



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2025

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/25/3371391

274-280 Brixton Road, Lambeth, London SW9 6AG

- 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 Ms Anna McAree (Build Hollywood Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/01700/ADV.
 - The advertisement is a wall mounted timber billboard (non-illuminated) measuring 6 (m) x 3 (m) for poster advertising.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The advertisement the subject of the appeal is already in place at the appeal site. The Council determined the advertisement consent application on a retrospective basis, and I have determined the appeal on the same basis.
3. The appeal site is located within the Brixton Road and Angell Town Conservation Area. As a result, in reaching my decision, I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) make it clear that advertisements are subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 does not apply to advertisement appeals. Even so, relevant development plan policies can be taken into account as a material consideration in advertisement appeals, and this is the basis on which I have determined the appeal.

Main Issue

5. The Council has identified that the effect of the advertisement on public safety is acceptable. I agree with this conclusion. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

6. The significance of the Brixton Road and Angell Town Conservation Area (the CA) as a whole is largely derived from its architectural interest. Making a strong contribution to this interest are the CA's concentrations of traditionally designed residential properties, originally built as villas and townhouses, which line Brixton Road and which are generally set back behind generous gardens. Within the more

central parts of the largely linear CA there is a noticeable shift in character to one that is more commercial and urban. Nevertheless, this area also includes fine examples of traditional architecture. Additionally, verdant public open spaces in the south of the CA also positively contribute to the CA's significance.

7. The appeal site is located within the part of the CA with the more commercial character, and there are many advertisements in the area. This includes, on the opposite side of Brixton Road, a large poster advertisement and a large digital advertisement structure, albeit the display was switched off at the time of my site visit.
8. However, most of the concentration of advertisements in the area comprise of smaller signs located on the commercial premises they relate to. In contrast, measuring approximately 6 metres wide by 3 metres high, the advertisement the subject of the appeal is large, and it is out of scale with many of the advertisements in the area. The advertisement is not illuminated, and I accept it would be more strident if it were. Even so, by reason of its size and siting, it is nevertheless a prominent addition to the area being visible from both Brixton Road and Robsart Street.
9. The building the advertisement is affixed to is not listed and, overall, it does not exude the architectural qualities of many of the buildings which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA. However, the gable end on which the advertisement is sited is largely constructed of a yellow-coloured brick which is very reflective of traditional buildings within the CA. A significant expanse of this section of wall has been concealed, and its more subtle and sympathetic appearance has been replaced with the more imposing and visually jarring advertisement. The appellant asserts that the building the advertisement is displayed on is due for redevelopment. However, the evidence I have before me that this redevelopment is likely to take place is not substantive.
10. There are views whereby the advertisement is seen in conjunction with some of the traditionally designed buildings within this part of the CA. In these views, I find that the advertisement's size and appearance is harmfully at odds with the architectural quality of these buildings. Consequently, rather than successfully assimilating into its surroundings, I find that the advertisement the subject of the appeal has added to the existing plethora of advertisements in the area in an unsympathetic way to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area. The advertisement has failed to preserve or enhance the appearance of the CA. Having regard to the relevant statutory duty I set out earlier, this harm is a matter of considerable importance and weight in my decision.
11. For these reasons, the advertisement has unacceptably harmed visual amenity. Policy Q17 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (the LP) specifically relates to advertisements and signage and, amongst its content, this Policy seeks to ensure that advertisements deliver design excellence, do not add to unacceptable visual clutter and do not diminish the significance of heritage assets. Altogether, Policies Q2, Q5 and Q22 of the LP seek to ensure that visual amenity is not unacceptably compromised, that local and historic character is positively responded to and the character and appearance of conservation areas is preserved. Given their content, these Policies are material in this case, and since I have concluded that the advertisement harms visual amenity, it conflicts with these policies.

12. I also find that the advertisement conflicts with Lambeth's Advertisement and Signage Guidance which requires advertisements to be well designed and which sets out that large advertisements can particularly damage amenity.

Other Matters

13. The consideration of advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Whilst the appellant asserts that the advertisement benefits business and other organisations, it has not been demonstrated to me that these matters are relevant to amenity or public safety. As a result, these asserted benefits do not weigh in favour of the advertisement sought for consent.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the advertisement has unacceptably harmed amenity. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR