, it would not appear to be particularly heavily used by pedestrians – most of the pedestrian activity being concentrated on the opposite side of the road near the market entrance. There is very little in the way of street furniture in the immediate vicinity of the proposed kiosk, and it would appear to be sited between the two pavement trees. In this position, it would not affect the likely pedestrian desire lines along this part of***

the road, which appear to be more heavily influenced by the position of the bus shelter and the crossing point for pedestrians at the junction of Chalk Farm Road and Hartland Road, both of which effectively direct pedestrians away from the kerb into the middle of the pavement.

51. In the light of the above, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk could not be said to harm the character or appearance of the nearby CA, or to the setting of the listed buildings on the opposite side of the road. Moreover, on the basis of the information available to me, it appears that the kiosk would not be likely to result in any harm to the free and safe movement of pedestrians along this section of pavement. Accordingly, I allow the appeal, subject to the telephone within the kiosk being positioned at a height of between 0.75 metres and 1 metre above ground level, in the interests of ensuring maximum accessibility for disabled persons. I have referred to this condition in the section on decisions above."

2.35. It is within this context that the siting of the Pulse Smart Hub (referred to as **Appeal F** above) should be allowed given the Inspector's conclusions that the siting of a bulkier telephone kiosk at the same location would not:

- Harm the character and appearance of the area including the siting of the Regents Canal Conservation Area
- Unacceptably add to the clutter of street furniture and signage.
- Impede pedestrian flows or necessitate the use of the road as an alternative.
- Cause an undue obstruction on the public highway and would not compromise the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.

Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)

2.36. The application site is depicted on the Site Location Plan and Existing Site Photographs and would be sited at the rear of the pavement on West End Lane, close to its junction with Iverson Road.

2.37. Details of a previous Prior Approval proposal for the installation of a telephone kiosk at the same location and granted on appeal in 2018 are set out in the Planning History section (see below). This includes the Inspector's evaluation of the proposals in the context of the site and surroundings. It is submitted that the physical environment has not materially changed since the 2018 decision.

Site Designations

2.38. There are no designated or non-designated heritage assets near the site. The installation process will not require any substantive below ground excavation and as such the proposals will not have a deleterious impact under the street. The remaining designations are characteristic of the site's location within a central, commercial location where street furniture and advertisement content are widely seen.

Planning History

2.39. Prior approval was granted at the same location as the current proposals on the 19 December 2018 ('Appeal K' under appeal ref. APP/X5210/W/17/3202789) following the council's decision to refuse planning permission for the installation of a public telephone box. It was determined at the same time as the successful appeal at Location 5 (Appeal F) (see above) along with 10 other proposals. A copy of this appeal decision is attached at **Appendix Bv**.

2.40. The phone box has not been installed, because it is massively outdated technology and no longer serves the original purpose for the community, and the Prior Approval has now expired. Nevertheless, the appeal decision is highly pertinent for the reasons explained below.

2.41. The Inspector's reasons for allowing the appeal are set out in paras. 19 and paras. 75 to 79 of the Appeal Decision as follows:

> ***"Main Issues***
>
> ***19. The Council's reasons for refusal are almost identical in terms of the proposal subject to each appeal. I therefore consider that the main issue for each of the Appeals A - L is whether or not approval should be given in respect of the siting and appearance of the development, with particular regard, as appropriate, to whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the relevant Conservation Area; its effect on Listed Buildings; and to include, where relevant, the effect upon highway and pedestrian safety.***
>
> ***…….***
>
> ***The proposed kiosk would be sited at the rear of the pavement on West End Lane, close to its junction with Iverson Road. The pavement here is very wide***
>
> ***and is relatively free of street furniture. There is a slimline display board in close proximity to the site of the proposed kiosk and there are equipment cabinets backing onto a 2.5 metre high fence that bounds the Thameslink railway cutting to the north. The pavement on the western side of West End Lane is very narrow as the road bridges the railway, and then widens out considerably at the end of***

the bridge. Pedestrian flows are heavy but the effect of the existence of the narrow pavement over the bridge appears to concentrate pedestrian flows to the front of the pavement, whereas the kiosk would be sited to the rear.

76. The area behind the pavement here comprises a tree-lined walkway from West End Lane to the West Hampstead Thameslink station. This walkway is situated to the rear of the pavement along Iverson Road and is relatively wide and open in the vicinity of the proposed kiosk. It contains a number of cycle stands near to the station itself, but the stands are some considerable distance away from the kiosk site and access would not be affected by it.

77. Pedestrian flows along this section of West End Lane focus on two pedestrian crossings to the south of the appeal site. One crossing takes pedestrians over Iverson Road and the other, which is close by, takes pedestrians across West End Lane itself. The Council contends that the kiosk would have the effect of reducing the 'clear footway' of the pavement to less than the minimum required threshold, which would reduce pedestrian comfort, resulting in overcrowding, and issues of highway safety through interfering with signals and visual obstructions. In this case, I disagree. The width of the pavement in the vicinity of the proposed kiosk site is around 7 metres, such that the kiosk, sited at the rear, would not significantly interfere with pedestrian desire lines and would leave significantly greater space than threshold required.

78. This section of West End Lane, and Iverson Road off it, is characterised by very modern buildings, and the simple modern design of the kiosk would not, in this case, adversely affect the prevailing character or appearance of the area.

79. In conclusion, I find that the proposed kiosk, by virtue of its modern simple design, would complement the modern frontages of nearby shops, and the designs of nearby buildings. It would not be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and it would not prejudice pedestrian safety. Accordingly, I allow the appeal, subject to the telephone within the kiosk being positioned at a height of between 0.75 metres and 1 metre above ground level, in the interests of ensuring maximum accessibility for disabled persons. I have referred to this condition in the section on decisions above."

2.42. It is within this context that the siting of the Pulse Smart Hub (referred to as **Appeal A** above) should be allowed given the Inspector's conclusions that the siting of a bulkier telephone kiosk at the same location would not:

- Harm the character and appearance of the area
- Unacceptably add to the clutter of street furniture and signage.

- Impede pedestrian flows or necessitate the use of the road as an alternative.
- Cause an undue obstruction on the public highway and would not compromise the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.

3. The Proposals

3.1. Planning Permission and Advertisement Consent is sought for the installation and operation of Pulse Smart Hubs.

3.2. The design of the proposals is depicted on the plans and documents, including the DMOS submitted with this Application (**Appendix A**).

3.3. The proposed Hubs are to be sited so that they meet with recognised guidance, as described in Section 4, for locating street furniture on the public highway.

3.4. Specifically, they are positioned to ensure:

- The footway clear zone is not less than 2,000mm wide
- There is no obstruction which could pose a safety hazard i.e. at the front of the kerb near a junction or side road
- They are located away from loading bays, service access points and crossovers. The user functions of the Hub will not directly impact onto the path of pedestrians
- The Hubs are sited not less than 450mm from the kerb face
- That there is sufficient space to allow mechanised cleaning

Location

3.5. The Pulse Smart Hubs will be located at the following locations:

- Location 1: Pavement outside, Pinnacle Apartments, 11 Safron Central Square
- Location 2: Pavement outside 8 – 52 Boxpark, 99 George Street

3.6. A rigorous site selection process of the proposed location was undertaken to ensure that collectively the Pulse Smart Hub along with existing and future consented Hubs will deliver a comprehensive network of connectivity within the Borough whilst at the same time selecting locations that:

- Avoid unacceptable harm to public amenity.
- Avoid harm to the significance of streetscape and heritage assets or their settings.
- Will not compromise safety and security or obscure highway sightlines and allow free movement along the public highway by all users, including people with disabilities, especially the visually impaired.
- Will not adversely impact on trees on or near the proposed site, especially those protected by Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) or within conservation areas.
- Are aligned, where possible, to areas of established “street furniture zones”, i.e. typically the section of pavement between the edge of kerb and clear pathways and comprising

amenities and elements such as pay phones, lighting and benches, bus stops and trees for the safety, comfort and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists.

3.7. A minimum of 5% of total screen time on the main two digital screens will be given over for free to local organisations, businesses, and the community to use daily.

Operator / Applicant Obligations

3.8. All operators of radio equipment are responsible for ensuring compliance with a plethora of regulations and guidelines.

3.9. Of specific note would be the 'Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England' and the 'International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines'.

3.10. The Code of Best Practice provides guidance to Mobile Network Operators, their agents and contractors, and equally to all local planning authorities in England. The Code was developed by a Working Group consisting of representatives from governmental departments, planning departments and private operators. The principal aim of this Code is to ensure that the Government's objective of supporting high quality communications infrastructure, which is vital to continued economic prosperity and social inclusion for all, is met.

3.11. The ICNIRP guidelines are designed to safeguard all members of the public of all ages and in all states of health. The important thing about ICNIRP guidelines approach is that they are based upon peer-reviewed and published research, spanning many decades. The guidelines are constantly reviewed.

3.12. The Our Responsibilities statement attached at **Appendix C** sets out commitments from UIC to fully adhere to the above guidelines. This adherence would apply to all Hubs installed.

Design, Functionality and Management

3.13. As described in Section 1 Pulse Smart Hubs are free-standing structures featuring a fully accessible interactive tablet along with larger digital display screens on two sides.

3.14. The touchscreen provides free access to:

- Built-in Public Access Defibrillator.
- Built-in Nasal Naloxone opioid antagonist.
- Emergency Safety button to support anyone who is vulnerable.
- 999 emergency service button.
- Free phone calls with a built-in speaker and receiver.
- Free Wi-Fi

- Digital wayfinding / mapping.
- Wireless mobile phone charging.
- Hyper-local information on what's on, council services and helplines.

3.15. All these features are to be provided at no cost to members of the local community and wider public. All the features have been and continue to be refined and developed in collaboration with tourism boards, local councils, police, outreach charities and other community organisations.

3.16. It is not the intention to rehearse the detailed specifications, features, installation and ongoing management and maintenance of the of the Pulse Smart Hub in this Planning Statement as these are described in detail in Chapter 2: 'The Smart Hub experience' of the DMOS which is broken down into the following 7 sub-sections.

Design detail

3.17. Describing the Pulse Smart Hub as a quintessential British design as an evolution of the 21st Century telephone kiosk the DMOS provides the detailed dimensions of the proposed Hubs and describes its key features in terms of connectivity, the 'smart city' platform, the emergency lifesaving defibrillator and overall life-saving technology.

The user experience

3.18. Provides additional information on the key features of the Pulse Smart Hubs to enhance the user experience, as referred to in para. 3.6 above.

Design and functionality

3.19. Describing the external appearance of, and the materials used in the manufacture, the Pulse Smart Hubs and provides information on environmental performance, mitigating light and noise pollution and the technical specification of the messaging screens. This section also provides a useful comparative assessment as to how the Pulse Smart Hubs relate in terms of scale and footprint to other street furniture and how the contemporary design sits very comfortably within a streetscape with either a modern or historic backdrop. For instance, the Pulse Smart Hubs have a 66% smaller footprint than a standard telephone kiosk design and is smaller in width yet provides a multitude of free services.

Locating our hubs and accessibility

3.20. Provides a summary of the approach to locating Pulse Smart Hubs on the ground principally to ensure the streets remain 'clutter free' and the Hubs positioned to meet the needs of all users, including those with disabilities.

Installation process

3.21. Describes the installation process detailing how each Pulse Smart Hub is installed, generally within 1 week, with minimal disruption to users of the public realm.

Ongoing maintenance and management

3.22. Describes the approach to maintenance and management. The materials used in manufacture are robust to minimise the need for repair with most software malfunctions and upgrades being able to be managed remotely. Local service agreements will be put in place to manage anything requiring more substantive maintenance or repair. Each Hub is monitored constantly 24 hours a day, 7 days per week all year round using 'remote' camera surveillance to ensure they always fully function. Each Hub undergoes a weekly cleaning regime managed by Pulse (free to taxpayer).

Addressing antisocial behaviour.

3.23. Sets out the approach to managing malicious behaviour including response to fly posting, spray paint graffiti and glass etching noting in any event all Pulse Smart Hubs are subject to a fortnightly deep clean; mitigating any misuse of free public calls or Wi-Fi; mitigating against misuse of the 999 and emergency buttons.

3.24. The philosophy behind the proposals is justified with reference to relevant planning policy and the key planning issues set out in the following sections.

4. Planning Policy

4.1. The principle of the proposed hubs is established under the provisions of section 106 of the Electronic Communications Code and para. 17 of Schedule 18 of the Telecommunications Act 2023 given the development is proposed by UIC a telecommunications code system operator and has permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

Digital Strategies and Policy Statement

National

4.2. As demonstrated throughout this Planning Statement and the DMOS the benefits of the Pulse Smart Hub to the communities in which they serve are **very significant** indeed and **very substantial weight** should be afforded to these benefits. They will contribute to the UK Government's strategic priorities for a new digital age as set out in the many UK Government strategies and policy statements published in the last 10 years, including:

- Digital Strategy 2017 (Updated September 2023)
- Wireless 2030 (January 2023)
- Infrastructure, Towns and Regeneration (September 2021)
- UK Wireless Infrastructure Strategy (April 2023)
- The Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England (March 2022).

4.3. At the national level the need to plan for greater investment in world-class digital infrastructure is critical to the continued social, economic and environmental success of this country.

> ***"…. wireless technology has transformed our world almost beyond recognition. Today, radio waves connect communities across the country not just with one another, but with the world thousands of miles beyond our shores, and the satellites hundreds of miles above our skies.***
>
> ***Connectivity has brought benefits for British households and British business, boosting growth, productivity, and opportunity for all. And change shows no sign of stopping. In fact, we find ourselves on the brink of a new revolution which promises to transform the world once more.***
>
> ***…. 5G will drive growth in the industries of today and tomorrow, including in emerging sectors like artificial intelligence where Britain leads the world. … 5G can improve our public services …. in everything from education to social care.***
>
> ***This is an incredible opportunity; widespread adoption of 5G could see £159 billion in productivity benefits by 2035 …. By bringing together world-class research and a***

dynamic business ecosystem, we can harness enterprise and innovation to grow the economy ….

