



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2025 by R Parker BSc (Hons)

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/Z/25/3363399

Railway Abutment Wall, Adjacent to 196 Shoreditch High Street, Hackney E1 6LG

- 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 P Hulme (Global Street Art) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2733.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of a non-illuminated mural on wall to railway viaduct measuring 7.5m x 3.59m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of a non-illuminated mural on wall to railway viaduct measuring 7.5m x 3.59m. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

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. A mural is currently in place on the appeal site under a previous consent, occupying a larger space than proposed in this appeal. While each proposal is considered on its own merits, and notwithstanding the differences in size, the mural in situ nonetheless allowed me to form a good impression of the effect the proposal would have.
4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) set out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised 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. In this instance, no objection has been raised by the Council or other interested party in relation to public safety. Having regard to the presented evidence and my observations on site, I have no reason to reach an alternative view and confirm that the proposal would cause no harm to public safety.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity, with particular regard to the South Shoreditch Conservation Area (SSCA), nearby listed buildings and locally listed buildings.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises an abutment wall supporting a Transport for London (TfL) railway bridge and is situated on a busy multi-lane thoroughfare. The site's position adjacent to a major crossroads for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic, underneath a railway bridge, renders it quite an unappealing space, in contrast with its rich and historic environs.
7. The appeal site is located within the South Shoreditch Conservation Area (SSCA), which owes much of its special interest to its historic association with the furniture and printing industries. The site also lies within the setting of several Grade II listed buildings, including 187-189, 191 and 196 Shoreditch High Street, and in proximity to several locally listed buildings, namely 192-193 Shoreditch High Street and 2-4 Great Eastern Street.
8. The significance of these nearby listed and locally listed buildings derives primarily from their special historic interest and architectural detailing but also, in the case of nos 187-191, their value as a group. The built environment surrounding the appeal site consists of buildings of mixed ages, predominantly those from the 19th and 20th centuries. Many of the surrounding buildings retain features demonstrative of their previous industrial or commercial use. Within this sensitive historic context, the railway bridge, which the appeal site forms part of, somewhat appears as a detracting feature. That said, the juxtaposition of the historic, mid-century (such as the Locally Listed 2-4 Great Eastern Street) and the modern is a defining feature of Shoreditch High Street's character at this location.
9. This is an energetic, colourful area, predominantly characterised by active street frontages, including shops, hotels, bars and cafes with outdoor seating, and a constant pedestrian presence, creating a strong feeling of connection between buildings, street, and people. While demonstrating some stylistic cohesion, such as that seen at nos 187-191, buildings are constructed using a diversity of materials and with a variety of architectural details – as at the locally listed nos 192-193. There is too a plethora of advertisements on display – largely in the form of shop fascias and projecting signs, which reflects the commercial character of the area.
10. Within this context, the proposed mural would not cause harm to the amenity of the area, but would reflect its visually rich character by enlivening an otherwise unattractive and rather intimidating space. Further, the proposal would protect the site itself from unauthorised uses such as tagging and flyposting, thus aiding in the reduction of visual clutter in the area. As owners of the wall, TfL would retain a degree of control over the content of the murals, including the nature and frequency of any advertising contained within them, through their existing advertising policy, preventing the site from excessive commercial advertising.
11. Consequently, the appeal proposal would not detract from the amenity of the surrounding area and, as such, would preserve the character and appearance of the SSCA, but also the special interest of the nearby listed buildings and locally listed buildings aforementioned, as derived from their respective setting. Therefore,

to the extent that they are material considerations relevant to the main issue, the proposal would not conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan, or with Policies LP1, LP2, LP3, LP4, or LP7 of the Hackney Local Plan (2020), which among other things, seek to ensure high-quality design and the protection of heritage assets.

Conditions

12. The five standard conditions should be imposed.
13. The Council has suggested an additional condition of a reduced approval period of 12 months. However, this is not what the appellant had applied for and would be tantamount to an alteration of the proposal and therefore unsuitable, particularly as the five year period sought is considered acceptable in this instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

R Parker

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR