

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2015

by **C Thorby MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 August 2015

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/15/3031287**

**Pavement on Howland Street, adjacent to 95 Tottenham Court Road  
London W1T 4TW**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval under Schedule 2, Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (formerly part 24 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO 1995 as amended).
  - The appeal is made by Infocus Public Networks Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2015/0691/P dated 2 February 2015, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2015.
  - The development proposed is the installation of a public payphone on the highway.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Reasons

2. The main issue is the effect on the siting and appearance of the payphone on the street scene and on pedestrian safety and convenience. The payphone would be of light construction with a metal frame and clear glass. I note the Council's fears about advertisements, but the appearance of the payphone would be acceptable.
3. However, this is a very busy section of pavement close to the corner with Tottenham Court Road, one of central London's main streets where there is a very high level of activity including people crossing Howland Street both at the crossing and further along the street. I am concerned that in this location it would present an obstacle to those crossing the road which would be undesirable in this busy location.
4. In addition, it would detract from views along Howland Street where the public realm appears pleasant and visually open and there are views to and from Tottenham Court Road. The siting of the payphone would therefore be unacceptable and the appeal would fail in this regard. It would conflict with Camden Core Strategy policy CS14 and Camden Development Policy DP21 which seek to protect local character.
5. There would meet the need of wheelchair users as it allows wheelchair access and I note that other payphones of similar appearance have been allowed elsewhere in London, including in the vicinity of the site. However, the appeal decisions referred to by the appellant are unlike this appeal as the payphone was sited either next to an existing payphone or a recycling centre.

6. There are no details given in the other examples and I do not know if the circumstances are similar. These matters would not alter my conclusion and the appeal is dismissed.

*C Thorby*

INSPECTOR