To do all this, we need world-class digital infrastructure…"

- The Rt Hon Michelle Donelan MP, Secretary of State for Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT) UK Wireless Infrastructure Strategy (Published 11 April 2023).

"The more our lives are conducted online, the more access to the internet becomes critical for social and economic opportunity.

This is why delivering world-class digital infrastructure to all Britons is a fundamental mission of this government - and our efforts to build it the modern equivalent in scale and ambition to the Victorians' construction of the railways. Our plan is for every corner of our country to get lightning fast connectivity, not only to give people real choices about where to live and work today but so they will not be left out of future technological revolutions because of poor infrastructure.

…. the time is right to turn our sights to mobile connectivity …. to deliver the kind of wireless infrastructure that will transform how we live our lives and run our economy ….

The power of 5G and future telecoms advances will unlock new solutions in everything from industry to healthcare. Falling behind in coverage will mean falling behind in international competitiveness when it comes to the technologies of tomorrow, and failing to provide British people with innovative, life-enhancing services on secure, resilient networks."

- Julia Lopez MP, Minister of State for DSIT UK Wireless Infrastructure Strategy (Published 11 April 2023).

4.4. The Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England (March 2022) provides guidance to mobile network operators, their agents and contractors and equally to all local planning authorities in England. It supersedes the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Phone Network Development (2016).

4.5. The principal aim of this Code is to support the government's objective of delivering high quality wireless infrastructure whilst balancing these needs with environmental considerations. It also has an important role in making sure that appropriate engagement takes place with local communities and other interested parties. Consistent with the advice set out in para. 122 of the NPPF, local planning authorities should not seek to determine health and safety matters that are subject to separate controls. Providing applications are accompanied with an International

Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) certificate, planning authorities are not required to make any further judgement on health and safety issues.

London

4.6. Our Smarter London Together 'The Mayor's Roadmap to Transform London into the Smartest City in the World', published in June 2018:

> ***"…. sets out how we plan to transform London into the smartest city in the world. It is a response to my challenge to find a bolder approach to the way data innovation and digital technology serve those who live, work and visit our great city.***
>
> - Sadiq Khan, Mayor of London

4.7. The 'roadmap' understands that supporting a new generation of smart infrastructure and providing world-class connectivity and smarter streets is central to this mission including the need to enhance public wifi in streets and public buildings to assist those who live, work and visit London.

4.8. As set out above the applications are submitted under the provisions of the 1990 Planning Act and 2007 Advertisement Regulations. Planning permission is required for the physical elements of the communication apparatus and consent for the display of advertisement on the Hub with the powers under the Advertisement Regulations restricted in the interests of amenity and public safety taking into account the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.

4.9. Factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest. Factors relevant to public safety are the safety of persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome, and whether the display of the advertisement in question is likely to obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air.

4.10. The Development Plan comprises:

- **The London Plan (March 2021)**

4.11. London Plan Policy SI 6: Digital connectivity infrastructure promotes the accommodation of well-designed and suitably located mobile digital infrastructure which will contribute to meeting many of the social, environmental and economic objectives set out in the following London Plan objectives and policies:

- ***Objectives:***

- Policy GG1: Building strong and inclusive communities.
- Policy GG3: Creating a healthy city.
- Policy GG5: Growing a good economy.
- Policy SD6: Town centres and high streets.
- Policy SD8: Town centre network.
- Policy SD9: Town centres: Local partnerships and implementation.
- Policy SD10: Strategic and local regeneration.

- ***Policies***

- Policy D4 Delivering good design
- Policy D11: Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- Policy D12 Fire safety
- Policy S1: Developing London's social infrastructure
- Policy HC6: Supporting the night-time economy
- Policy T2 Healthy streets
- Policy T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts

4.12. Policies also relevant to the consideration of the detailed elements of the proposals are:

- Policy D4: Delivering good design
- Policy D5: Inclusive design
- Policy D11: Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- Policy S1: Developing London's social infrastructure
- Policy HC6: Supporting the night-time economy

- **Camden Local Plan (2017)**

4.13. The Camden Local Plan sets out the Council's planning policies. It incorporates both strategic and development management policies across a wide range of topics. It was adopted on the 3 July 2017 and is the same Plan that formed the local policy basis for determining the previous kiosk appeals

4.14. The most relevant policies, remain those relevant to the appeal proposals; namely:

- Policy A1 Managing the impact of development
- Policy D1: Design
- Policy D2: Heritage

- Policy D4: Advertisements

4.15. In the case of the previous appeals the inspectors concluded that there was no conflict with these policies. Given the significantly reduced scale of the application proposals it is submitted that there would again be no conflict.

Other Material Considerations

- ***National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF)***

4.16. Chapter 10: Supporting high quality communications of the NPPF provides the national planning framework for delivering on the Government's commitment to the digital revolution.

4.17. Para. 118 states that:

> ***"Advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. Planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections. Policies should set out how high quality digital infrastructure, providing access to services from a range of providers, is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time; and should prioritise full fibre connections to existing and new developments (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution)."***

4.18. In turn the delivery of high-quality communications will contribute to the social, economic and environmental framework objectives set out in:

- Chapter 6: Building a strong, competitive economy.
- Chapter 7: Ensuring the vitality of town centres.
- Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities.

4.19. The following chapters are pertinent to detailed matters:

- Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places.

- ***National Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014 and updated ad-hoc) (NPPG)***

4.20. Alongside the NPPF, the NPPG provides more detailed information on various aspects of planning not covered in the NPPF. Section 8 provides detailed guidance on the control of advertisements. It confirms that the display of advertisements is subject to a separate consent

process within the planning system - principally set out in the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

4.21. It confirms that advertisements are controlled with reference to their effect on amenity and public safety only, so the regime is lighter touch than the system for obtaining planning permission for development.

- ***Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents***

4.22. In October 2023 the GLA published draft London Plan Guidance on 'Digital Connectivity Infrastructure' – i.e. the physical digital infrastructure including mobile and fixed (e.g., broadband) connections to the internet and other physical equipment.

4.23. One of its key aims is to provide guidance on avoiding harm to surrounding areas and the mitigation of adverse impacts including to:

- Traffic and circulation, including pedestrian flows, cycle traffic, public transport infrastructure and vehicle movement.
- Designated or non-designated heritage assets, or their setting, as appropriate.

4.24. Camden has prepared a series of Supplementary Planning Documents to further guide development. Pertinent to the proposals are:

- Access for All SPD (March 2019)
- Adverts CPG (March 2018)
- Design (January 2021)
- Digital Infrastructure (March 2018)

4.25. Much of the detail is consistent with the advice contained in the 'Other' guidance' referred to below with specific reference to 'Siting of Street Furniture on the Public Highway' with the Council supporting advertisements that:

- Preserve the character and amenity of the area
- Preserve or enhance heritage assets and conservation areas

whilst resisting advertisements that:

- Contribute to an unsightly proliferation of signage in the area
- Contribute to street clutter in the public realm
- Cause light pollution to nearby residential properties or wildlife habitats
- Have flashing illuminated elements
- Impact upon public safety.

4.26. With specific reference to the Advertisements SPD free-standing signs and signs on street furniture will only be accepted where they would not create or contribute to visual and physical clutter or hinder movement along the pavement or pedestrian footway.

- ***Other***

- ***Siting of Street Furniture on the Public Highway***

4.27. The following publications provide guidance on the siting of street furniture on the public highway:

- Inclusive Mobility, Department for Transport (DoT) (2022)
- Manual for Streets 1 and 2, Department for Transport (DoT) (2007) (as updated)
- Part E Footway Amenities, Streetscape Guidance, 'Streets Toolkit', Transport for London (TfL) (2016)
- Appendix B of the Pedestrian Comfort Guidance 2015, Transport for London (TfL) (First Edition 2010).

4.28. The 'Streets Toolkit' recognises with reference to the LinkNYC internet pylons (pp. 244), a broadly similar product to the Pulse Smart Hub (albeit with significantly less public benefits) that with ever increasing use of smartphones and reliance on the internet, free public WiFi is an increasing priority and recognises the public benefits of the role out of broadly similar smart street furniture in the UK.

4.29. The 'Toolkit' provides specific guidance on co-ordinating street furniture which applies to the Pulse Smart Hub within Part E of the Streetscape Guidance Section. It advocates using a coordinated approach for designing and maintaining the layout of street furniture to:

- Minimise cluttering footways with unnecessary furniture
- Maximise unobstructed widths for comfortable pedestrian movement
- Satisfy network operational requirements
- Ensure that the product is appropriate for the location in function and style
- Merge or combine street furniture components on a single post where practicable to further reduce clutter.

4.30. For the siting of the Pulse Smart Hub, based on the same guidance for telephone boxes and other larger items, the 'Toolkit' states that consideration should be given to the following:

- Footway and verge widths and the setting out of specific guidance for 'footway zones' i.e. the area between the kerb line and the highway as follows:
    - Kerb zone between 450mm and 600mm

    - Furniture zone from kerb zone preferred minimum 2,000mm
    - Footway clear zone preferred minimum 2,000mm (acceptable minimum 1,500mm where 2m is not possible with an absolute minimum of 1,000mm where there is an obstacle (maximum length of restricted width is 6m)
- Vehicle speeds where horizontal clearance widths between the Hub and the carriageway kerb edge should be between 450mm (typically subject to 30mph speed limit or lower) and 600mm (typically where speed limits are higher)
- Pedestrian flows, as follows with reference to the Pedestrian Comfort Guidance for London (2015):
    - Minimum footway width (total width) 2.9m Low flow < 600 peak hour flow pedestrians per hour (pph). In high street or tourist areas the total width can be reduced to 2.6m if there is no street furniture (except streetlights). In other areas, low flow streets can be 2m wide if there is no street furniture. This total width is required for two users to pass comfortably and to meet DfT minimum standards.
    - Minimum footway width (total width) 4.2m Active Flow 600 to 1,200 pph. In high street or tourist areas the width can be reduced to 3.3m if there is no street furniture (except streetlights). This width allows two groups to pass. In other areas, active flow streets can be 2.2m wide if there is no street furniture. This width is required for the level of flow and to meet DfT minimum standards.
    - Minimum footway width (total width) 5.3m High Flow > 1,200 pph. In areas such as transport interchanges more space may be required if there are multiple bus stops on one footway. If there is no street furniture, the width can be reduced to 3.3m. This is enough space for comfortable movement of up to 2,000 pph.
- Parking and loading requirements noting that street furniture should not be located where it is at risk of damage from vehicle movement or where access to the street furniture poses a safety risk to pedestrians except where street furniture has been placed to discourage vehicle movement
- Street Types noting that the material and layout of furniture should contribute to the function, performance and character of the street
- Adjacent land uses noting that furniture should satisfy a need as well as reflect the character of the setting without causing an obstruction or reducing the functionality of the surrounding buildings or land uses
- Street furniture size and location requirements noting that individual components should satisfy designated criteria to ensure a minimum standard is attained (see above)
- Security noting that furniture must not create a situation which compromises the safety or security of any user
- Maintenance noting that street furniture placement does not restrict standard cleansing regimes

- ***Electromagnetic Fields and Electrical Interference***

4.31. The RF EMF Guidelines 2020 (The ICNIRP Guidelines) for Limiting Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields are for the protection of humans exposed to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (RF) in the range 100 kHz to 300 GHz. The guidelines cover many applications such as 5G technologies, WiFi, Bluetooth, mobile phones, and base stations.

4.32. All new electronics equipment should not cause significant and irremediable interference with other electrical equipment, air traffic services or instrumentation operated in the national interest, having also considered the possibility of the construction of new buildings or other structures interfering with broadcast and electronic communications services.

4.33. It will be demonstrated in the following sections with reference to the proceeding sections of this Statement that the proposals have been formulated with full regard to all relevant planning policies and supplementary planning guidance and would not conflict, nor would cause harm, to any interest of acknowledged importance.

5. Heritage Statement

5.1. Heritage Statements are required to be submitted with planning applications where heritage assets may be affected (directly or indirectly) in accordance with paragraph 200 of the NPPF which states:

> ***"In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting…".***

5.2. Page 70, within the glossary section of the NPPF defines a heritage asset as:

> ***"A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).***

5.3. Accordingly, this statement assesses the respective sites historic context and the significance of any heritage assets. It then assesses the impact of the proposed development on these assets.

Planning Policy Context

5.4. The Planning Policy context for design and access is set out in Section 4. The policy context for assessing heritage significance and assessing impact is considered not to have materially changed despite revisions to the NPPF since the previous telephone kiosk appeals at the same locations were allowed.

Heritage Context

5.5. Designated and non-designated heritage assets considered to have a direct relationship to:

- Location 1: : Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road
  - Regents Canal Conservation Area
  - Grade II* listed Roundhouse Theatre
- Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street
  - Kingsway Conservation Area
  - The following listed buildings:
    - Grade II St Martins College of Arts and Design
    - Grade II Victoria House
    - Grade II Kingsway Tram Subway
    - Grade II Avenue Chambers.

- Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road
  - Hatton Garden Conservation Area
- Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road
  - Hatton Garden Conservation Area
- Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road
  - Regents Canal Conservation Area
- Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)
  - No designated or non-designated heritage assets identified

have been identified in Section 2 where an Assessment of Significance is required.

Assessment of Significance

5.6. With reference to the Planning History sub-sections (Section 2) the Appeal inspectors in connection with the previous Prior Approval proposals for the installation of telephone kiosks at both locations assessed the impact of the kiosk on the Maritime Mercantile World Heritage Site and concluded the proposals would not cause any harm.

5.7. The current Hub proposals, as described in Section 3, assume a significantly more streamlined form than the previously approved kiosk design associated with the previous Prior Approval appeal. Whilst there is a slight increase in height by 500mm from 2,450mm to 2,500mm the hub will take up significantly less space, and therefore will appear less cluttered in the street scene, with a very significant reduction in depth of 710mm from 1,110mm to 400mm. The width of the proposed hubs compared to the previous kiosks is also reduced by 0.20mm from 1,320mm to 1,300mm.

5.8. As summarised in Section 3, drawing from Chapter 2 of the DMOS the advertisement element of the proposals is very modest in scale noting that all advertisements will be statically displayed. The Technical Appendices to the DMOS confirms that ambient noise and light levels will comply with the latest standards and current best practice. Judged in the context of each proposed Hub location it is concluded that the advertisement elements of each proposal will not cause any additional layer of harm to designated heritage or non-designated heritage assets.

5.9. On this basis the current proposals are judged not to harm any of the designated assets identified above and consequently would not detract from their significance.

6. Justification for the Proposals

6.1. This Section of the Planning Statement outlines the key issues in respect of the determination of this Application having regard to national planning policy, the development plan and other material considerations.

6.2. As described in Section 4 the principle of development is established in law under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), given the development is proposed by UIC a telecommunications code system operator. It is only the matter of siting and appearance that need to be considered within the context of these proposals.

6.3. With reference to the digital strategies described in Section 4 delivering world-class digital infrastructure is a fundamental objective of national, regional and local government in recognition of the importance of delivering lightning-fast connectivity so they will not be left out of future technological revolutions because of poor infrastructure. At the national level Government recognises that the power of 5G and future telecoms advances will unlock new solutions in everything from industry to healthcare. It recognises that falling behind in coverage will mean falling behind in international competitiveness when it comes to the technologies of tomorrow, and failing to provide British people with innovative, life-enhancing services on secure, resilient networks

6.4. At the regional level the Greater London Authority digital strategy understands that supporting a new generation of smart infrastructure and providing world-class connectivity and smarter streets is central to this mission including the need to enhance public Wi-Fi in streets to assist those who live, work and visit London.

6.5. **Very substantial weight** should be afforded to the public benefits associated with the proposed Pulse Smart Hub. Chapter 1 of the DMOS provides evidence on the very significant problems faced by individuals and community organisations where communication through towns and cities is erratic inconsistent and unreliable in an age when reliable connection is as important as it has ever been, and that modern life requires people to stay connected. The remainder of Chapter 1 demonstrates, drawing on the Applicant's successful roll out of its first network of Pulse Smart Hubs in Belfast, how the network of Pulse Smart Hubs proposed by these applications will assist in bridging the digital divide to make people living and working in the City better connected and feeling safe by delivering a community-first network of smart street furniture with life-saving equipment.

6.6. Section 3 of this Planning Statement summaries the detailed specifications, features, installation and ongoing management and maintenance of the of the proposed Pulse Smart Hub network as described in detail in Chapter 2 of the DMOS. These are paid for in full by the Applicant.

6.7. As described the Pulse Smart Hubs are a quintessential British design brought up to the new age in terms of smart phones and digital technology. The Pulse Smart Hub represents the 21st century evolution of the telephone kiosk.

6.8. The design of the Pulse Smart Hubs has been developed over time and is a high quality, multifunctional piece of street furniture which maximises the services available to the public within a footprint smaller than a traditional public call box. The IoT technology and provision of open-source data provides endless potential applications that will see the use of the Hub evolve.

6.9. The two proposed digital displays are a key element of the proposal as they support the advertising required to make the scheme viable without any capital or revenue costs to the Council or the public.

6.10. However, the main screens also form a significant part of the offer to local stakeholders, as they are made available for a wide range of public uses. A minimum of 5% of total screen time on the main digital screens will be given over for free for local organisations, businesses and the community to use. In Belfast the screens have been used by the Police, Council, City Centre Management, Charities and Tourism Boards. Across an 18-hour day of screentime, 5% is equivalent to 650 free messaging spots per hub. UIC and its advertising partners also support creative formatting to help the local community make best use of the screens.

6.11. In comparison to other street furniture:

- The Pulse Smart Hub has a 66% smaller footprint than a standard kiosk design and is smaller in width yet provides a multitude of services.
- The scale and footprint of the Pulse Smart Hub is the minimum required to accommodate the telecommunications and smart city equipment.
- The design sits comfortably within the streetscape, with either a modern or historic backdrop. For example, in Belfast, a Pulse Smart Hub is located directly next to the famous Grade B1 listed Old Town Hall.

6.12. **Table 1** below summarises the material design differences between the previously approved kiosk design and the proposed Pulse Smart Hub and demonstrates that the proposed Hub will have a lesser visual impact on amenity and no greater impact on highway safety.

Table 1: Comparison of Design

Key Issues	Pulse Smart Hub (Validated 16/05/24)	Kiosk (Approved 07/08/18)	Comments
VISUAL IMPACT AND AMEITY			
Siting			
Pavement width	6,940mm	6,940mm	Because of its much-reduced depth (see below) the Pulse Smart Hub leaves a significantly greater area (greater than 22%) of unimpeded footway between the back edge of the pavement and the structure. No additional street furniture or trees introduced since the previous kiosk proposals considered so no additional harm is considered to now make the current proposals unacceptable in terms of unacceptably adding to street clutter.
Back edge of pavement to structure	5,094mm	4,120mm	
Front edge of pavement to structure	600mm	600mm	
Remaining footway width	6,540mm	5,620mm	
Dimensions			
Height	2,540mm	2,450mm	The Pulse Smart Hub has a 66% smaller footprint than a standard kiosk design and when compared to the previously consented proposal has a 70% reduction in depth. This more than off-sets the very modest increase in height (just 110mm) and width (just 0.170mm). The scale and footprint of the Pulse Smart Hub is the minimum required to accommodate the telecommunications and smart city equipment. Overall, the size of the Hub, certainly given it occupies significantly less space than the previously approved kiosk is considered appropriate to the immediate context and judged within the context of the previous kiosk is not incongruously large in the street scene and will not harm the Conservation Area.
Width	1,280mm	1,110mm	
Depth	400mm	1,320mm	
Materials			
	Gloss gel coated fibreglass	Powder coated metal frame	Overall appearance remains that of a lightweight structure with the black laminated glass elements and media screens retaining the sense of a light and airy modern design complementing a viable town centre
	Anodised metal	Reinforced laminated glass	
	Black laminated glass	Solar panels on roof	
	Media screen x 2 sides		
Advertisement			
	X 2 internally illuminated screens each measuring 1.66m x 0.93m set 0.54m above ground.	N/A	All advertisement content displayed to human scale with the eye essentially being drawn to a height of just 2.2m i.e. contained to ground level set within the context of a busy commercial street where the facades of most of the ground floor buildings are characterised by non-residential uses with retail frontages and other signage and street furniture. Illuminance levels within the guidance contained within the Institute of Lighting Professional (ILP) Technical Note. The advertising element of the Hub unit's siting, limited footprint and its depth, and overall scale and massing will not result in any material reduction in amenity with regard to overbearing impact, reduced daylight or through noise generation or light pollution. Consequently, the amenities of neighbouring occupiers would be protected. The Applicant will agree to a condition which restricts the hours that advertisement content can be displayed to between 00:00 – 06:00.
	To display static images in sequence changing no more frequently than every 10 seconds	NA	
	Illuminance levels during hours of operation limited to 600 c/m2 (dusk to dawn) and daytime levels adjusted automatically up to a maximum potential brightness of 2000 c/m2	N/A	

TRANSPORT (HIGHWAY SAFETY)			
Pedestrian sightlines			
	Siting and dimensions as above	Siting and dimensions as above	
Road user's view			
	As above	As above	As above
Clarity/effectiveness traffic sign			
	As above	As above	As above
Clearance above part of highway			
	As above	As above	As above
Other: Moving elements / close study / resemble traffic signs / embody directional or other traffic elements			
	See 'Advertising' section under Visual Impact and Amenity.	N/A	The proposed advertisements do not include moving elements, require close study, resemble traffic signs or embody directional or other traffic elements. Details of types of advertising are included in the submission – note Technical Appendices section of the DMOS.

6.13. At the same time whilst having a very substantially smaller footprint than a standard kiosk design, **Table 2** below provides a simple description of the multitude of services it provides when compared to the traditional redundant kiosk:

Table 2: Comparison of Services

Feature Types	Pulse Smart Hub	Telephone Kiosk
Keeping People Connected		
Paid calls	X	✓
Free phone calls	✓	X
Free charging for devices	✓	X
Small cell technology (to support mobile offloading -5G)	✓	X
Free public Wi-Fi	✓	X
Long Range Wide Area Network (LoRaWAN) enabled	✓	X
Smart City Platform		
Internet of Things (IoT) connectivity	✓	X
Open-source data collection and sharing	✓	X
Air Quality monitoring	✓	X
Footfall counting	✓	X
Evolutionary technology – built to stand the test of time	✓	X
Saving Lives		
Public Access Defibrillator (PAD)	✓	X
Nasol Naloxone opiate antagonists	✓	X
Specific 999 call function	✓	X
Emergency call button and emergency service protocols	✓	X
Built-in CCTV monitoring for evidentiary purposes	✓	X
Information Sharing		
Override protocols for policing purposes	✓	X
Public and emergency messaging	✓	X
5% plus free public advertising	✓	X
Public interface and local Information	✓	X
Local maps and wayfinding	✓	X
Digital advertising to modernise streetscapes	✓	X

The Material Planning Issues

6.14. The main issues of the proposed Pulse Smart Hub installation are:

- The principle of development and the public benefits.
- The effect on public amenity.
- The effect on streetscape and heritage assets or their settings.
- The effect on highway safety and security including impacts on highway sightlines and the free movement along the public highway by all users, including people with disabilities, especially the visually impaired.
- The effect on trees on or in close proximity to the proposed site, especially those protected by Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) or within conservation areas.
- If any harm is identified at any of the proposed locations whether that harm would be outweighed by public benefits.

6.15. The principle of development and public benefits of this Pulse Smart Hub proposal are assessed first – drawing significantly from the Applicant's experiences in the successful roll out of its Pulse Smart Hub network in Belfast.

6.16. An assessment of the location then follows to consider siting and appearance and highway and pedestrian safety. Where relevant, other factors such as any relevant planning history are also considered.

Principle of Development and the Public Benefits

6.17. With the roll of out of 5G, which will deliver faster broadband speed and the ability to connect more devices at the same time, each hub is enabled with Internet of Things (IoT) technology to assist in the collection and sharing of data. Each Hub is future proofed to meet the specific needs of the community they may serve and to enable new technologies to be added as they are needed. For example, each hub is enabled to dispense Nasal Naloxone, a drug used under controlled conditions for the emergency treatment of a drug overdose. This was a new feature added to the Hubs following stakeholder engagement with Public Health Northern Ireland and drug outreach services across Belfast.

6.18. The **very significant** public benefits are now described under the following for headings.

Benefit 1: Keeping People Connected

6.19. On average at least 4,000 free local and national calls are made annually across the Belfast Pulse Smart Hub network. Homeless charities are among the top 10 most called numbers and taxi services are the most frequently called land line numbers.

6.20. Drawing from Belfast keeping people connected by means of:

- Free phone calls via touch screen
- Public convenience Wi-Fi provision
- Of faster 4G (fourth generation) and 5G (fifth generation) technology used to log into the mobile internet and allow online access on a mobile device without needing to connect to a cable or Wi-Fi
- Mobile device charging (inc. wireless)
- Space for other telecom devices

is considered to be a **very significant benefit**.

Benefit 2: Contributing to the Smart City

6.21. Data is key to informing organisations understanding of, and making decisions, on improving their local environment. The Pulse Smart Hub provides this data at no cost to organisations such as Town Centre management teams that would benefit from it.

6.22. Drawing from Belfast providing smart technology to enhance quality, performance and interactivity of services, to reduce costs and resource consumption and to increase contact with the local community and public services through the provision of:

- Power, data and space for city centre technology to enable a better understanding of our cities e.g. collecting and sharing data on air quality, pedestrian footfall and traffic flow.
- Environmental sensors collecting Nitric Oxide, Nitrogen Dioxide and Carbon Monoxide data has been collected over 5 years and has been shared with the local council.
- Small cell networks to boost wireless network connectivity, comprising base stations with low power consumption and cheap cost to facilitate the delivery of faster 4G (fourth generation) and 5G (fifth generation) technology

is a **very significant benefit**.

Benefit 3: Protecting and Saving Lives

6.23. Working closely with the police, public health services and charities UIC has developed close partnerships and protocols to continually improve and enhance the Pulse Smart Hub life-saving features described in Section 4; namely:

- Call 999 from the touchscreen to speed up emergency responses.
- Emergency button available for critical scenarios or vulnerable people.
- Fitted cameras for real time monitoring when the emergency button is activated.
- Fitted with lifesaving Nasal Naloxone.
- Emergency public safety call Partnership protocols in place with emergency services including police e.g. police and health and social care services i.e. the police can take

immediate control of the screens in the event of emergency, removing the advertising in place of important public messages.

- Real time reporting to the public of unexpected events e.g. severe weather warning, public disorder or criminal activity, major fire or explosion, pandemics, acts of war or terrorism or major structural collapse.

6.24. According to the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) access to and use of a defibrillator is the number one intervention to increase the likelihood of survival from out of hospital cardiac arrest. Cardiac arrest survival rates are 70% higher if a defibrillator is used within five minutes of arrest. Survival chances decrease by 10% for every minute without access to a defibrillator. Using Belfast as an example on average 1 defibrillator is deployed every month across the City. Furthermore, UIC has run 25 hours of free public defibrillator training.

6.25. The provision of a defibrillator is therefore considered to be a **very significant benefit** in addition to the other lifesaving technology accessible through the Pulse Smart Hub.

Benefit 4: Sharing Information

6.26. Drawing from Belfast an average at least 2,000 people accessed council information, and 2,000 people accessed information on local charities across the Belfast "Pulse Smart Hub" network. This information can be always accessed free of charge.

6.27. Over the last 5 years in Belfast:

- A minimum of 10% of all display time has been given over to local organisations.
- Over 1,500 free public messages have been shown.
- Wayfinding has been used an average of 45 times per month.
- 223 local event pages are typically viewed by the local community per month.

6.28. Daily people are also able to access live maps, digital wayfinding, weather forecast and information relating to the area. In Belfast, the interactive tablet connects directly through the Visit Belfast tourism website. People can directly access 'what's on' information, attractions and events within the vicinity of each hub. This helps promote local business and in turn supports the vitality and vibrancy of town and city centres.

6.29. Furthermore, a minimum of 5% of total screen time on the main two digital screens is given over for free to local organisations, businesses and the community to use on a daily basis. In Belfast the screens have been used by the Police, Council, City Centre Management, Charities and Tourism Boards amongst others. Across a typical 18-hour window of screentime, 5% is equivalent to 650 free messaging spots per hub for the community to benefit from free of

charge. UIC and its advertising partners also support creative formatting to help the local community make best use of the screens.

6.30. It is within this context that the Pulse Smart Hub's ability to allow the public free to access hyper-local information for what's on as well as council, visitor and charity information services and helplines, whilst also providing the opportunity for free local promotion and advertising, is considered to be a **very significant benefit.**

Summary of Benefits

6.31. Drawing these collective public benefits together, which can all be accessed free of charge the principle of development is supported within the context of the Development Plan; namely London Plan Policy SI 6: Digital connectivity infrastructure of the London Plan

6.32. Indirectly, the multitude of services provided free of charge also contribute to other key London Plan policy objectives by making the city safer and more accessible at all times of the day and night through free access to the digital technology the Pulse Smart Hubs will deliver in terms of access to emergency services including the police and paramedics, access to a defibrillator, access to hyper local information for what is on as well as council, visitor and charity information, services and helplines, access to digital way finding and mapping, and access to public messaging. These include London Plan:

- Policy D11 which seeks to promote safety, security and resilience to emergency.
- Policy S1 with the aim of developing London's social infrastructure.
- Policy HC6 which supports measures that promote the night-time economy.

6.33. The legislative framework described above establishes the principle of development and there can be no policy requirement to explore opportunities for co-location under Part D of Policy 19, notwithstanding the proposals are innovative insofar as they represent smart street furniture that introduces shared facilities with the very considerable public benefits outlined above. Furthermore, due to the nature of the proposals it is simply not feasible to locate the hubs anywhere else other than on the public highway or attached to any existing structures. As a matter of principle, the proposals accords with Policy D4 of the City Plan.

6.34. Moreover, the proposals meet the objectives of the NPPF in delivering advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure which is essential for economic growth and social well-being (para. 118) and will deliver mobile digital connectivity that supports national, regional and local digital strategies and policy statements.

6.35. In conclusion **very substantial weight** should be attributed to:

i. That as a matter of principle the proposed "Hub" locations are supported in policy terms.
ii. The very significant and evidenced public benefits these proposals will deliver.

6.36. Having concluded that there are very considerable public benefits in the delivery of Pulse Smart Hubs, attention turns to the individual assessment of the proposals, which is examined under the following headings.

Assessment of Impact

6.37. With reference to the Planning History sub-sections (Section 2) in connection with the previous Prior Approval proposals at the following locations:

- Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street
- Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)

it was concluded in each case that they would not:

- Detrimentally add to clutter that would harm the character and appearance of their respective areas.
- Result in undue harm to the safety of the public and agreed that the siting of the kiosks would not compromise pedestrian user and highway safety.

6.38. The current hub proposals assume a significantly more streamlined form than the previously approved kiosk design. Whilst there is a slight increase in height by 500mm from 2,450mm to 2,500mm the Hub will take up significantly less space, and therefore will appear less cluttered in the street scene, with a very significant reduction in depth of 710mm from 1,110mm to 400mm. The width of the proposed Hub compared to the kiosk is also reduced by 0.20mm from 1,320mm to 1,300mm.

6.39. The advertisement element of the proposals is very modest in scale noting that all advertisements will be statically displayed. Ambient noise and light levels will comply with the latest standards and current best practice. Judged in the context of each proposed Hub location it is concluded that the advertisement elements of each proposal will not cause any additional layer of harm to the locations on any aspect of amenity or highway safety.

6.40. At the same time, with reference to Table 2 'Comparison of Services' showing the multitude of services offered by the Pulse Smart Hub when compared to the standard telephone kiosk proposed, the delivery of public benefits is very significantly greater.

6.41. The Inspectors description of the site and surroundings remains reflective of what is evident on the ground today and that in terms of character and appearance of the street scene very little has changed since the 2018 decisions.

6.42. Whilst the previous proposals were considered under a previous Development Plan regime the material planning considerations and weight to be attached in respect of the identified issues – public amenity, streetscape and heritage assets, highway safety and trees remain unchanged.

The effect on public amenity

6.43. Within the context of the previous appeal decisions, it is submitted that the proposals at:

- Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street
- Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)

will avoid unacceptable harm to public amenity.

The effect on highway safety

6.44. Within the context of the previous appeal decisions, it is submitted that the proposals at:

- Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street
- Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)

will not compromise safety and security or obscure highway sightlines and allow free movement along the public highway by all users, including people with disabilities, especially the visually impaired.

Effect on streetscape and heritage assets

6.45. Within the context of the previous appeal decisions, it is submitted that the proposals at:

- Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street
- Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)

will avoid harm to the significance of streetscape and heritage assets or their settings.

Effect on trees

6.46. Within the context of the previous appeal decisions, it is submitted that the proposals at:

- Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street
- Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road
- Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road
- Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)

will not adversely impact on trees on or in close proximity to the proposed site, especially those protected by Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) or within conservation areas.

6.47. The Pulse Smart Hubs are located at ground floor level and relate well to their surroundings in terms of size, scale and siting.

6.48. It has been demonstrated that:

- The proposals would not harm amenity or compromise public safety, including security.
- The digital screen for the display of illuminated content is appropriate in scale to its surroundings with the level of illuminance designed not to appear overly bright.
- The Hub is located in a commercial area where advertising is considered appropriate, and the Pulse Smart Hub will not clutter the street.

6.49. Accordingly, it is submitted that there is no inherent conflict with policies and guidance at the national level with no conflict with London Plan policies:

- Policy D4: Delivering good design
- Policy D5: Inclusive design
- Policy HC1: Heritage conservation and growth

and Camden policies:

- Policy A1 Managing the impact of development
- Policy D1: Design
- Policy D2: Heritage
- Policy D4: Advertisements

and all other supplementary planning guidance including the Camden Digital Infrastructure and Adverts supplementary planning documents.

6.50. The Our Responsibilities statement attached at **Appendix C** sets out commitments from UIC to fully adhere to the above ICIRP Guidelines on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection and to avoid interference with other electrical equipment.

6.51. The proposals are innovative insofar as they represent smart digital street furniture, designed and installed in accordance with current guidelines and best practice and the application demonstrates that the proposals have followed and are in accordance with the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England.

6.52. Due to the nature of the proposals, it is simply not feasible to attach the hubs to existing structures or locate them anywhere else other than on the public highway or attached to any existing structures. However, they do introduce shared facilities with the very considerable public benefits outlined above.

7. Conclusions

7.1. Strategically positioned, the Pulse Smart Hubs will create a free telecommunications and services network, enhancing modern digital infrastructure, whilst improving public safety on the streets, with access to emergency services and lifesaving equipment.

7.2. With the roll of out of 5G, which will deliver faster broadband speed and the ability to connect more devices at the same time, each Hub is enabled with Internet of Things (IoT) technology to assist in the collection and sharing of data. Each Hub is future proofed to meet the specific needs of the community they serve and to enable new technologies to be added as they are needed.

7.3. It has been demonstrated that the principle for delivering the Pulse Smart Hubs at the locations identified in these applications accord with the Development Plan and that **very substantial weight** should be afforded to the **very significant benefits** the strategically placed Pulse Smart Hubs will deliver in line with digital strategies and key policy objectives set out at national level, and at the regional – through the Greater London Authority and the London Plan - and through the City at the local level.

7.4. It has further been demonstrated that the proposed Pulse Smart Hub locations will not have a detrimental impact on:

- Public amenity
- Highway safety
- Streetscape and heritage assets
- Trees

7.5. Finally, the Applicant has no objection to the imposition of prior to installation conditions e.g. colour of finished materials as well as operational conditions, subject to dialogue during the determination period, on a grant of Planning Permission and Advertisement Consent e.g. to control the luminance levels and the operation of the digital screens.

7.6. For the reasons above the proposals are commended to the Council for approval.

Appendices

Appendix A: Schedule of Plans and Documents

Location 1: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road

General

Title
Planning Application and Advertisement Consent Form
Ownership Certificate
Article 12 Certificate (Agricultural Land Declaration)

Application Plans and Illustrative Material

Title	**Drawing Number**	**Scale**	**Author**
Site Location Plan	Cam-CFR1/2024/01	1:1,250@	UIC
Existing Site Plan	Cam-CFR1/2024/02	1:500@A3	UIC
Proposed Site Plan	Cam-CFR1/2024/03	1:200@A3	UIC
Technical Specifications Elevations	Cam-CFR1/2024/04	1:25@A3	UIC
Photograph of Existing	Cam-CFR1/2024/05	NTS	UIC
Proposed Illustration	Cam-CFR1/2024/06	NTS	UIC

Location 2: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street

General

Title
Planning Application and Advertisement Consent Form
Ownership Certificate
Article 12 Certificate (Agricultural Land Declaration)

Application Plans and Illustrative Material

Title	**Drawing Number**	**Scale**	**Author**
Site Location Plan	Cam-OGS/2024/01	1:1,250@	UIC
Existing Site Plan	Cam-OGS/2024/02	1:500@A3	UIC
Proposed Site Plan	Cam-OGS/2024/03	1:200@A3	UIC
Technical Specifications Elevations	Cam-OGS/2024/04	1:25@A3	UIC
Photograph of Existing	Cam-OGS/2024/05	NTS	UIC
Proposed Illustration	Cam-OGS/2024/06	NTS	UIC

Location 3: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road

General

Title
Planning Application and Advertisement Consent Form
Ownership Certificate
Article 12 Certificate (Agricultural Land Declaration)

Application Plans and Illustrative Material

Title	Drawing Number	Scale	Author
Site Location Plan	Cam-CR1/2024/01	1:1,250@	UIC
Existing Site Plan	Cam-CR1/2024/02	1:500@A3	UIC
Proposed Site Plan	Cam-CR1/2024/03	1:200@A3	UIC
Technical Specifications Elevations	Cam-CR1/2024/04	1:25@A3	UIC
Photograph of Existing	Cam-CR1/2024/05	NTS	UIC
Proposed Illustration	Cam-CR1/2024/06	NTS	UIC

Location 4: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road

General

Title
Planning Application and Advertisement Consent Form
Ownership Certificate
Article 12 Certificate (Agricultural Land Declaration)

Application Plans and Illustrative Material

Title	Drawing Number	Scale	Author
Site Location Plan	Cam-CR2/2024/01	1:1,250@	UIC
Existing Site Plan	Cam-CR2/2024/02	1:500@A3	UIC
Proposed Site Plan	Cam-CR2/2024/03	1:200@A3	UIC
Technical Specifications Elevations	Cam-CR2/2024/04	1:25@A3	UIC
Photograph of Existing	Cam-CR2/2024/05	NTS	UIC
Proposed Illustration	Cam-CR2/2024/06	NTS	UIC

Location 5: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road

General

Title
Planning Application and Advertisement Consent Form
Ownership Certificate
Article 12 Certificate (Agricultural Land Declaration)

Application Plans and Illustrative Material

Title	Drawing Number	Scale	Author
Site Location Plan	Cam-CFR2/2024/01	1:1,250@	UIC
Existing Site Plan	Cam-CFR2/2024/02	1:500@A3	UIC
Proposed Site Plan	Cam-CFR2/2024/03	1:200@A3	UIC
Technical Specifications Elevations	Cam-CFR2/2024/04	1:25@A3	UIC
Photograph of Existing	Cam-CFR2/2024/05	NTS	UIC
Proposed Illustration	Cam-CFR2/2024/06	NTS	UIC

Location 6: Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road)

General

Title
Planning Application and Advertisement Consent Form
Ownership Certificate
Article 12 Certificate (Agricultural Land Declaration)

Application Plans and Illustrative Material

Title	Drawing Number	Scale	Author
Site Location Plan	Cam-IR/2024/01	1:1,250@	UIC
Existing Site Plan	Cam-IR/2024/02	1:500@A3	UIC
Proposed Site Plan	Cam-IR/2024/03	1:200@A3	UIC
Technical Specifications Elevations	Cam-IR/2024/04	1:25@A3	UIC
Photograph of Existing	Cam-IR/2024/05	NTS	UIC
Proposed Illustration	Cam-IR/2024/06	NTS	UIC

The following documents are common to, and support, all the proposed Pulse Smart Hub locations:

Submitted in Support

Documents	Author
Planning Statement	DPV
Design, Management and Operational Statement	UIC

Appendix B: Installation of Telephone Kiosks
App Bi: Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road (APP/X5210/W/17/3180682)
App Bii: Pavement Outside The Holborn Hotel, on the North Side of Theobald's Road at the Junction with Old Gloucester Street (APP/X5210/W/17/3195372)
App Biii: Pavement outside 133 Clerkenwell Road (APP/X5210/W/18/3195374)
App Biv: Land adjacent to 85 Clerkenwell Road (APP/X5210/W/18/3180694)
App Bv: Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road (APP/X5210/W/18/3202786) and Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road) (APP/X5210/W/18/3202789)

Attached Separately

Appendix C: Our Responsibilities Statement, UIC

Attached separately