
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2024 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/24/3352884

2-3 Clapham Common South Side, London SW4 7AA

- 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 Sam Harrison of King Media Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/02206/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is for the display of 1 x non illuminated temporary shroud advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council have referenced development plan policies it considers relevant to this appeal and I have taken these into account where they are material. However, powers under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 (The Regulations) to control advertisements, may only be exercised in the interests of visual amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. Consequently, the Council's policies have not by themselves been decisive in my determination.
4. Subsequent to the decision made by the Council on the application to which this appeal relates, the Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the revised Framework) on 12 December 2024. I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my recommendation with regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area, with specific regard to Clapham Common Conservation Area (CCCA), the setting of Clapham High Street Conservation Area (CHSCA) and nearby Grade II listed buildings.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is situated at a junction within a curved terrace of properties featuring ground-floor shops. The majority of these buildings appear to be of a similar age and height, and exhibit consistent detailing in their design. As a commercial area, there are numerous advertisements in the vicinity which, like the buildings, are uniformly small in scale. This uniformity in fenestration, design, and advertisements contributes to a visually harmonious streetscape.
7. The site is located within and contributes to the significance of the CCCA, which is characterised by the open common together with the buildings and commercial premises surrounding it. In accordance with the duty imposed on me by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.
8. The appeal site is opposite the CHSCA, and is located within its setting. From the CHSCA, the appeal site can be seen as the terrace turns the corner onto Clapham High Street. There are also a number of Grade II listed buildings which are located close to the appeal site. The first, and only listed building mentioned by the Council, is the Alexandra Hotel and adjoining buildings (12-16 Clapham Common South Side)¹, which are part of the same terrace as the appeal site. Two other Grade II listed buildings near to the site, for which the listing descriptions were submitted in evidence by the Council, are the Clock Tower², and the Entrance Building to Clapham Common Tube Station³. The two latter buildings are sited in front of the terrace, which the appeal site forms part of. As such, they are viewed with the appeal site as a backdrop.
9. The shroud advertisement would be installed upon scaffolding, and the commercial advertisement area would be set within a 1:1 representation of the building façade. The advertisement would be positioned at first floor level, and would extend to cover part of the second floor. It would not take up the whole of the scaffold shroud and a large amount of the 1:1 representation of the building would be visible around the advertisement.
10. As discussed, the advertisements in the surrounding area are of a consistent small scale. This would contrast with the proposed advertisement which would have a larger scale, dominating the street scene. As the host building is also in a prominent location, the proposed advertisement would command attention from passers-by, and would also be a prominent addition to the street scene.
11. The advertisement would be highly visible from within the CCCA. It would be a large addition to the street scene and a juxtaposition from the existing smaller scale advertisements. This contrast, even for a temporary period, would have a harmful effect on the CCCA, failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CCCA.
12. The advertisement would form part of the backdrop within which the Grade II listed Clock Tower and tube station entrance would be viewed, and would be harmful to their setting. The advertisement would also be seen within the same context as 12-16 Clapham Common South Side and the CHSCA, and would appear as an unduly prominent and discordant feature within the street scene.

¹ List Entry Number 1184183

² List Entry Number 1251240

³ List Entry Number 1065005

13. While I appreciate that the advertisement would be installed for a temporary period, it would still cause harm to the setting of these heritage assets. The Appellant has advanced that the advertisement would display local artwork, and it would help to fund the works to the building beneath the scaffolding. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm to the CCA or setting of the CHSCA and Grade II listed buildings.
14. Accordingly, the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the local area. It would cause harm to the setting of the CHSCA and nearby Grade II listed buildings, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CCA. The proposal would not be in accordance with the design guidance contained in the Lambeth's Advertising and Signage Document (2016), Policies Q2, Q5, Q17, Q20 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021). These collectively seek to ensure the quality and character of places and that advertisements have regard to the local character and appearance of an area.

Other Matters

15. The Appellant has referred to two Planning Appeals which concerned shroud advertisements. However, both of those appeal sites were located on Brixton Road. The context of these other examples is therefore different to the appeal before me.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR