
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2025

By SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K5030/Z/25/3366346

62 Aldgate High Street, City of London, London EC3N 1BD

- 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 City of London.
 - The application Ref is 25/00425/ADVT.
 - The proposed advertisement is described on the application form as “temporary wall mural advertisement”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations) and paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework state that advertisements should be subject to control in the interests of amenity and public safety. In this case, the Council has raised no issue regarding public safety, and I have found no reason to disagree.
3. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan only in so far as they are material.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on Aldgate High Street. The immediate context is typified by a busy, commercial environment, including Aldgate Underground Station, a bus terminus, and large-scale commercial buildings. While this area of the City exhibits vibrancy and architectural variety, it is also characterised by a notable restraint in terms of advertising. There is an almost complete absence of advertising above ground floor level in the surrounding area, and this is a defining visual characteristic of the locality.
6. The proposal involves the installation of a non-illuminated wall mural advertisement measuring 6000mm high x 7500mm on the brick flank elevation of the four-storey host property for a period of 18 months. The elevation is currently highly prominent

in the street scene due to an adjacent cleared site. The appellant's evidence suggests that the host building will be demolished in due course as part of a wider redevelopment.

7. The proposed mural, though hand-painted and non-illuminated, would occupy a large portion of the flank wall at first and second floor levels. It would be highly visible in both short-range views, including from Aldgate Underground Station and the bus terminus, as well as in longer perspectives along Aldgate High Street. Its elevated siting and substantial scale would render it visually dominant and incongruous, undermining the established restrained character of the area.
8. While the temporary nature of the proposal may somewhat limit its impact on amenity, it does not sufficiently mitigate the harm arising from the advertisement's excessive scale, incongruous nature and dominant presence. In this instance, even for a limited period of 18 months, the mural would disrupt the character of visual coherence and advertising restraint that defines this part of the City.
9. I am referred by the appellant to an existing illuminated advertising display at 54 Aldgate High Street. However, based on the limited information before me, this advertisement is of a markedly different format and is not located at an elevated level. Furthermore, each case depends on its specific context, and the siting, and position here are key considerations. In any case, I have assessed this appeal on its own merits, and the presence of this other advertisement does not justify the harm to amenity at this site.
10. One public comment in support of the proposal was received, noting the potential to improve the area's attractiveness. However, in the context of broader amenity considerations, limited public support does not outweigh the harm identified.
11. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that in assessing amenity, a consideration is whether the proposal is in scale and in keeping with the characteristics of a neighbourhood where the advertisement is to be displayed. For the reasons given above, I find that the site is not suitable for the proposed advertisement due to its scale, siting and the effects on a cohesive and restrained architectural environment and character.
12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would harm the amenity of the area. As far as it is material, it would also conflict with Policies CS10 and DM10.6 of the City of London Local Plan (adopted 2015), which amongst other matters, encourage a high standard of design and a restrained amount of advertising in keeping with the character of the City.

Other Matters

13. The use of local artists and the mural format is commendable in its intent, albeit it remains a form of commercial advertising. However, the Regulations make clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. This consideration does not alter my findings on the main issue above.

Conclusion

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

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR