



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 May 2025 by R Pankhurst

Decisions by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/U5360/Z/25/3359706

135-137 City Road, Hackney, London, EC1V 1JB

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Justin Myers (blowUP media UK Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2387.
 - The advertisement proposed is temporary printed decorative scaffold shroud wrap with a 1:1 replica of the building façade with an inset sponsors advertising area measuring 8 x 7 metres.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/U5360/Z/25/3363321

135-137 City Road, Hackney, London, EC1V 1JB

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Justin Myers (blowUP media UK Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0176.
 - The advertisement proposed is temporary decorative printed scaffold shroud wrap advertisement comprising a 1:1 replica image of the building façade incorporating a designed in sponsors advertising area measuring 7 x 7 metres.
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A and B are both 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. There are two appeals for shrouds with commercial advertisement insets at the site. Appeal A proposes an advertising area measuring 8 x 7 metres on the elevation facing Cranwood Street and Appeal B proposes an advertising area measuring 7 x 7 metres on the front elevation facing City Road. Each proposal has been considered on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) set out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised only 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.

Main Issues

5. For both appeals, the Council has concluded that the advertisements would be acceptable in terms of public safety and, from the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, for both appeals, the main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendations

6. The appeal site comprises a four storey property at the end of a three storey brick terrace, with stone fenestration and shops on the ground floor. The surrounding area is commercial with a mix of retail, restaurants, bars, offices and residential. There is variety in the age of buildings with period listed buildings amongst modern high rise buildings. However, the immediate area is characterised by older buildings, with ornately detailed period properties opposite which are in the Moorfields Conservation Area (MCA) and include a Grade II listed building. The listed building is a large and highly decorated structure which makes a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the MCA and local area.
7. The appeal site is on a corner plot and prominently visible from a number of short to medium range views, in particular along City Road, the junction from Cranwood Street onto City Road, and from the joining of East Road into City Road. The appeal site forms part of a larger group of period properties, which includes the buildings opposite, which together have collective value.
8. In the appeal submission, reference is made to the exterior of the appeal building being in poor condition and I note that the Council served a section 215 enforcement notice requiring the owners to address the condition of the building by April 2025. Although the parties have not made any further submissions to update me on progress on these works, during my site visit, I observed that the exterior of the appeal property appears to have been refurbished. It had a tidy and freshly painted appearance much improved from the condition shown in the photograph in the Council's officer report. Therefore, the appeal property now positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The character of the advertising within the immediate area is generally restricted to smaller-scale and low-level signage associated with ground floor level businesses. This is the case even on much larger properties in the vicinity. While I acknowledge there is a digital advertising display on the other end of the terrace and a multifaceted digital advertising display just above Old Street Station, these advertisements are largely surrounded by modern high rise buildings with a busy multi lane junction at the centre and are therefore set in a different context to the appeal site.
10. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) cautions that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets out that buildings which are being renovated may be considered suitable as temporary sites for shroud advertisements. However, it also states that the local characteristics of the neighbourhood should always be considered. While development plan policies are not determinative in advertisement appeals, the provisions of the development plan can be taken into account if they are material. Policy LP7 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 Strategic Planning (adopted 2020) (HLP), requires advertisements to be

of the highest standard of design, respect local character and context and be sensitive to the character of an area.

11. The proposed schemes for Appeal A and B would each install a shroud decorated with a 1:1 image of the building facade along with an area for advertisement, for a temporary period whilst alterations are made to the building. For Appeal A the temporary period applied for is 12 months, however the appellant has said they would accept 6 months. For Appeal B the temporary period applied for is 6 months.
12. In Appeal A the advertisement inset would cover a significant proportion of the appeal property's side elevation in an elevated position where it would be prominently visible in the street scene. In Appeal B, the advertisement inset, albeit slightly smaller, would still be at an elevated position on the front elevation facing City Road. This elevation is even more prominent and closer to the Grade II listed building opposite. Both proposals would therefore obscure views of the host building, diminishing its contribution to the MCA, to the detriment of the amenity of the area.
13. Both schemes would also be seen in conjunction with the listed building opposite. There are other large advertisements in the vicinity of this building, and its setting is highly commercial. However, the proposals would each introduce a prominent and detracting feature into views towards the listed building, detracting from its setting and contribution to the MCA. The Appeal B scheme would have a greater impact due to its proposed siting facing the listed building, despite being slightly smaller than the Appeal A scheme.
14. This harm would be reduced by the temporary nature of both proposed advertisement insets, however the harm would still endure for the duration of each proposal. The 1:1 image of the building façade proposed for each scheme would be preferable to a plain shroud. However, I consider that the harm to the amenity of the area resulting from the size and elevated position of each advertising inset would outweigh that benefit of the 1-1 image, even for the temporary period sought by each proposal. This would still be the case if the temporary period was reduced from 12 months to 6 months as suggested by the appellant for Appeal A, as although the impact would be reduced, there would still be a slight residual harm to amenity.
15. The digital advertisement above Old Street Station is a standalone structure and isolated from period properties. The digital advertisement on the other end of the appeal terrace is a sharp contrast to the historic environment and not particularly sympathetic, but it does not obscure any period detailing of the property. Both are positioned by a large multi lane junction some distance away from the appeal site. Therefore, while I acknowledge there are views where the MCA is seen in the background of these digital advertisements, these digital adverts are seen in a different and more modern context than the appeal site. In addition, I am not aware of what was in existence on each site previously or the circumstances around their approvals. Due to this combination of factors, the effect of these other adverts is not directly comparable to the impact of either appeal scheme.
16. The appellant has mentioned similar building projects whereby a replica building image is displayed, however, the full details of these schemes are not before me. Therefore, I cannot be certain the visual impact of those schemes is comparable to

either appeal proposal. In any event, I must consider each appeal on its own merits.

17. For the reasons above, each of the appeal proposals would harm the amenity of the local area, and that harm would not be satisfactorily mitigated by the temporary nature of each proposal or the conditions suggested. I have taken into account HLP Policy LP7 which seeks to protect amenity and so is material in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with this policy.
18. I have also had regard to HLP Policies LP1 and LP3 and Policies D4, D8 and HC1 of The London Plan (2021). These refer to development however, and advertisements are not development for the purposes of planning legislation, so they are not directly relevant to the proposal before me. Nevertheless, there would be conflict with those elements of the policies which seek good design and to conserve or enhance heritage assets.

Other Matters

19. In each case the appellant has claimed the advertising inset would help towards funding the works needed to the building, and that without the funding the works may not be fulfilled or take longer. However, given the current condition of the appeal site it is not clear if any works remain to be carried out. Furthermore, there is no financial information before me to demonstrate that either of the proposals are necessary to fund any remaining works. Therefore, this does not justify the harm I have identified above.

Conclusions and Recommendations

20. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that Appeal A and Appeal B should both be dismissed.

R Pankhurst

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decisions

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendations. On that basis Appeal A and Appeal B are both dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR