

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		21/05/2025	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		04/05/2025	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Geri Gohin				1. 2025/1324/P 2. 2025/1437/A			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
Pavement outside The Heals Building, 191-199 Tottenham Court Road London W1T 7LQ				Refer to draft decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
1. Installation of telephone call box with digital screen following removal of existing; and 2. Display of an LCD digital advertising screen integrated within a telephone call box.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		1. Refuse Planning Permission 2. Refuse Advertisement Consent					
<b>Application Types:</b>		1. Full Planning Permission 2. Advertisement Consent					
<b>Reason(s) for refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining occupiers and local residents / groups</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>	

**Summary of all  
consultation  
responses:**

A site notice was displayed on 09/04/2025 and expired on 03/05/2025

In response to the proposal, an objection was received from a local resident:  
*'I oppose this application. Camden should be encouraged to continue in its welcome efforts to be removing all "modern" phone boxes of all types and descriptions and not permitting in the replacement of existing units (or allowing new ones) into the area. There is zero legitimate demand for phone calls from these units; if they are used it is typically for anti-social or criminal related activity. Furthermore, phone boxes whether they are closed or of the proposed design are used for storage of rubbish, drug taking and as toilets. Locating this ugly unit so close to Heals that has been called "a beacon of design on the high street" adds insult to injury. The last thing Tottenham Court Road needs is more of these poorly designed installations.'*

**Metropolitan Police (Designing Out Crime Officer)**

Responded to the proposals, as follows:

*'The development falls within the policing ward of Bloomsbury. The top reported crimes for the month of March 2025 (taken from the police UK website) were theft from the person, other theft, antisocial behaviour and violence and sexual offences. Other offences of note for this area include shoplifting, robbery and public order.'*

***I object to the proposal for the following reasons:***

- This area suffers with higher than average crime rates. Opportunistic crime such as theft from the person is prevalent. The location of the kiosk is in very close proximity to the carriageway. Due to the openness of the kiosk any mobile phones on display at this location (either on charge or in the person's hand) will be vulnerable to the opportunist phone snatch.*
- This specific location is a known charity outreach area for the local street population. The arches and recess spaces on the façade of Heal and Sons are taken up with tents and temporary bedding overnight. The American church opposite runs a soup kitchen and is registered as a warm space in the colder months. This attracts a higher than usual amount of homeless to the area. A portion of the street population are drug users. It is felt that the communication hub could boost the local drug trade in and around this area.*
- The current phone box appears to be used as a storage cupboard for cardboard and other pieces of material to be used as bedding for the homeless that evening. There is also refuse bags propped up. It is not helped by the fact that the phone box has been damaged with graffiti. This has not been repaired and does not look appealing for the public to use in its intended manner.'*

## Site Description

The application site comprises of an area of the footway adjacent to no. 191-199 Tottenham Court Road (A400) on the eastern side of the road.

The pavement here is approximately 6.6 metres in width (excluding the private forecourt area). The site is characterised by a complete lack of bulky items of street furniture adjacent to the kerbside, except for the existing kiosk. There are some slender lamp columns, traffic signal poles and sign posts in the general vicinity of the site. This is a busy road for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic and is positioned approximately 11 metres south of a pedestrian crossing at the junction with Torrington Place and Tottenham Court Road.

The site sits adjacent to a Grade II\* Listed Building, known as The Heals Building (nos.191-199 Tottenham Court Road, including nos. 18-28 Torrington Place). It is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to the Charlotte Street Conservation Area across the road to the west. The site is also located within both the Fitzrovia East Neighbourhood and Fitzrovia Action Areas.

## Relevant History

### Application site:

2021/2111/P - Installation of a new phone hub unit following removal of existing kiosk as part of wider proposals to replace Infocus telephone kiosks. Refused 18/11/2021. Appeal dismissed dated 14/11/2022 (APP/X5210/W/22/3290323 – see appendix 2). *'The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and its general amenity. It would also harm an aspect of the listed building's setting that contributes to its significance and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the two conservation areas. It would thus fail to accord with the requirements of the LBCA. It would also be contrary to Policies D1, D2 and D4 of the LP, which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high quality of design and preserve the character and amenity of an area including designated heritage assets.'* Paragraph 66.

2021/3108/A - Display of LCD advertisement display with static images on the side of new phone hub unit. Refused 18/11/2021. Appeal dismissed dated 14/11/2022 (APP/X5210/H/22/3290325 – see appendix 2).

2019/2697/P - Installation of 1 x replacement telephone kiosk on the pavement. GPDO prior Approval refused 12/07/2019. Refused on grounds that (1) proposal not wholly for the purpose of the operator's electronic network; and by reason of its location, size and detailed design would (2) add to visual clutter and detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Buildings; (3) would reduce the amount of useable, unobstructed footway, which would be detrimental to the quality of the public realm and hinder pedestrian movement and have a detrimental impact on the promotion of walking as an alternative to motorised transport; and (4) would fail to reduce opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour to the detriment of community safety and security, and compromise the safety of those using and servicing the telephone kiosk.

2017/5186/A - Display of a 6 sheet internally (back lit) LED illuminated advertisement panel to south-eastern elevation of existing public payphone. Advertisement consent refused 23/11/2017 on grounds that by reason of its' location and illumination (1) would be unduly dominant and visually obtrusive in the street scene, and harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the adjacent Grade II\* listed building through the adverse effect on its' setting, and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and nearby Charlotte Street Conservation Area; and (2) would be a harmful distraction to drivers and other road users on the approach to the junction with a pedestrian crossing and be detrimental to highway and public safety. Appeal dismissed dated 10/07/2018

2017/5186/A - Display of a 6 sheet internally (back lit) LED illuminated advertisement panel to south-eastern elevation of existing public payphone. Advertisement consent refused 23/11/2017 on grounds that by reason of its' location and illumination (1) would be unduly dominant and visually obtrusive in the street scene, and harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the adjacent Grade II\* listed building through the adverse effect on its' setting, and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and nearby Charlotte Street Conservation Area; and (2) would be a harmful distraction to drivers and other road users on the approach to the junction with a pedestrian crossing and be detrimental to highway and public safety. Appeal dismissed dated 10/07/2018

2014/3673/A - Display of internally illuminated panel to side of bus stop. Advertisement consent application was withdrawn dated 05/08/2014

2009/1035/P - Installation of telephone kiosk on the public highway. GPDO prior approval refused 19/05/2009. On the grounds that proposed telephone kiosk, by reason of its design, size and location would introduce an incongruous feature with the streetscape, add to visual clutter detracting from the pedestrian environment and the setting of the adjoining Charlotte Street conservation area and Grade II\* Listed Building.

### **Enforcement action**

Pavement outside 196-199 Tottenham Court Road (Infocus kiosk)

As part of a separate enforcement investigation following complaints about the underused and poorly maintained telephone kiosks along Tottenham Court Road, Enforcement notices have been served on a number of kiosks in the street as a breach of condition A.2 (b) (Part 16 Class A) of the GPDO 2015. The existing Infocus kiosk at the application site is one of the units which the Council is seeking to remove (along with nos. 80 and 105 Tottenham Court Road).

### **Other neighbouring sites:**

Adjacent to 80-85 Tottenham Court Road

2018/5531/P - Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. Prior Approval refused 20/12/2018 and Appeal dismissed dated 09/12/2019

Outside 81 Tottenham Court Road

2019/2690/P - Installation of 1 x replacement telephone kiosk on the pavement. Prior Approval refused 11/07/2018

Outside 105 Tottenham Court Road

2019/2692/P - Installation of 1 x replacement telephone kiosk on the pavement. Prior Approval refused 11/07/2018

Outside 82 Tottenham Court Road

2018/0515/A - Erection of double-sided freestanding advertisement panel to display 2 x internally illuminated digital advertisements, following the removal of existing freestanding advertisement panel. Advertisement consent granted 14/08/2018

Adjacent 80-85 Tottenham Court Road

2018/0312/P - Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. Prior Approval refused 15/03/2018 and Appeal allowed dated 28/08/2019

Land Adjacent to 90 Tottenham Court Road

2018/5562/P - Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. Prior Approval refused 20/12/2018 and Appeal dismissed dated 09/12/2019

Land Adjacent to 90 Tottenham Court Road

2018/0333/P - Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. Prior Approval refused 15/03/2018 and Appeal dismissed dated 16/10/2019

Land Adjacent to 90 Tottenham Court Road  
2017/1026/P - Installation of 1 x telephone box. Prior Approval refused 07/04/2017

Adjacent 80-85 Tottenham Court Road  
2017/1199/P - Installation of 1 x telephone box. Prior Approval refused 07/04/2017

Adjacent 80-81 Tottenham Court Road  
2010/5338/A - Relocation of internally illuminated free-standing advertising column to the pavement.  
Advertisement consent granted 01/12/2010

Adjacent 80-81 Tottenham Court Road  
2009/1037/P - Installation of telephone kiosk on the public highway. Prior Approval refused 19/05/2009

Outside 80-81 Tottenham Court Road  
A9601569 – Display of free standing illuminated advertisements. Advertisement consent granted 24/07/1997

Outside 185-186 Tottenham Court Road  
PS9604101 - Upgrade existing telephone kiosks. Prior Approval granted (in default) 04/12/1996

Outside 93 Tottenham Court Road  
PS9604096 - Upgrade existing telephone kiosks. Prior Approval granted (in default) 04/12/1996

### **Relevant policies**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework 2024**

Sections 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy), 10 (Supporting high quality communications) and 12 (Achieving well-designed places)

#### **London Plan 2021**

Policy D8 (Public Realm)  
Policy T2 (Healthy Streets)

#### **TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance for London 2010**

#### **Camden Local Plan 2017**

A1 Managing the impact of development  
C5 Safety and Security  
C6 Access  
D1 Design  
D2 Heritage  
D4 Advertisements  
D8 Public Realm  
G1 Delivery and location of growth  
T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

#### **Draft Camden Local Plan**

A [Submission Draft Camden Local Plan](#) (updated to take account of consultation responses) was reported to Cabinet on 2 April 2025 and the Council on 7 April 2025. The Council resolved to agree the Submission Draft Local Plan for publication and submission to the government for examination (following a further period of consultation). The Submission Draft is a significant material consideration in the determination of planning applications but still has limited weight at this stage.

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG Design 2021 - chapters 2 (Design excellence), 3 (Heritage) and 7 (Designing safer environments)

CPG Transport 2021 - chapters 7 (Vehicular access and crossovers) and 9 (Pedestrian and cycle movement)

CPG Advertisements 2018 – paragraphs 1.1 to 1.15 (General guidance and advertising on street furniture); and 1.34 to 1.38 (Digital advertisements)

CPG Amenity 2021 - chapter 4 (Artificial light)

### **Camden Streetscape Design Manual**

**Digital Roadside Advertising and Proposed Best Practice (commissioned by Transport for London) March 2013**

**Design of an accessible and inclusive built environment. External environment - code of practice (BS8300-1:2018 and BS-2:2018)**

**Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (adopted April 2011)**

**Charlotte Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (adopted July 2008)**

**Fitzrovia Area Action Plan - Part 3: Vision and objectives (adopted March 2014)**

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

- 1.1 It is proposed to remove an existing telephone kiosk (see Images 1 and 2 below) and replace it with a telephone kiosk with an updated design (see Images 3 and 4 below). The existing kiosk is considered to be in a poor condition and limited use demonstrated by the signs of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), including storage of cardboard.

Images 1 and 2 (Street View Images – July 2024 on the left and April 2023 on the right)



Images 3 and 4, Proposed unit:



1.2 The proposed new, replacement kiosk would be located on an area of the footway on the eastern side of Tottenham Court Road. The pavement here is approximately 6.6 metres in width (excluding the private forecourt area). Appendix C (Existing and Proposed Units Comparison) of the application submission states that the kiosk would measure 1.4m (W) x 2.5m (H). The rear elevation of the proposed kiosk would contain a digital advertisement screen. Appendix A (LCD Telephony Network Detail) confirms that the screen would measure 1.005m (W) x 1.860 metres (H) with a visible display area of 2sqm. The screen's luminance level would not exceed 300 cd/sqm during the hours between dusk and dawn.

## **2. Assessment**

2.1 On 25 May 2019, the GPDO was amended through the adoption of the Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development, Advertisement and Compensation Amendments) (England) Regulations 2019. This amendment has had the effect of removing permitted development rights to install a public call box under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO. Accordingly a planning application and associated advertisement consent application have been submitted.

2.2 As planning permission is now required for the installation of a telephone kiosk, the Council can take into consideration more than just the siting, design and appearance of the kiosk. The Council is also able to take into consideration all relevant planning policies and legislation.

2.3 The current applications form 1 set of 5 similar sets of planning and advertisement consent applications in which the proposed development seeks the overall introduction of 5 new, replacement kiosks. If planning permission was to be approved, a legal agreement would be required to secure these matters to ensure that all old kiosks were removed in a timely fashion and to include other management controls.

## **3. Design**

3.1 Policy D1 (Design) of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring buildings, its contribution to the public realm, and its impact on wider views and vistas.

3.2 Local Plan Policy D2 (Heritage) recognises that the setting of a listed building is of great importance and should not be harmed by unsympathetic neighbouring development. Paragraph 7.60 advises that *'the value of a listed building can be greatly diminished if unsympathetic development elsewhere harms its appearance or its harmonious relationship with its surroundings.'* Further, Policy D2 states that the Council will only permit works that would not *'cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building'* (Paragraph 7.62), and *'resist development that would cause harm to significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting.'*

3.3 The Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy in paragraph 5.62 advises that *'the planning authority will seek to encourage improvements to the public realm including the reduction of street clutter and improved street lamps, way-finding and signage design.'*

3.4 The Fitzrovia Area Action Plan (Part 3: Vision and objectives) promotes the creation of high quality physical environments in this locality through, *'enhancing the interaction between streets and the ground floors of buildings by removing visual clutter and encouraging high quality design.'* As an adopted Area Action Plan, the aims and objectives of Fitzrovia Area Action Plan are closely associated with the Camden Local Plan and have equal weight to Local Plan policies.



- 3.5 Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises the importance of design in managing and improving spaces, including the quality of place. The design of all built form, including street furniture, must be sustainable, functional, visually attractive, safe, inclusive and accessible, encourage innovation, be sympathetic to local character, and promote health and well-being.
- 3.6 The proposed structure is considered to be poor in design terms given its size and position on a relatively clear area of public footway, characterised by a complete lack of bulky items of street furniture adjacent to the kerbside, except for the existing kiosk, some slender lamp columns, traffic signal poles and sign posts in the general vicinity of the site. The proposed kiosk has been designed around the inclusion of a large digital screen which has resulted in a large monolithic structure which gives the overall appearance as an advertisement panel rather than a phone kiosk. This design approach has resulted in a structure which is dominant, visually intrusive and serves to detract from the appearance of the wider streetscene.
- 3.7 The illuminated digital advertising display screen would occupy most of the rear elevation of the kiosk (facing north). While it is accepted that all advertisements are intended to attract attention, the introduction of an illuminated advertisement panel in this particular location is therefore considered to be inappropriate as it would introduce a visually obtrusive piece of street furniture, detracting from the character and appearance of the wider streetscene, Fitzrovia East Neighbourhood and Bloomsbury Conservation Areas, and the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building, and so fail to adhere to Local Plan Policies D1 and D2 and the vision expressed in Part 3 of the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan.
- 3.8 It appears from the images included within the submission that the size of the unit is determined by the size of the advertising panel. This is an unfortunate ordering of the characteristics and would be better designed around the items on the other side of the unit (such as the wayfinding screen, USB charger, defibrillator, etc.) that may have some public benefit, with the overall unit (and therefore any advertising) being as small as these would allow.
- 3.9 It should also be noted that Camden has declared a climate emergency and considers the reduction in carbon emissions to be critical. These proposals go against that, with embodied carbon involved in the creation of the new units and operational carbon associated with running an illuminated screen that is expected to be higher than that of the existing payphone boxes.
- 3.10 Overall, therefore, the design of the unit is not considered to be the high quality that Camden expects across the borough's buildings, streets and open spaces. There is nothing distinctive or responsive to context within the proposal, which would appear to be a missed opportunity to create a uniquely Camden unit. The uncompromising bulk would have an adverse visual effect. At a time of re-invention of the street, with widening of pavements and appreciation of generous public realm, these proposals are a disappointing reinstatement of underused pavement clutter. The proposal lacks the initiative that has been shown elsewhere in the borough for creativity and reappraisal of streets and public spaces and fails to create something that might possibly be considered a genuine improvement on the poor condition of the underused existing kiosk.
- 3.11 In the appeal decision (Ref: APP/X5210/W/20/3254037 and 3252962 – see Appendix 3) in relation to a phone kiosk of a slightly smaller scale, but with a similar design approach, the Planning Inspector noted that, *'The visual impact of the kiosk would be increased by the large illuminated advertising panel, which would be a dominating feature on the structure. The panel, close to the kerbline, would be a prominent standalone illuminated feature. The panel would be unrelated to the services provided by the adjacent commercial units and would appear prominent in views along the street both during the day and in hours of darkness'*. (Paragraph 21).

- 3.12 Furthermore, Camden Planning Guidance (CPG Design) advises that *'the design of streets, public areas and the spaces between buildings, needs to be accessible, safe and uncluttered. Well-designed street furniture and public art in streets and public places can contribute to a safe and distinctive urban environment'*. As such, street furniture should not obstruct pedestrian views or movement.
- 3.13 As stated above, one of the aims of the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan (Part 3: Vision and objectives) is to promote high quality physical environments through de-cluttering existing footways in this locality in order to enhance pedestrian movement and public realm. Similarly, it is also important to note that Tottenham Court Road has been the subject of a major public realm renewal program as part of the Council's 'West End Project' involving an investment of £35m intended to transform this part of the borough. One of the objectives of the Project is to reduce the number of telephone kiosks and to declutter the public highway and streets, and as such, significant works have already taken place over the last few years to realise these improvements in this location.
- 3.14 However, there is no evidence in the application submission that any consideration has been given to the local aims and objectives of either the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan or the West End Project, nor has any attempt been made to integrate the Council's wider highway, urban realm and landscape proposals into the proposals. As an adopted Area Action Plan, the aims and objectives of the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan are closely associated with the Camden Local Plan and have equal weight to Local Plan policies. As such, the proposal is at odds with the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan, and the broader, integrated approach of the Council to improve and rationalise the public realm throughout the Borough, and would fail to adhere to Local Plan Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) and CPG Design, Part 3 (Vision and objectives) of the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan, as well, as the core design principles as set out in Section 12 of the NPPF.

#### Heritage

- 3.15 Local Plan Policy D2 (Heritage) recognises that the setting of a listed building is of great importance and should not be harmed by unsympathetic neighbouring development. Paragraph 7.60 advises that *'the value of a listed building can be greatly diminished if unsympathetic development elsewhere harms its appearance or its harmonious relationship with its surroundings.'*
- 3.16 Further, Policy D2 states that the Council will only permit works that would not *'cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building'*, and *'resist development that would cause harm to significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting.'*
- 3.17 The application site sits adjacent to a Grade II\* Listed Building, known as The Heals Building (nos.191-199 Tottenham Court Road, including nos. 18-28 Torrington Place). It is also located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area (and immediately adjacent to the Charlotte Street Conservation Area across the road to the west).
- 3.18 Notwithstanding the existence of a telephone kiosk in situ, the proposed kiosk would appear as a particularly obtrusive piece of street furniture and unduly dominant in this context, given its location and size, adding harmful visual clutter harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building through the adverse effect on its setting, and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. In this regard, the proposal would fail to adhere to Local Plan Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage).

3.19 In the appeal decision in 2022 (Ref **APP/X5210/W/22/3290323** – Appendix 2) for the installation of a new phone hub unit following removal of existing kiosk, the Inspector dismissed the proposal and noted:

*The removal of the existing kiosk would be a benefit that would attract modest weight. The provision of free services to the public such as phone charging, free calls, internet access and a defibrillator also weigh in favour of the proposal. However, even if I take these together, in the context of Paragraph 199 of the Framework, which establishes that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset, the public benefits before me are not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.'* Paragraph 65.

The Inspector also considered that *'the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and its general amenity. It would also harm an aspect of the listed building's setting that contributes to its significance and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the two conservation areas. It would thus fail to accord with the requirements of the LBCA. It would also be contrary to Policies D1, D2 and D4 of the LP, which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high quality of design and preserve the character and amenity of an area including designated heritage assets.'* Paragraph 66.

3.20 Furthermore, in a recent appeal decision for an internally illuminated advertisement on a bus shelter (Ref APP/X5210/Z/25/3359412 – Appendix 6), the Inspector acknowledged that *'in this location, in such proximity to the listed building, the overtly modern digital form of the proposed screen would jar injuriously with the Doric colonnade of the Friends House'* and that it *'would be to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area, even with controls relating to the time of operation and luminance levels.'* Paragraph 7. The Inspector concluded that *'the proposed advertisement would have a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the area having regard to its location in relation to heritage assets.'* Paragraph 9. This is very similar to this application as the site is also located adjacent to a grade II\* listed building (The Heals Building), within Bloomsbury Conservation Area as well as adjacent to the Charlotte Street Conservation Area.

3.21 Considerable importance and weight has also been attached to the desirability of preserving the adjacent listed building, its setting and features of special architectural or historic interest, and the conservation areas, under s.66 and s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.

3.22 Given the above assessment, it is considered that the addition of a new, replacement public telephone kiosk would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building.

#### Public benefit

3.23 Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) states that the Council will seek to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities.

3.24 Local Plan Policies D1 and D2, consistent with Paragraph 5.28 of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, and Chapter 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the NPPF which seeks to preserve and enhance heritage assets, state that the Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of a designated heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal convincingly outweigh that harm

3.25 More specifically, Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that *'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'*

3.26 It is acknowledged that the proposal would include public facilities and thereby result in some public benefit as a result of the scheme. Public facilities would include, a defibrillator, free Wi-Fi, possible free phone calls landlines and charities, wayfinding, device charging, public messaging capabilities and CCTV. However, there is no evidence that these facilities can only be provided on a kiosk of the proposed scale and design with the inclusion of a large digital panel.

3.27 Furthermore, no evidence has been provided as to how these types of facilities might be appropriately and safely used under current circumstances, especially given the prevalence of personal mobile phone ownership, which already provides many of the facilities proposed. Moreover, no details have been provided on the location of existing wayfinding or defibrillator coverage in the area or any consideration for whether there might already be scope for providing public messaging capabilities in some better way, for instance, on existing bus shelters within the street. It is also noted that public phone charging facilities of the type proposed can encourage anti-social behaviour (see also Section 5 below, 'Anti-Social Behaviour').

3.28 Weighing the less than substantial harm caused as a result of the proposed development against this limited public benefit, it is considered on balance that any benefit to the public arising from enhancing the proposal would not outweigh the harm arising to the character and appearance of the streetscene, Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building.

3.29 Overall, therefore, and on balance, the proposed development does not accord with Chapter 16 of the NPPF which seeks to preserve and enhance heritage assets, and the proposal is considered on balance to be unacceptable in design terms.

#### **4. Highways/footpath width**

4.1 Policy D8 (Public Realm) of the New London Plan states in regard to development proposals that '*Applications which seek to introduce unnecessary street furniture should normally be refused*'.

4.2 Policy T2 (Healthy Streets) of the New London Plan states that '*Development proposals should demonstrate how they will deliver improvements that support the ten Healthy Streets Indicators in line with Transport for London guidance*'. It is considered that the application would fail to deliver any improvements which support any of the ten Healthy Streets Indicators.

4.3 Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will seek to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities, and that the Council will resist development that fails to adequately assess and address transport impacts affecting communities, occupiers, neighbours and the existing transport network. Paragraph 6.10 states that the Council will expect works affecting the highway network to consider highway safety, with a focus on vulnerable road users, including the provision of adequate sightlines for vehicles, and that development should address the needs of vulnerable or disabled users.

4.4 Furthermore, Local Plan Policy T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) point (e) states that the Council will seek to ensure that developments provide high quality footpaths and pavements that are wide enough for the number of people expected to use them, including features to assist vulnerable road users where appropriate, and Paragraph 9.10 of CPG Transport highlights that footways should be wide enough for two people using wheelchairs, or prams, to pass each other.

4.5 Camden's Streetscape Design manual – section 3.01 footway width states the following:

- 'Clear footway' is not the distance from kerb to boundary wall, but the unobstructed pathway width within the footway;
- 1.8 metres – minimum width needed for two adults passing;
- 3 metres – minimum width for busy pedestrian street through greater widths are usually required;

- Keeping the footway width visually free of street furniture is also important, allowing clear sightlines along the street.

4.6 All development affecting footways in Camden is also expected to comply with Appendix B of Transport for London's (TfL's) Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, which notes that active and high flow locations must provide a minimum 2.2m and 3.3m of 'clear footway width' respectively for the safe and comfortable movement of pedestrians.

4.7 Local Plan Policy T1 of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will promote sustainable transport choices by prioritising walking, cycling and public transport use and that development should ensure that sustainable transport will be the primary means of travel to and from the site. Policy T1 subsections a) and b) state that in order to promote walking in the borough and improve the pedestrian environment, the Council will seek to ensure that developments improve the pedestrian environment by supporting high quality improvement works, and make improvements to the pedestrian environment including the provision of high quality safe road crossings where needed, seating, signage and landscaping.

4.8 Paragraph 9.7 of CPG Transport seeks improvements to streets and spaces to ensure good quality access and circulation arrangements for all. Ensuring the following:

- Safety of vulnerable road users, including children, elderly people and people with mobility difficulties, sight impairments, and other disabilities;
- Maximising pedestrian and cycle accessibility and minimising journey times making sites 'permeable';
- Providing stretches of continuous footways without unnecessary crossings;
- Making it easy to cross where vulnerable road users interact with motor vehicles;
- Linking to, maintaining, extending and improving the network of pedestrian and cycle routes;
- Taking account of surrounding context and character of the area;
- Providing a high quality environment in terms of appearance, design and construction, considering Conservation Areas and other heritage assets;
- Avoiding street clutter and minimising the risk of pedestrian routes being obstructed or narrowed, e.g. by footway parking or by unnecessary street furniture; and
- Having due regard to design guidance set out in the Camden Streetscape Design Manual, TfL's London Cycling Design Standards, TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Level Guidance and TfL's Healthy Street Indicators.

4.9 Paragraphs 7.41 and 7.42 of CPG Design provide guidance on telephone boxes and kiosks.

Paragraph 7.41 states that *'In all cases the Council will request that the provider demonstrates the need for the siting of the new facility. We will consider whether kiosks add to or create street clutter, particularly if there are existing phone kiosks in the vicinity'*. Paragraph 7.42 states that *'All new phone boxes should have a limited impact on the sightlines from or of the footway and should not hamper pedestrian movement. The size of the structure that the phone box is in should be minimised to limit its impact on the streetscene and to decrease the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour'*.

4.10 This is supported by Policy C5 (Safety and security) of the Camden Local Plan which requires development to contribute to community safety and security. In particular, Paragraph 4.89 states that *'The design of streets, public areas and the spaces between buildings needs to be accessible, safe and uncluttered. Careful consideration needs to be given to the design and location of any street furniture or equipment in order to ensure that they do not obscure public views or create spaces that would encourage antisocial behaviour'*.

- 4.11 The site is located on Tottenham Court Road (A400) which forms part of the strategic road network (SRN) and is located in a high footfall area in Central London between Goodge Street and Warren Street stations (both London Underground), on the opposite side of the road. This is a busy road for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Pedestrian volumes are extremely high in this location. The existing kiosk is located on the footway on the east side of Tottenham Court Road and is not located in a recognised street furniture zone. The site is characterised by a complete lack of bulky items of street furniture adjacent to the kerbside, except for the existing kiosk. There are some slender lamp columns, traffic signal poles and sign posts in the general vicinity of the site. The site is located 11 metres south of a pedestrian crossing controlled by traffic signals at the junction with Torrington Place.
- 4.12 Appendix B of 'Pedestrian Comfort Guidance for London (published by Transport for London) indicates that footways in high flow areas such as this should be at least 5.3 metres wide with a minimum effective footway width of 3.3 metres. The proposed site plan indicates that the footway width is 6.6 metres wide, and with the proposed telephone kiosk, the remaining footway would be 4.9 metres. It is acknowledged that the footway is wider than the minimum recommended width; however, the loss of any available footway space is considered to be unacceptable given that pedestrian footfall is exceptionally high at this location and is predicted to increase significantly with ongoing economic growth in Central London and High Speed Two (HS2) currently under construction.
- 4.13 The proposal would do nothing to improve matters for pedestrian movement along this part of the footway beyond a marginal reduction in width of available footway. Indeed, the proposal would simply re-introduce another significant physical and visual obstruction to a busy pedestrian environment, so failing to improve the pedestrian movement at the site. This is considered to be unacceptable in such a high footfall location in Central London (arguably the highest footfall in the Borough). Enforcement action taken to date has secured the removal of 19 phone kiosks out of the 32 kiosks within the street. Allowing the reinstatement of phone kiosks with digital screens, when the Council is demonstrating that older kiosks are no longer required for telecommunication purposes would be contrary to the Council's aims to declutter our pavements and improve the public realm.
- 4.14 Similar to the existing telephone kiosk proposed to be removed, the proposed kiosk would also obscure sightlines along the footway. This section of footway should therefore be kept clear from bulky items of street furniture such as the type of telephone kiosk being proposed. The proposed kiosk would therefore worsen the situation at the site by obscuring sightlines along the footway and would constitute an unnecessary obstruction or hazard to pedestrians and road users alike.
- 4.15 Observations on site by the Planning Officer indicate that pedestrians cross the road at this location, even though dedicated pedestrian crossing facilities are located 11 metres to the north of the site. In this regard, the proposal represents a similar situation to 2 similar applications on the pavement outside Euston Tower on west side of Hampstead Road (See Appendix 4 - Appeal decision refs. APP/X5210/W/18/3195366 and 3195365). The Planning Inspector in dismissing those appeals noted that *'The kiosk would impinge here into a clear area uncluttered by any street furniture, which has been sensitively designed. As such it would spoil this uncluttered design by introducing a prominent feature that would look out of place.'* The Inspector also concluded that *'A kiosk here would not significantly interfere with pedestrian flows. But the site is close to the pedestrian crossing on Hampstead Road and I noticed that people also cross the road here. The depth and height of the kiosk would interfere with pedestrians' visibility of traffic travelling north at this point, which in my view would present a needless hazard.'* The appeal site context in the above case is considered to be markedly similar to the proposal and therefore recommended for refusal on the same grounds.
- 4.16 Furthermore, the proposed telephone kiosk would be orientated perpendicular to the kerbside on Tottenham Court Road. This could lead to distractions for road users approaching the rear of the kiosk from the north who would face the proposed illuminated display panel in close proximity to an existing digital panel sign on the opposite side of the road and a pedestrian crossing located no more than 11 metres away to the north (see also Paragraphs 6.15-6.21 below, 'Public Safety').

4.17 Overall therefore, the proposed telephone kiosk would have a significant harmful impact on pedestrian amenity, comfort and safety, and as such, is considered to be contrary to Local Plan Policies A1 and T1 and the above related guidance.

## **5. Anti-social behaviour**

5.1 In regard to community safety matters, a number of issues have been raised by the Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor. In particular, it has been noted that existing telephone kiosks within the London Borough of Camden have become 'crime generators' and a focal point for anti-social behaviour (ASB). Specifically, in relation to the locations of the kiosks around Camden, there is a common theme among the crime statistics; all these areas have a major issue with street crime and in particular ASB, pickpocketing and theft from person. They are also recognised as being areas of significant footfall with both commuters, local residents and numerous tourists, similar to the application site.

5.2 Furthermore, there is concern that the design of the proposed kiosk would not sufficiently reduce the risk of the types of crime listed above from occurring. Due to the openness of the kiosk, any mobile phones on display at this location (in hand) would be vulnerable to the opportunist phone snatch. The close proximity of the site to the carriageway, would also increase the opportunity of this form of crime being carried out by moped or bicycle from the roadside. Additionally, the large façade created as a result of the advertising screen would provide the opportunity for concealment and so increase the potential risk of theft and assault.

5.3 The design and siting of a structure, which is considered unnecessary and effectively creates a solid barrier to hide behind on a busy footway, would further add to street clutter and safety issues in terms of crime and ASB, through reducing sight lines and natural surveillance in the area, as well as, providing a potential opportunity for an offender to loiter. This would increase opportunities for crime and the fear of crime taking place in an area which already experiences issues with crime.

5.4 The Council has experienced ASB from BT link panels within Camden which provided free calls and charging facilities, as proposed with the current application. Residents and members reported a rise in anti-social behaviour and crime as a direct result of these kiosks being installed. These activities include increased instances of loitering, as well as usage of the free calls facility to coordinate drug deals. This has been most apparently in areas such as Euston and Camden Town. Other boroughs such as Tower Hamlets and Islington have experienced similar issues and few boroughs are supporting the installation of more. One of the public benefits to these kiosks was the ability to provide free calls, as with the proposed scheme. Initially the free calls had to be removed until an algorithm was created to identify abnormal call levels to a single number and then blacklists this number, a scheme outlined by the applicant for the current application. The intention being that this would result in the facility being available for legitimate use but will prevent abuse of the free calls for illegal activities. A trial was undertaken in consultation with the Metropolitan Police and community safety team. As soon as the call facility was turned back on, the number of calls escalated very quickly, but very few numbers met the 'threshold' set by BT for call blocking. Data provided by BT and Link UK showed that the majority of calls were for less than 10 seconds. Officers concerns with these panels were that it was not possible to successfully demonstrate that the panels could operate without creating a 'honey pot effect' for crime and ASB.

