
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/Z/24/3353539

45-55 Great Eastern Street, Shoreditch, London EC2A 3EP

- 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 Justin Myers, Blow Up Media UK LTD, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0991.
 - The advertisement proposed is a temporary printed decorative scaffold shroud wrap advertisement comprising a 1:1 image of the building façade with an inset advertising area measuring 21m x 7m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of a printed decorative scaffold shroud wrap advertisement comprising a 1:1 image of the building façade with an inset advertising area measuring 21m x 7m at 45-55 Great Eastern Street, Shoreditch, London EC2A 3EP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/0991. The consent is for one year from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The advertisement permitted by this consent and any structures erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying the advertisement shall be removed from the site no later than 1 year from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The advertisement permitted by this consent shall not be illuminated.

Procedural Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require that applications for the display of advertisements are considered in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the South Shoreditch Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a terrace of 4 storey brick properties of similar appearance above with a recessed modern roof extension has been added. The terrace occupies the entirety of the portion of Great Eastern Street between Phipp Street and Curtain Road and is a prominent element in the street scene. Great Eastern Street is located within a busy, vibrant and high density commercial area on the fringe of the City of London. The appeal site is situated within the South Shoreditch Conservation Area (CA) and opposite 40-42 Great Eastern Street, an elegant grade II listed late-Victorian former warehouse building.
6. The distinctive character of the CA is derived from the mix of generally 4 and 5 storey grand former retail and warehouse buildings that line the main thoroughfares and the lower-scale buildings in the irregular grid of smaller streets and lanes behind the main roads. The warehouse buildings use a similar palette of materials and architectural details which gives the area a relatively high degree of visual unity. The appeal building forms part of this visual unity and therefore makes a positive contribution to the CA.
7. The appellant intends to carry out restoration and refurbishment works to the appeal property's street frontages. To do this scaffolding would need to be erected. The appeal proposal would comprise the wrapping of this scaffolding with a shroud that would depict the building's façade at a scale of 1:1. Within the main face of the shroud an approximately 21m wide by 7m high space would be dedicated for use as an advertisement area. The facade image would be fixed for the duration of the advertisement consent whilst the appearance of the advertising area would change over time. The appellant advises that the advertising area would help fund the building montage image on the shroud and the refurbishment works.
8. I fully appreciate that the street frontages of the appeal property require refurbishment and give significant weight to the long term enhancement to the character and appearance of the CA that should result from these works. The installation of a shroud with a 1:1 image of the appeal property's main façade during the temporary period of the refurbishment works would have a lesser visual impact than would occur with standard scaffolding sheeting. Whilst the advertising area would be large, it would not be an overly dominant element in this instance given the significant overall size of the shroud.
9. For these reasons, and having regard to Planning Practice Guidance on shrouds attached to scaffolding, I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on visual amenity and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA for the temporary period that it needs to be in place.
10. I have taken into account Policies LP1, LP3, and LP7 of the adopted Hackney Local Plan 2020 (LP33) which, amongst other matters, seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposed shroud would not harm amenity, it does not conflict with these policies.

11. The application drawings indicate that the advertising area would be illuminated by 7 projecting lamps situated above the advertisement area. This would accentuate the advertisement area to a high degree during hours of darkness and tip the balance into harm in respect of visual amenity and appearance to the CA. On the basis that the appellant has identified this part of the proposal as “optional” and the lamps are physically severable from the shroud, a condition is imposed to prohibit the installation of illumination.

Conditions

12. There is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the refurbishment works cannot be undertaken within a year from the date of this decision. Consequently, I do not consider it necessary impose the form of condition put forward by the appellant. For the avoidance of any doubt a condition is imposed to explicitly prevent the installation of illumination.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in respect of the installation of a shroud.

S Poole

INSPECTOR