

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	03/01/2019
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	15/12/2018
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Charlotte Meynell			2018/5557/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
Pavement outside 100-110 Euston Road London NW1 2AJ			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>				
Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Prior Approval Required – Approval Refused			
<b>Application Type:</b>	GPDO Prior Approval Determination			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p><u>A site notice was displayed on 21/11/2018 and expired on 15/12/2018.</u></p> <p>No responses were received from neighbouring residents.</p> <p><b>Metropolitan Police – Designing Out Crime Officer objects on the following grounds:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Telephone kiosks are no longer used for their original purpose due to the fact that nearly every person is in possession of some kind of mobile device thus negating the need to use fixed land line telephone. As a result of this the phone boxes in The London Borough of Camden have now become 'crime generators' and a focal point for anti-social behaviour (ASB).</li> <li>• My own previous experience of policing Camden highlights the above ASB, ranging from witnessing the taking of Class A drugs, urination, littering, the placing of 'Prostitute Cards', graffiti, sexual activities and a fixed location for begging. All of which have occurred within the current telephone kiosks. Also, due to poor maintenance any that are damaged or are dirty do not get cleaned, which makes the telephone kiosk unusable and an eye sore. Following the 'Broken Window' theory, if a location looks and feels that it is uncared for and in a state of disrepair then this leads to other criminal activity occurring within that location.</li> <li>• The proposed location of the device is directly outside a major hotel and also restaurant. Also present is three other telephone kiosks from other companies present which currently generate anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• The design of the unit itself appears to be an issue as the operating unit, chargers and handset are situated on one side. Therefore if a person is using the unit they cannot see what is going on around them nor who could be approaching them from further up the foot path. Therefore creating a fear of crime whilst being used. The solar panels positioned at an angle on top of the device will act as a shelter from inclement weather.</li> <li>• The hand set unit appears to be recessed into the main unit and therefore appears from the picture graphic to create a flat surface. Euston Road and the surrounding area is well known for Class A Drugs Misuse and therefore any well-lit and smooth surface is used for the preparation of such narcotics. This recess could also be used to store small objects and conceal them if police approach a suspect drug misuser preventing them from detecting crime.</li> <li>• The introduction of the unit will also increase the above ASB, as it conceals the activities of what is occurring behind the actual space and prevents police or passers-by seeing what or who is in/near there. This generates for the latter a fear of crime especially in regards to begging. As they will use the phone box as a cover and as a back rest when they sit on the floor, when the footpath is reduced in width even more by their presence pedestrians have to walk past</li> </ul>					

closely and therefore this generates an uncomfortable feeling for them.

- The extra lighting produced by the kiosk and the space it uses up in the public realm will also create an added distraction to an already cluttered street space. Any CCTV monitoring the area will be effected by this and therefore any crime prevention/detection properties they produce is lost.
- Recent media reports have highlighted the increase in planning applications submitted to local planners for the construction of telephone kiosks. These were proven to have very little or no benefit to the local community especially in regards to the facilities that they are alleged to supply. The main reason busy locations with a high pedestrian and vehicle activity is chosen so that the telephone kiosk can be used as advertising space.
- For the above reasons I object to this planning application

**TfL Spatial Planning objects on the following grounds:**

- For the below reasons, TfL Spatial Planning objects to the granting of prior approval for a new phone kiosk on behalf of TfL.
- The site of the proposed kiosk is on A501 Euston Road, which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). TfL is the highway authority for the TLRN, and is therefore concerned about any proposal which may affect the performance and/or safety of the TLRN.
- TfL notes that this phone kiosk application does not appear to be contingent on removal of more than one phone kiosk in exchange for the new unit proposed, so that it would not contribute to an overall reduction of phone kiosks across Camden's public realm.
- We remind the applicant and Council that the current London Plan Policy 6.10 (Walking) refers to 'promoting simplified streetscape, decluttering and access for all' and also states that Planning Decisions 'should ensure high quality pedestrian environments and emphasise the quality of the pedestrian and street space'. TfL Spatial Planning takes the view that the phone kiosk proposed would not contribute in any way to a high quality pedestrian environment or emphasise the quality of pedestrian and street space.
- The draft London Plan Policy D7 (Public Realm) states 'Ensure that shade and shelter are provided with appropriate types and amounts of seating to encourage people to spend time in a place, where appropriate. This should be done in conjunction with the removal of any unnecessary and dysfunctional clutter of street furniture to ensure the function of space and pedestrian amenity is improved. Applications which seek to introduce unnecessary street furniture should normally be refused'.
- Policy T2 (Healthy Streets) of the draft 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.' TfL does not consider that the application will deliver any improvements which support any of the ten Healthy Streets Indicators.
- Unnecessary and dysfunctional street clutter in any location in the footway on the TLRN has an obvious adverse impact on the movement of pedestrians, which goes against TfL's statutory network management duties.

**Transport Strategy object as follows:**

- The site is located on Euston Road (A501) which forms part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is one of the busiest traffic (including pedestrians) corridors in the borough. Pedestrian footfall is particularly high with numerous commercial properties and 3 mainline railway stations on the northern side (Euston, Kings Cross and St Pancras). Underground stations are also located at each mainline railway station, Euston Square and Warren Street. A high number of bus services serve bus stops along both sides of Euston Road. Transport for London (TfL) is the highway authority for Euston Road as it is located on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). TfL has a duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to ensure that any development does not have an adverse impact on the SRN.
- Policy T1 of Camden's Local Plan states that to promote sustainable transport choices, development should prioritise the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and ensure that sustainable transport will be the primary means of travel to and from the site. It goes on to state that the Council will seek to ensure that developments improve the pedestrian environment, including the provision of high quality footpaths and pavements for the number of people expected to use them. It also states that features should be included to assist vulnerable road users where appropriate.
- Camden Planning Guidance document CPG1 (Design) provides some guidance on telephone kiosks. Paragraph 9.27 includes the following text:
  - *All new phone boxes should have a limited impact on the sightlines of the footway. The size of the box or other supporting 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.*
- Camden Planning Guidance document CPG7 (Transport) provides some guidance on street furniture. Paragraph 8.6 states that the Council will seek improvements to streets and spaces to ensure good quality
  - access and circulation arrangements for all. This includes improvement to existing routes and footways that will serve the development. Key considerations informing the design of streets and public spaces include: ensuring the safety of vulnerable road users, including children, elderly people and people with mobility difficulties, sight impairments, and other disabilities; taking account of surrounding context and character of area;
  - providing a high quality environment in terms of appearance, design and construction, paying attention to Conservation Areas;
  - avoiding street clutter and minimising the risk of pedestrian routes being obstructed or narrowed, e.g. by pavement parking or by street furniture.
- Paragraph 8.10 of CPG7 states that works affecting highways should avoid unnecessary street clutter; design of footways should not include projections into the footway, unnecessary and cluttered street furniture or other obstructions; and any minimum standards for footway widths should not be used to justify the provision of unnecessary street clutter or reduction in footway widths.
- Standard telephone kiosks have a footprint of 0.9 metres x 0.9 metres (0.81 sqm). BT has minimised the size of their replacement kiosks (BT InLink) by designing a unit with a footprint of 0.89 metres x 0.27 metres (0.24 sqm). The proposed telephone kiosks would have a footprint of 1.325 metres x 0.219 metres (0.29 sqm). The footprint of

the proposed telephone kiosk is broadly similar to that of the new BT replacement kiosks. However, the longer of the 2 horizontal dimensions (1.325 metres) would be 435 mm wider than the new BT replacement kiosks (0.89 metres). The applicant has clearly failed to minimise the size of the telephone kiosk in accordance with Camden's guidance.

- The Council generally refuses any applications to install new items of street furniture of this scale in the public highway unless they can be located within a defined and established street furniture zone. This is especially relevant where such proposals would constitute clutter or have a detrimental impact on pedestrian amenity, comfort or safety, as well as being detrimental to road safety generally.
- The footway on the north side of Euston Road at the above site is characterised by a complete lack of bulky street furniture adjacent to the kerbside. A slender street furniture zone consisting of lamp columns, cycle parking stands, signal posts, a Legible London wayfinding sign and electrical feeder pillars has been sensitively designed to provide a clear and uncluttered environment sufficient to accommodate extremely high volumes of pedestrians walking on the footway during busy periods (e.g. morning, lunchtime and afternoon/evening peak periods).
- A row of 4 mature trees is located towards the rear of the footway. These help to soften the landscape and define the street. Unfortunately, the street scene has been spoiled by the installation of 3 telephone kiosks at this location. The proposal to install a further telephone kiosk would only worsen the situation through the introduction of unnecessary street clutter in an already cluttered pedestrian environment. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the street scene. The street scene is somewhat similar to that adjacent to 297 Euston Road. It is worth referring to the recent appeal decision (Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/Z/18/3204104) to provide advertising at an existing telephone kiosk at that location. The Planning Inspector notes at paragraph 5:
  - Due to its bulk and siting, the kiosk erodes the existing openness beyond the row of trees, and due to its depth and width, it disrupts the largely unrestricted routes of pavement users by the row of trees.
- The proposal to site an additional telephone kiosk outside 100-110 Euston Road would also erode the existing openness of the street scene. It would also obstruct pedestrian desire lines between Euston Road and Chalton Street. The proposal should be refused on the same grounds.
- Appendix B of 'Pedestrian Comfort Guidance for London (published by Transport for London) indicates that footways in high flow areas 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 is approximately 6.6 metres wide. The plan also indicates that the resulting effective footway width would be reduced to 4.1 metres. This would exceed the minimum requirement of the guidance. However, the loss of any available footway space at this location is considered to be unacceptable due to the close proximity to 3 mainline railway and underground stations. Pedestrian footfall is exceptionally high at this location and this is predicted to increase significantly with ongoing economic growth in Central London and High Speed Two (HS2) currently under construction.

- The appeal decision to refuse a similar telephone kiosk on the pavement outside Fitzroy House, 355 Euston Road, London NW1 3AL (Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/18/3195370) is worthy of reference. Paragraph 15 is particularly relevant to this current application. The proposal should be refused on the same grounds.
- The proposed plan indicates that the kiosk would be offset from the adjacent property by 1.3 metres. This is considered to be insufficient and would constitute an obstruction to pavement cleaning and building maintenance activities. The proposal should be refused on this basis.
- The proposed telephone kiosk would be significantly wider than the established street furniture zone in the general vicinity of the site. It would as a result encroach significantly into the effective footway width available for pedestrian movement. The proposed telephone kiosk would therefore obscure sightlines along the footway significantly while also constituting a significant impediment/obstruction to pedestrian movement along the pedestrian desire line. This would be a particular problem for pedestrians with visual impairments (e.g. blind and partially sighted) who rely on clear and unobstructed pedestrian routes. Paragraph 6.3.10 of the Manual for Streets states:
  - *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.*
- The proposed telephone kiosk, by being significantly wider than the established street furniture zone and encroaching significantly into the effective footway width available for pedestrian movement, is deemed to be a hazard for blind or partially-sighted people.
- Paragraph 6.3.23 of the Manual for Streets states:
  - *Footway widths can be varied between different streets to take account of pedestrian volumes and composition. Streets where people walk in groups or near schools or shops, for example, need wider footways. In areas of high pedestrian flow, the quality of the walking experience can deteriorate unless sufficient width is provided. The quality of service goes down as pedestrian flow density increases. Pedestrian congestion through insufficient capacity should be avoided. It is inconvenient and may encourage people to step into the carriageway.*
- The proposed telephone kiosk, by being in a high footfall area, would have a detrimental impact on the walking experience due to a reduction in the level of service. It would lead to pedestrian congestion which could result in dangerous situations such as pedestrians colliding with each other, or indeed with the telephone kiosk.
- The proposed telephone kiosk would clearly have a significant impact on pedestrian amenity, comfort and safety. For these reasons, the proposal is considered contrary to Local Plan policies A1 and T1 and should be refused on this basis.

**The Council's Access Officer objects as follows:**

- Under the New BS8300-1:2018 and BS-2:2018 all telephone communication devices for public use should be fitted with assistive technology such as volume control and inductive couplers and there should be an indication of their presence.
- A knee hole should be provided at least 500mm deep and 700mm high to allow ease of access for wheelchair users.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Telephone controls should be located between 750mm and 1000mm above the floor level. To benefit people who are blind or partially sighted, telephones should be selected which have well-lit keypads, large embossed or raised numbers that contrast visually with their background, and a raised dot on the number 5.</li><li>• Instructions for using the phone should be clear and displayed in a large easy to read typeface</li><li>• A fold down seat (450-520mm high) or a perch seat (650-800mm high) should be provided for the convenience of people with ambulant mobility impartments.</li></ul> |
|--|--|

## Site Description

The application site comprises of an area of the footway adjacent to No. 100-110 Euston Road, on the northern side of Euston Road. The site is directly adjacent to a mature street tree to the north-east, and another mature street tree and 2 x BT telephone kiosks are located between approximately 5-7m to the north-east of the site. 1 x independently owned telephone kiosk is located approximately 17m to the north-east of the site along the northern side of Euston Road.

The site lies within the Central London Area and is part of Transport for London's (TfL's) Road Network (TLRN). The site does not fall within a conservation area and is not adjacent to any listed buildings.