5.5 Whilst a maintenance strategy is proposed, it is not considered sufficient to address the fact that ASB would be encouraged by the design of the kiosk itself. In an Appeal decision ref: APP/X5210/W/20/3253878 and 3253540) the Inspector noted *'the appellants' proposed maintenance regime would be likely to reduce the effects of such ASB. However, the form of the structure provides a degree of screening for such behaviour and would be likely to encourage it'*.

5.6 As such, and for the reasons set-out above, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Local Plan Policies D1 and C5 (Safety and security), and CPG Design.

## **6. Advertisement**

6.1 Advertisement consent is sought for a proposed integrated digital advertising panel on the rear elevation of the structure (facing southwards). The screen would measure 1.005m (W) x 1.86m (H) with a visible display area of 2sqm.

6.2 The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 permits the Council to consider amenity and public safety matters in determining advertisement consent applications.

Amenity: Visual impact and impact on public safety

6.3 Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the NPPF states in Paragraph 136 that '*The quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed*'.

6.4 CPG Design advises that good quality advertisements respect the architectural features of the host building and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. CPG Adverts states that '*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*'.



- 6.5 Local Plan Policy D4 (Advertisements) confirms that the “*Council will resist advertisements where they contribute to or constitute clutter or an unsightly proliferation of signage in the area.*” (Paragraph 7.82).
- 6.6 CPG Amenity advises that artificial lighting can be damaging to the environment and result in visual nuisance by having a detrimental impact on the quality of life of neighbouring residents, that nuisance can occur due to light spillage and glare which can also significantly change the character of the locality. As the advertisement is not located at a typical shop fascia level and would be internally illuminated, it would appear visually obtrusive.
- 6.7 While it is recognised that the proposed integrated digital advertising panel would be displayed on a replacement kiosk, the inclusion of the panel would introduce illuminated digital advertising, which by design is a more visually prominent and attention grabbing form of display than, say, a traditional 6-sheet advertising panel, by virtue of its method of illumination and image transition. The provision of a large digital screen would therefore add noticeable, visual clutter by virtue of its size (along with its’ location, prominence and method of illumination) to this busy stretch of pavement on Tottenham Court Road, resulting in an incongruous addition which would contribute to the degradation of visual amenity within the streetscene and Fitzrovia East Neighbourhood Area. It would also be harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building through the adverse effect on its’ setting, and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
- 6.8 As referred to above, the Planning Inspector noted in a recent appeal decision (Ref: APP/X5210/W/20/3254037 and 3252962 – see Appendix 3) in relation to a phone kiosk of a marginal smaller scale, but with a similar design approach, that ‘*The visual impact of the kiosk would be increased by the large illuminated advertising panel, which would be a dominating feature on the structure. The panel, close to the kerbline, would be a prominent standalone illuminated feature. The panel would be unrelated to the services provided by the adjacent commercial units and would appear prominent in views along the street both during the day and in hours of darkness.*’ The application is recommended for refusal on similar grounds.
- 6.9 Additionally, the Planning Inspector noted in the appeal decision dated 14 November 2022 (APP/X5210/H/22/3290325) that ‘*The proposed illuminated panel would stand in an isolated position. It would be visually intrusive in this sensitive historic context. It would erode the character and appearance of both conservation areas, the setting of the listed building and the amenity of the area more generally.*’ (Paragraph 63).
- 6.10 In terms of the proposed screen’s luminance level, the supporting cover letter and ‘replacement unit’ document (Appendix A) confirm that this would not exceed 300 cd/sqm during the hours between dusk and dawn. While it is accepted that all advertisements are intended to attract attention and that certain aspects of the display can be controlled by condition should consent be granted (such as, luminance levels, transition, sequencing, etc.), the addition of an illuminated digital advertisement in this location would significantly raise the prominence of the proposed piece of street furniture, especially given that the screen is proposed to be active throughout the majority of any 24 hour period, 7 days a week.
- 6.11 In this regard, it is noted in 4 appeals for comparable illuminated digital advertisement displays (see Appendix 5 attached) dated 22nd May 2018 (Ref: APP/H5390/Z/17/3192478 (Appeal B); APP/H5390/Z/17/3192472 (Appeal B); APP/H5390/Z/17/3192470 (Appeal B); APP/H5390/Z/17/3188471 (Appeal B), the Planning Inspector commented that while the luminance level and rate of image transition could be controlled by condition, the appeal proposal would nevertheless create an isolated and discordant feature. In each case, the display of a sequential series of static digital images was considered to be conspicuous and eye-catching, and as such, would have a harmful effect upon visual amenity.

6.12 The introduction of an illuminated digital advertisement display panel sited in this location and within close proximity to each other would therefore not only worsen the current situation by introducing more prominent, additional visual and physical clutter, but also by contributing to the over proliferation of illuminated signage in this locality. Local Plan Policy D4 (Advertisements) states that the Council will resist advertisements that *'contribute to an unsightly proliferation of signage in the area and contribute to street clutter in the public realm'*.

6.13 Overall therefore, the introduction of the screen would appear as an incongruous and dominant illuminated feature in this location, severely degrading the visual amenity of the streetscene, Fitzrovia East Neighbourhood and Bloomsbury Conservation Areas, and the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building, through the creation of visual clutter, as well as, contributing to the over proliferation of illuminated signage in this location. As such, the proposal fails to adhere to Section 12 of the NPPF, and Policies D1 (Design), D2 (Heritage) and D4 (Advertisements), and Part 3 (Vision and objectives) of the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan 2014 in this regard.

6.14 Should the application be recommended for approval, conditions to control the brightness, orientation and frequency of the displays, and to prevent any moving displays, would be required to be attached to any consent.

#### Public Safety

6.15 Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) requires development proposals to avoid disruption to the highway network, its function, causing harm to highway safety, hindering pedestrian movement and unnecessary clutter as well as addressing the needs of vulnerable users. The Council will not support proposals that involve the provision of additional street furniture that is not of benefit to highway users.

6.16 CPG Design in paragraph 7.42 advises that, *"All new phone boxes should have a limited impact on the sightlines of the footway."* This is supported by Transport for London (TfL) in the document titled 'Streetscape Guidance' which on page 142 states that, *"Sightlines at crossings should not be obstructed by street furniture, plantings or parked/stopped vehicles."* Paragraph 6.3.10 of the Manual for Streets advises that, *"Obstructions on the footway should be minimised. Street furniture is typically sited on footways and can be a hazard for blind or partially-sighted people."*

6.17 It is accepted that all advertisements are intended to attract attention. However, advertisements are more likely to distract road users at junctions, roundabouts and pedestrian crossings particularly during hours of darkness when glare and light spillage can make it less easy to see things, which could be to the detriment of highway and pedestrian and other road users' safety.

6.18 Appendix A of the 'Guidance for Digital Roadside Advertising and Proposed Best Practice' (commissioned by Transport for London in March 2013) advises that digital advertisement panels will not normally be permitted if proposed to be installed within 20m of a pedestrian crossing, either on the approach or the exit.

6.19 The proposed digital advertising sign would be located within approximately 11 metres of a busy pedestrian crossing and traffic controlled signals to the north, and as such, would introduce a distraction to southbound road users approaching the crossing along Tottenham Court Road and junction with Torrington Place, as well as, those turning south from this junction, given the close proximity of both to each other and the orientation of the proposed digital advertising panel which would face southbound traffic. Also whilst not directly adjacent, it is noted that there is a loading bay in proximity separated by a traditional lamp post.

6.20 Therefore, the proposed digital advertising sign is considered to be harmful to either pedestrian or vehicular traffic given that the proposed location of the screen is close to a busy pedestrian crossing and traffic signal controlled junction, and as such, would likely introduce any undue distraction or hazard in public safety terms.

## **7. Conclusion**

- 7.1 The proposal would result in unacceptable street clutter harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscape, Fitzrovia East Neighbourhood and Bloomsbury Conservation Areas, and the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building. The proposal would also be detrimental to pedestrian flows, as well as, creating issues with safe pedestrian movement. The advertisement would also serve to harm the visual amenities of the area and cause harm to highway and public safety. The proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable and contrary to the aforementioned policies.
- 7.2 If the applications were considered to be acceptable, the Council would seek an obligation attached to any planning permission for the applicant to enter into a legal agreement to secure the removal of all kiosks prior to the installation of any new or replacement kiosk. This agreement would also secure controls to ensure that any new or replacement kiosk is well maintained and that the advertisement is only in place whilst the telephone element is in operation.

## **8. Recommendation**

### Refuse planning permission

- 8.1 The proposed telephone kiosk, by reason of its location, size and detailed design, would add harmful visual clutter and detract from the character and appearance of the street scene, Fitzrovia East Neighbourhood and Bloomsbury Conservation Area, and the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building, contrary to Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and Part 3 (Vision and objectives) of the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan 2014.
- 8.2 The proposed telephone kiosk, by virtue of its location, size and detailed design, adding to unnecessary street clutter, would reduce the amount of useable, unobstructed footway, which would be detrimental to the quality of the public realm, cause harm to highway safety and hinder pedestrian movement and have a detrimental impact on the promotion of walking as an alternative to motorised transport, contrary to Policies G1 (Delivery and location of growth), A1 (Managing the impact of development), C6 (Access for all), D8 (Public Realm) and T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 8.3 The proposed telephone kiosk, by reason of its inappropriate siting, size and design would fail to reduce opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour in an area to the detriment of community safety and security, and compromise the safety of those using and servicing the telephone kiosk, contrary to Policy C5 (Safety and security) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 8.4 In absence of a legal agreement to secure a maintenance plan for the proposed telephone kiosk, the proposal would be detrimental to the quality of the public realm, and detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene, contrary to Policies D1 (Design), G1 (Delivery and location of growth), A1 (Managing the impact of development), C6 (Access for all) and T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

### Refuse advertisement consent

- 8.5 The proposed advertisement, by virtue of its location, scale, prominence and method of illumination, would add harmful visual clutter, detrimental to the amenity of the streetscene, Fitzrovia East Neighbourhood and Bloomsbury Conservation Areas, as well as, the setting of the adjacent Grade II\* Listed Building, contrary to Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) and D4 (Advertisements) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and Part 3 (Vision and objectives) of the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan 2014.

8.6 The proposed advertisement, by virtue of its location, scale, prominence, and method of illumination, would introduce a distraction to traffic and pedestrians, causing harm to highway and public safety, contrary to Transport for London guidance, and to policies A1 (Managing the Impact of Development), D4 (Advertisements) and T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

### **List of Appendices**

**Appendix 1:** Copy of appeal decisions 3341451 & 3341453 dated 21/08/2024

**Appendix 2:** Copy of appeal decisions 3290323 & 3290325 dated 14/11/2022 (Appeals G & H)

**Appendix 3:** Copy of appeal decisions 3254037 & 3252962 dated 16/11/2020

**Appendix 4:** Copy of appeal decisions 3195366 & 3195365 dated 18/09/2018 (Appeals D & E)

**Appendix 5:** Copy of appeal decisions 3192478, 3192472, 3192470 & 3188471 dated 22/05/2018

**Appendix 6:** Copy of appeal decision 3359412 dated 26/03/2025

