



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by Luke Simpson BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Z/22/3305473

164-166 First Floor, Vauxhall Bridge Rd, City of Westminster, London, SW1V 2RA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Giovanni Leuzzo (Blow Up Media UK Ltd) against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04847/ADV, dated 18 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2022.
 - The advertisement proposed is described on the application form as 'temporary decorative scaffold shroud advert printed onto PVC and comprising a 1;1 image of the building facade with an inset area for advertising and information measuring 9.8 metres x 6.6 metres.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Both main parties have referred to appeal reference APP/X5990/Z/22/3300360 which is for a similar proposal on the same site. However, neither party has provided me with a copy of the plans, nor the Council and appeal decision notices. Given the lack of substantive evidence in this regard, and the fact that I must consider this appeal on the basis of the evidence provided by the parties, I do not afford this consideration any significant weight in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement shroud on amenity, with regard to the effect on the host building and the surrounding area, including the character and appearance of the Vincent Square Conservation Area (CA) and the effect on the setting of the Lillington and Longmoore Gardens CA.

Reasons

4. The host property comprises a multi-storey building on the corner of Vauxhall Bridge Road and Rochester Road. The building is in a prominent location at a road junction. The appeal site is located within the Vincent Square CA and opposite the Lillington and Longmoore Gardens CA, which is located to the south. The Framework advises that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance and that any harm requires clear and

convincing justification. I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.

5. The Vincent Square CA primarily derives its significance from its varied townscape which comprises a mixture of architecture and building types¹. The Lillington and Longmoore Gardens CA primarily derives its significance from a combination of complex architectural forms and the generous communal gardens and planting around them, creating an attractive high density residential character².
6. The main contention between the parties relates to the effect of the advertising element of the shroud, which would cover an area of approximately 17% of the overall shroud, with the remainder being a 1:1 image of the building. The advertising area would be approximately 9.8m x 6.6m and would face towards Vauxhall Bridge Road. It would cover part of the first and second floors and as such, would be in an elevated and prominent position, clearly visible within the immediately surrounding area (including from both CAs).
7. Whilst much of the existing ground floor development in the surrounding area is commercial, with active street frontages and advertising at ground floor level, the upper stories are predominantly free from advertisements and have a more residential appearance. The proposal, which would introduce a large advertisement in a prominent position (albeit for a temporary period) would be at odds with the prevailing character and would be visually harmful to the character of the Conservation Areas in this regard. This harm would arise regardless of whether the advertisement was to be illuminated.
8. I note that the scaffolding would be covered and that there is support for advertising shrouds within the Planning Practice Guidance. However, each case should be considered on its own merits and in this case the site is in a sensitive location and the proposal would be prominent and discordant with the surroundings. Indeed, in this regard the scaffolding would likely be less harmful than the proposal.
9. For the reasons above, the proposed shroud would harm amenity as a result of the harmful effect on the character and appearance of surrounding area. As such, it would neither preserve nor enhance the Conservation Areas.
10. The Council has referred to Policies 38, 39 and 43 of the City Plan 2019 - 2040 (2021) and I have had regard to these policies only to the extent that they are a material consideration. Together these policies seek to ensure that new development contributes positively to townscape and streetscape and that heritage assets are conserved.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the display of the proposed advertisement would be detrimental to the interests of amenity. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Luke Simpson

INSPECTOR

¹ Conservation Area Audit & Management Proposals Vincent Square (2010)

² Conservation Area Audit Lillington and Longmoore Gardens Conservation Area (2012)