## Relevant History

### Site history:

**2018/0954/A** – Display of 1 x LCD illuminated digital advertisement to telephone kiosk.

**Advertisement consent under consideration.**

**2018/0879/P** – Erection of freestanding telephone kiosk providing phone and Wi-Fi facilities, location based information, payment facilities with 1 x LCD illuminated digital advertisement following the removal of 1 x telephone kiosk. **Prior Approval under consideration**

**2018/0326/P** – Installation of 1x telephone kiosk on pavement. **Prior Approval refused 15/03/2018; Appeal underway**

**2017/3524/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 07/08/2017**

**2017/3507/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 07/08/2017**

**2017/1022/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone box on pavement. **Prior Approval refused 05/04/2017**

**2015/2620/P** – Replacement of an existing public telephone kiosk with a combined public telephone and Automated Teller Machine (ATM) kiosk. **Planning permission refused 09/12/2015**

### **Land adjacent to 110-118 Euston Road and junction with Mabledon Place**

**2017/1775/A** – Installation of digital advertisement screen (Dimensions: 6m height x 4m width x 0.5m depth) and associated stand (Dimensions: 10.3m height x 0.9m width x 0.9m depth). **Advertisement consent application withdrawn 30/11/2017**

### **O/S 100 Euston Road**

**2015/2620/P** – Replacement of an existing public telephone kiosk with a combined public telephone and Automated Teller Machine (ATM) kiosk. **Planning permission refused 09/12/2015**

### Neighbouring sites:

#### **Pavement outside 210 Euston Road**

**2017/3508/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 07/08/2017; Appeal dismissed 18/09/2018**

#### **Pavement outside 215 Euston Road**

**2017/3450/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 25/09/2017; Appeal refused 18/09/2018**

**2017/3451/P** – Installation of 1 x new telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 05/12/2017**

#### **Pavement outside Fitzroy House, 355 Euston Road**

**2017/3544/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 07/08/2017; Appeal dismissed 18/09/2018**

#### **Pavement outside 297 Euston Road**

**2017/5183/A** – Display of a 6 sheet internally (back lit) LED illuminated advertisement panel to north-eastern elevation of existing public payphone. **Advertisement consent refused 18/05/2018; Appeal dismissed 08/10/2018**



#### **Land adjacent to 101 Euston Road**

**2018/5546** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval under consideration**

**2018/0314/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on pavement. **Prior Approval refused 14/03/2018; Appeal underway**

**2017/1078/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone box on pavement. **Prior Approval refused 07/04/2017**

#### **Outside The British Library, 96 Euston Road**

**2009/1771/P** – Installation of a telephone kiosk on the public highway. **Prior Approval refused 22/05/2009. Appeal dismissed 04/05/2010**

#### **Land adjacent to Unison Centre, 130 Euston Road**

**2018/5536/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval under consideration**

**2018/0313/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 16/03/2018; Appeal underway**

**2017/2705/P** – Erection of a freestanding BT panel providing phone and Wi-Fi facilities with 2 x internally illuminated digital advertisement. **Full planning application withdrawn 28/09/2017**

**2017/1195/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone box on pavement. **Prior Approval refused 06/04/2017**

#### **Pavement outside Premier Inn, Euston Road**

**2017/3449/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 03/08/2017; Appeal allowed 06/08/2018**

#### **Land adjacent to 137-139 Euston Road**

**2018/5525/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval under consideration**

**2018/0330/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval refused 15/03/2018; Appeal underway**

**2017/1091/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone box on pavement. **Prior Approval refused 05/04/2017**

**2009/1170/P** – Installation of a telephone kiosk on the public highway. **Prior Approval refused 22/05/2009. Appeal dismissed 04/05/2010**

#### **Bus-Stop Outside 135 Euston Road**

**2017/0280/A** – Display of 2x internally illuminated digital screens to bus shelter no. CAM00108AB. **Advertisement consent granted 07/03/2017**

**Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/17/3202885, APP/X5210/W/17/3202779, APP/X5210/W/17/3202769, APP/X5210/W/17/3202763, APP/X5210/W/17/3202896, APP/X5210/W/17/3202786, APP/X5210/W/17/3202782, APP/X5210/W/17/3202879, APP/X5210/W/17/3203047, APP/X5210/W/17/3202794, APP/X5210/W/17/3202889, APP/X5210/W/17/3202789.**

10 appeals dismissed and 2 allowed on the 19<sup>th</sup> December 2018. The inspector's comments are summarised for each application below.

