



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2024

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K5030/Z/24/3342045

122 Minorities/14 Crosswall, London EC3N 1NT

- 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 Executive Developments Ltd against the decision of City of London Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01427/ADVT.
 - The advertisement proposed is temporary decorative scaffold shroud comprising a 1:1 image of the building facade with an inset advertising area measuring 10x7 metres for a temporary period of 9 months during scaffolding and building works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Regulations and paragraph 141 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (2023) confine my assessment of this appeal for advertisement consent to matters of amenity and public safety, taking into account any other relevant factors, including cumulative impact. In this instance, the Council refused consent for reasons of amenity.
3. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within a densely developed area comprising a mid- to high-rise buildings of varying ages in a city centre context. Its corner location lends visibility, although within the street scene larger buildings such as Ibex House dominate the existing four-storey building on the site.
5. The appeal proposal comprises a shroud enveloping the street elevations of a new building on the site during its construction phase. This would incorporate an advertisement that would wrap around the corner of the building at the approximate first, second and third floors of the building.
6. The surrounding area is characterised by a near-absence of any visible advertising above ground-floor level, and even those visible at this level do not dominate in street views. This leads me to consider that the new advertisement would be the largest visible by some margin in views of the site and, both as a result of this and the aforementioned characteristics of existing advertising, would result in a significantly noticeable addition to the area.

7. Although this site is not within a conservation area, it is in the setting of Ibex House, which is a grade-II listed building. Although there is a high level of activity in the area around the appeal site, the general absence of advertising above façade level enables an appreciation of the particular characteristics of the building within its setting. The introduction of a large shroud advertisement in close proximity would detract from this appreciation and have a detrimental impact on the heritage asset and its setting.
8. The advertisement would be temporary and has been reduced in size compared with a previous proposal for the site¹, but this does not mitigate the harm that would result during its display. The remainder of the shroud would be significant in area compared with the advertisement and display a decorative image of the building under construction, together with painted hoardings bordering the pavement. I acknowledge the advice of the Planning Practice Guidance regarding the potential suitability of construction shroud advertisements², and that such shrouds can provide interest within the street scene, particularly when compared with the alternative of an unshrouded construction site. However, none of these considerations outweigh the fact that the proposed advertisement would be incongruous.
9. Taking all of this into account, the advertisement would appear unreasonably obtrusive within the street scene. I therefore conclude that the proposed advertisement would have a harmful impact on the amenity of the area.

Other Matters

10. The Council has drawn my attention to the City of London Local Plan (2015) Policies CS10, CS12, DM 10.6 and DM 12.1, which it considers to be relevant to this appeal. I have taken these into account as a consideration. However, given that the Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and/or public safety, these policies have not been a decisive consideration in my decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal ref: APP/K5030/H/23/3329659; decision date 27 March 2024.

² PPG Reference ID: 18b-005-20140306.