#### **Pavement outside Crowndale Centre, 218 Eversholt Road, London, NW1 1BD:**

- Would have some impact on pedestrian flows along this busy pedestrian route, especially at night when patrons are dispersing from late night uses in the vicinity.
- Harm to the character and appearance of the CA would be localised and would, therefore, be less than substantial to the significance of the CA as a whole. The public benefits arising from the proposal, in terms of improved accessibility and security when compared to existing kiosks, do not, in this instance, outweigh the harm to the CA

#### **Pavement outside 1A Camden High Street, London, NW1 7JE**

- The proposed kiosk would appear incongruous in its setting within the largely open and

uncluttered pedestrian space recently created at the southern end of Camden High Street.

- Harm to the character and appearance of the CA would be localised and would, therefore, be less than substantial to the significance of the CA as a whole. The public benefits arising from the proposal, in terms of improved accessibility and security when compared to existing kiosks, do not, in this instance, outweigh the harm to the CA.
- Given the extremely busy nature of the pedestrian area at the southern end of Camden High Street, the proximity of the proposed kiosk to the entrances of the Koko building, and the likely impact of the kiosk on footfall near a busy pedestrian crossing, it would be harmful to pedestrian safety in what is otherwise a relatively open, uncluttered area.

**Pavement outside of Camden Town Underground Station, Camden High Street, London Borough of Camden**

- The design of the proposed kiosk would be unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the tube station, the façade of which comprises primarily red glazed tiles with glazed arches above the entrance.
- Kiosk would be detrimental to pedestrian safety at this point the bank building immediately to the south.
- The public benefits in this instance do not outweigh the harm to the CA as identified

**Pavement outside of 197-199 Camden High Street, London, NW1 7BT n, NW1 8NH**

- The kiosk would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the CA in this location.
- The siting of the kiosk would result in harm to pedestrian safety and convenience along this section of Camden High Street, due to heavy pedestrian flows and the additional conflict with these flows that would be created by the movement of goods and equipment along the pavement.

**Pavement outside of 186-188 Camden High Street, London, NW1 8QP**

- The kiosk would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, but the harmful siting of the proposal, when taken together with the resultant likely harmful impact on pedestrian flows, justifies dismissal of the appeal.

**Pavement outside of 27 Chalk Farm Road, London, NW1 8AG [allowed]**

- 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

**Pavement outside of 31 Chalk Farm Road, London NW1 8AH**

- The kiosk would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the CA on the opposite side of Chalk Farm Road, or with the setting of nearby listed buildings. There is a strong possibility of harm to the safety of pedestrians by virtue of its proximity to the cycle stands, outside restaurant seating, a car parking layby, and especially the mature tree.

**Pavement outside of 249 Kentish Town Road, London, NW5 2JT**

- Not in CA or listed buildings
- The kiosk would be harmful to the general visual amenities of the area by way of adding a degree of clutter to a location already somewhat crowded by existing street furniture. In addition, it would be located very close to a pinch point on the pavement and a busy parking bay on the road, to the detriment of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

**Pavement outside of 272 West End Lane, London, NW6 1LJ**

- Fail to result in public realm improvement in this part of the CA and would introduce an alien feature of modern design and materials into the street scene, as opposed to improving materials and reducing clutter.

**Pavement outside of 319 West End Lane, London, NW6 1RN**

- The proposed kiosk would be harmful to the setting of the listed Fire Station, and it would fail to result in public realm improvement in this part of the CA by way of introducing an alien feature of modern design and materials into the street scene, as opposed to improving materials and reducing clutter. It would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of this part of the WEGCA. It would appear unlikely that the kiosk would be harmful to pedestrian safety, but there may be some detriment to vehicular safety caused by the proximity of the kiosk to the

exit/crossover serving the fire station.

**Pavement opposite 152 West End Lane, (corner of Iverson Road), London, NW6 2LJ [allowed]**

- 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.

**Pavement outside Unit 1, Hardy Building, West End Lane, London, NW6 1BR**

- The proposed kiosk would be harmful to the character and appearance of the general area, and that its siting would be harmful to pedestrian safety.

**Appeal Decisions: APP/X5210/W/18/3195370, APP/X5210/W/18/3195368, APP/X5210/W/17/3180691, APP/X5210/W/18/3195366, APP/X5210/W/18/3195365, APP/X5210/W/18/3195361, APP/X5210/W/18/3195371, APP/X5210/W/18/3195362, APP/X5210/W/18/3195903, APP/X5210/W/17/3180688, APP/X5210/W/18/3195000, APP/X5210/W/18/3195002, APP/X5210/W/18/3195004.**

On 18<sup>th</sup> September 2018, 13 appeals were dismissed for installation of identical Euro Payphone kiosks along Euston Road and in King's Cross. One decision notice was issued covering all of the appeals. The inspector concluded that all the proposed kiosks would add to street clutter and most of them would reduce footway widths hampering pedestrian movement.

The Inspector agreed in all 13 cases with the council's concerns about the addition of street clutter whether the sites were or were not located inside a conservation area or affecting the setting of a listed building. In 11 cases the inspector agreed that the impact on pedestrian movement was unacceptable and, when the issue was raised, that the impact on the visibility of traffic signals would also not be acceptable. He took on board the availability too of other telephone kiosks in the vicinity.

In summary, the inspector noted the following:

The only matters for consideration are the siting and appearance of the kiosk. The appellant does not have to prove a need for new telephone kiosks (para 3). The kiosks however would appear as substantial structures on the pavement. The inspector also noticed that some of the existing kiosks of similar size in the area exhibited evidence of being used for sleeping in by homeless people. The phones in some of the kiosks also appeared not be functioning. These circumstances suggest that some of the existing kiosks are not being used for the purpose for which they were intended, which puts into question their primary purpose (para 12).

The inspector noted that the proposed kiosks would comply with the required minimum clear footway widths next to them as set out in the Transport for London Streetscape Guidance and Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, and with Camden's Streetscape Design Manual, Design Planning Guidance (CPG1) and Transport Planning Guidance (CPG7). The inspector notes (paras 45 and 46) however that paragraph 8.10 of CPG7 states that works affecting highways should avoid unnecessary street clutter; design of footways should not include projections into the footway, unnecessary and cluttered street furniture or other obstructions; and any minimum standards for footway widths should not be used to justify the provision of unnecessary street clutter or reduction in footway width. Paragraph 8.6 seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that street clutter is avoided and the risk of pedestrian routes being obstructed is minimised.

The inspector concluded that all the proposed kiosks would add to street clutter and most of them would reduce footway widths hampering pedestrian movement. The GPDO establishes the principle of the need for such telephone kiosks but the benefits of providing them are inevitably related to whether there are other existing pay phones in the vicinity. If there are no existing pay phones then the benefits of new pay phones must necessarily be enhanced, even despite the widespread use of mobile phones. He highlighted the availability of other such kiosks in the locality. The sites were also adjacent or within close walking distance of three mainline railway stations (Euston, St Pancras and King's Cross) all of which contain within them a number of pay phones. The benefit of providing additional kiosks in such circumstance is therefore limited.

## Relevant policies

**Part 16 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015**

**National Planning Policy Framework (2018)**

**London Plan (2016)**

**Draft New London Plan (2017)**

**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

G1 Delivery and location of growth

T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

**Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 Design (2015) – Section 9 Designing safer environments

CPG7 Transport (2011) – Section 8 Streets and public spaces

Camden Streetscape Design Manual

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

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Confirmation is sought as to whether the installation of a telephone kiosk would require prior approval under Part 16 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO. The order permits the Council to only consider matters of siting, design and appearance in determining GPDO prior approval applications. The potential impact on crime and public safety are relevant considerations under siting, design, appearance and access.
- 1.2 The proposal is for installation of a solar powered 'totem' telephone kiosk. The kiosk would measure 1.32m in width by 0.88m in depth with an overall height of 3.12m including its solar panel canopy (2.8m high for the main body and 0.22m in depth without the solar panel canopy) and would be located on the northern pedestrian footway along Euston Road.
- 1.3 The rear elevation would have phone facilities (handset and keypad) on a metal backing and frame with a rear solar panel; the front elevation would have a visual area which would be used entirely for an LED digital advertising display screen with 4 LED strips running the full height of the kiosk totem. A solar panel canopy would be located on top of the unit.

### 2.0 Assessment

- 2.1 Policy A1 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. Furthermore, Policy T1 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 8.9 of CPG7 (Transport) highlights that footways should be wide enough for two people using wheelchairs, or prams, to pass each other.

2.2 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 though greater widths are usually required;
- Keeping the footway width visually free of street furniture is also important, allowing clear sightlines along the street’.

2.3 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.

2.4 Policy T1 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 points 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.

2.5 Policy T1 (Public Transport) states that where appropriate, development will be required to provide for interchanging between different modes of transport including facilities to make interchange easy and convenient for all users and maintain passenger comfort.

2.6 Paragraph 8.6 of CPG7 (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 accessibility and minimising journey times;
- Providing stretches of continuous public footways without public highway crossings;
- Linking to, maintaining, extending and improving the network pedestrian pathways;
- Providing a high quality environment in terms of appearance, design and construction, paying attention to Conservation Areas;
- Use of paving surfaces which enhance ease of movement for vulnerable road users; and,
- Avoiding street clutter and minimising the risk of pedestrian routes being obstructed or narrowed e.g. by pavement parking or by street furniture.

2.7 Policy C5 requires development to contribute to community safety and security, and paragraph 4.89 of Policy C5 states that the design of streets needs to be accessible, safe and uncluttered, with careful consideration given to the design and location of any street furniture or equipment. Paragraphs 9.26 and 9.27 of CPG1 (Design) advise that the proposed placement of a new phone kiosk needs to be considered to ensure that it has a limited impact on the sightlines of the footway, and that the size of the kiosk should be minimised to limit its impact on the streetscene and to decrease opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour.

### **3.0 Siting**

3.1 The application site is located on a section of pavement and footway on Euston Road. This area of

the footway consistently experiences exceptionally high pedestrian footfall, due to its close proximity to Euston, King's Cross, and St. Pancras Underground and Railway Stations, and this is predicted to increase significantly with ongoing economic growth in Central London and High Speed Two (HS2) currently under construction.

3.2 Section 3.01 of Camden's Streetscape Design Manual requires a minimum unobstructed pathway width within the footway, known as the 'clear footway'. This guidance and Appendix B of TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, outlines the recommended minimum footway widths for different levels of pedestrian flows.

3.3 The footprint of the proposed telephone kiosk measures 1.32m wide by 0.22m deep. The dimensions provided on the site location and block plans show the footway to be 6.6m wide at this point, and the proposed telephone kiosk would be located in the middle of the pavement set in 1.3m from the building line of 100-110 Euston Road. This offset is considered to be insufficient and would constitute an obstruction to pavement cleaning and building maintenance activities. Furthermore, it would reduce the effective footway width to 4m. Whilst this would exceed the minimum requirement of TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, the loss of any available footway space at this location is considered to be unacceptable due to the close proximity to 3 mainline railway and underground stations. Furthermore, the proposed telephone kiosk would be significantly wider than the established street furniture zone in the general vicinity of the site. As a result, it would encroach significantly into the effective footway width available for pedestrian movement.

3.4 Given that greater pathway widths are usually required in high pedestrian flow areas like the proposed location, it is considered that pedestrian comfort would be inappropriately reduced by the proposal, resulting in an increased potential for impaired movement and overcrowding, as well as associated adverse highway safety implications. The proposed telephone kiosk would obscure sightlines along the footway significantly while also constituting a significant impediment/obstruction to pedestrian movement along the pedestrian desire line. This would be a particular problem for pedestrians with visual impairments (e.g. blind and partially sighted) who rely on clear and unobstructed pedestrian routes. This would have a significant impact on pedestrian comfort levels, both now and in the future. It would lead to pedestrian congestion which could result in dangerous situations such as pedestrians colliding with each other, or indeed with the telephone kiosk. This impact is likely to have a more significant detrimental impact on the disabled and elderly and their use of the highway, given the more restricted width. Both disability and age are protected characteristics under the Public Sector Equality Duty, and they will suffer more harm than groups who do not share those characteristics. The proposal therefore constitutes a hazard to public safety. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies A1 and T1 and is considered unacceptable.

3.5 The applicant states there is a need for children to have access to public telephone kiosks in order to make free calls to Childline. However, as highlighted above, there are 3 x existing telephone kiosks directly adjacent to the application site, and so the applicant's reasoning is not considered to be sufficient justification for the installation of a further telephone kiosk. In addition to concerns about the infrequent use of telephone kiosks due to the prevalence of mobile phone use, it is considered that the proposed telephone kiosk would act only as a hindrance to pedestrian movement, adding further clutter to the streetscene rather than providing a public service for the benefit of highways users, contrary to Policy A1.

3.6 The proposed scheme to reconfigure Euston Road and the King's Cross Gyratory are within the vicinity of the site. The scheme aims to create a high quality place and improve pedestrian comfort and increase the safety of vulnerable road users through providing additional space for walking and cycling. The installation of a new telephone kiosk in this location would add further street clutter to the streetscene, contrary to the aims of the committed scheme, and the resulting reduction in the footway width may discourage active travel. The siting of the proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable and contrary to Policy T1.

## 4.0 Design and Appearance

- 4.1 Policy D1 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy D1 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.
- 4.2 The proposed structure is considered to be a poor design in terms of its size, scale, massing, materials and accessibility, and as such, is not considered to be an appropriate or acceptable addition in this location. The kiosk would also include an illuminated digital advertising display screen with 4 LED strips running the full height of the kiosk totem. Whilst it is accepted that all advertisements are intended to attract attention, the introduction of an illuminated advertisement panel in this particular location is considered to be inappropriate as it would introduce a visually obtrusive piece of street furniture detracting from the street scene. As such, the proposal would fail to adhere to policy D1.
- 4.3 The footway on the north side of Euston Road at the above site is characterised by a complete lack of bulky street furniture adjacent to the kerbside. A slender street furniture zone consisting of lamp columns, cycle parking stands, signal posts, a Legible London wayfinding sign and electrical feeder pillars has been sensitively designed to provide a clear and uncluttered environment sufficient to accommodate extremely high volumes of pedestrians walking on the footway during busy periods (e.g. morning, lunchtime and afternoon/evening peak periods).
- 4.4 A row of 4 x mature trees is located towards the rear of the footway adjacent to the site. These help to soften the landscape and define the street. However, the installation of 3 x existing telephone kiosks in this location has had a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. Given the existence of the adjacent 3 x existing telephone kiosks and the prominence of the proposal's siting, it is considered that the proposed development would worsen the situation through the installation of further prominent street clutter in an already cluttered pedestrian environment. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the street scene, contrary to policy D1.

### Access

- 4.5 Policy C6 requires new buildings, spaces and facilities that the public may use to be fully accessible to promote equality of opportunity. Further, BS8300-1:2018 and BS-2:2018 (Design of an accessible and inclusive built environment. External environment - code of practice) provides the following guidance with regards to design standards that would be expected for an accessible phone booth:
- All telephone communication devices for public use should be fitted with assistive technology such as volume control and inductive couplers and there should be an indication of their presence.
  - A kneehole should be provided at least 500mm deep and 700mm high to allow ease of access for wheelchair users.
  - Telephone controls should be located between 750mm and 1000mm above the floor level. To benefit people who are blind or partially sighted, telephones should be selected which have well-lit keypads, large embossed or raised numbers that contrast visually with their background, and a raised dot on the number 5.
  - Instructions for using the phone should be clear and displayed in a large easy to read typeface.
  - A fold down seat (450-520mm high) or a perch seat (650-800mm high) should be provided for the convenience of people with ambulant mobility impairments.
- 4.6 Although the proposed kiosk would allow for wheelchair users to 'access' the kiosk to some degree, this does not amount to the provision of a wheelchair accessible phone. The telephone controls in the proposed kiosk are shown as being higher than 1m above the floor level which

would not be compliant. There are also no details of well-lit keypads, large embossed or raised numbers for the controls. No fold down or perch seat, nor knee-hole provision to allow ease of access for wheelchair users would be provided. Nor any indication that the kiosk is fully access compliant in all other ways, such as, providing clear and suitably displayed instructions for using the phone in a large easy to read typeface.

4.7 In light of the above, and in terms of inclusive design and accessibility, the kiosk is not considered to be fully accessible and would unnecessarily exclude a proportion of society from using the kiosk by reason of its poor functional design. As such, the design of the proposed kiosk is also considered to be contrary to policy C6 and standards advised under BS8300-1:2018 and BS-2:2018 as it would not be inclusive nor accessible to all.

## **5.0 Anti-social behaviour**

5.1 With regards 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).

5.2 The Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor also confirmed that Euston Road and the surrounding area is well known for Class A Drugs Misuse and any well-lit and smooth surface is used for the preparation of such narcotics. This proposed kiosk design appears to provide a recess within which small objects might be stored and concealed, and as such, may prevent police from detecting crime when approaching a suspect drug misuser.

5.3 It is therefore considered that the design and siting of the proposal on this busy footway would introduce additional street clutter, as well as increase opportunities for crime within a location where there are already safety issues in terms of crime and ASB, through reducing sight lines and natural surveillance in the area, and providing a potential opportunity for an offender to loiter. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy C5 and CPG1 (Design).

## **6.0 Conclusion**

6.1 The proposal would result in unacceptable street clutter, harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscape and to the detriment of pedestrian flows, as well as creating issues with safety and poor accessibility. The proposal, by virtue of its siting and appearance, is considered unacceptable.

## **7.0 Recommendation**

7.1 Refuse Prior Approval