



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2025

By SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/Z/25/3371576

532 Fulham Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London SW6 5BD

- 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 Brendan Gilmore of The Fulham Boys School against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2025/01531/ADV.
 - The proposed advertisement is described as 'Display of non-illuminated advertisement banner measuring 8.9m (height) x 7.7m (width) to the corner elevation of the main building facing both Fulham Road and Heckfield Place elevations'.
-

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 2024 state that advertisements should be subject to control in the interests of amenity and public safety.
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.
4. I have changed the description of the proposed advertisement in the banner heading above to that used on the Decision Notice and Appeal Form, which provide greater clarity and accuracy.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area; and,
 - the effect of the proposed advertisement upon public safety.

Reasons

Amenity

6. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Fulham Road and Heckfield Place, within Fulham Town Centre. The building is part four, part six storeys and accommodates The Fulham Boys School, with commercial and institutional activity at lower levels and residential units above.

7. The site lies immediately adjacent to the Walham Green Conservation Area (WGCA), whose boundary runs along Fulham Road. In accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
8. The special interest of the WGCA appears to derive from its cohesive historic townscape, distinguished by high-quality late Victorian and Edwardian architecture, consistent materials, and a unified urban grain. Together, these elements provide the area with considerable architectural, cultural and historic value. Within this sensitive context, the advertisement would occupy a visually prominent position.
9. While signage and advertisements are present along Fulham Road, those within this section of the Town Centre are typically modest in scale, traditional in form, and positioned at fascia level, directly associated with individual commercial frontages. There is a notable absence of large-scale or elevated advertising displays of the type now proposed.
10. The proposal seeks to install a non-illuminated advertisement measuring approximately 8.9 metres in height and 7.7 metres in width upon the corner façade of the host building between the first and second floors. It would obscure a number of existing windows and architectural features. By virtue of its nature, scale, siting and corner prominence, it would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature, failing to read as a subordinate or integrated addition to the host building.
11. Rather than integrating with its surroundings, when viewed in a south westerly direction in short and long views, it would jar with the prevailing character and rhythm of the streetscape. I acknowledge that the appeal site lies outside the WGCA boundary. Nonetheless, the proposal would intrude upon views into and out of the WGCA. From these vantage points, the advertisement would be harmful to the setting of the WGCA, introducing a discordant and commercialised element that would erode its visual coherence and historic character.
12. Accordingly, the advertisement would be visually intrusive, overbearing, and incongruous within this sensitive context. It would fail to respect, preserve, or enhance the character or appearance of the WGCA.
13. I have considered the appellant's submissions that the display would be temporary (five years), non-illuminated and constructed from high-quality, non-PVC material. These factors do not materially reduce the harm arising from the advertisement's excessive scale and prominence. Even as a temporary feature, a five-year duration represents a substantial period during which significant visual harm would persist.
14. The Planning Practice Guidance¹ (PPG) states that in assessing amenity, if the locality where the advertisement is to be displayed has important scenic, historic, architectural or cultural features, whether the proposal is in scale and in keeping with these features is a consideration. For the reasons given above, I find that the site is not suitable for the proposed advertisement given the sensitive heritage context.
15. I conclude that the proposal would harm the amenity of the area. Having due regard to my duty under the Act, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve or

¹ Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 18b-079-20140306

enhance the character or appearance of the WGCA. As far as it is material, it would also conflict with Policies DC1 and DC9 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (2018) (LP) and Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (the SPD), which collectively seek to ensure that advertisements respond positively to local character and avoid harm to heritage assets.

Public Safety

16. The Council's Highway Officer raised concerns that, in the absence of a Highway or Road Safety Audit, the proposed advertisement could distract motorists and pedestrians, thereby posing a risk to public safety, particularly given the site's position at a busy junction with high pedestrian activity associated with the adjacent school.
17. The PPG recognises that while all advertisements are designed to attract attention, particular care is required where drivers must exercise heightened concentration. It identifies the characteristics of advertisements most likely to cause danger². The proposal would be a static, non-illuminated advertisement positioned flush with the building façade. It would not obstruct sightlines, resemble traffic signs, or incorporate moving or illuminated elements. Moreover, the section of Fulham Road concerned benefits from good forward visibility and is subject to a 20-mph speed limit.
18. Having considered the evidence and my observations on site, I find no compelling evidence that the proposal would cause unacceptable distraction to road users or materially increase risk to highway safety.
19. For the reasons given above, based upon the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in harm to public safety. The provisions of the development plan, so far as they are relevant, have been considered. Since the proposed advertisement would not have an unacceptable impact upon public safety, I find no conflict with Policies T1 and DC9 of the of the LP or Key Principle TR28 of the SPD in this respect.

Other Matters

20. The appellant and third parties have referred to the potential financial benefits arising from the proposal, particularly in generating additional funding for the school. 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.
21. The appellant contends that Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the SPD apply only to new development within conservation areas and should not therefore be applied in this case, as the site lies outside the boundary of the WGCA. However, as noted above, the proposal would affect the setting of the WGCA. In accordance with the Regulations, I have therefore had regard to this guidance only insofar as it is material.
22. The appellant also highlights an error in the Council's Decision Notice regarding the specified advertisement material. Nevertheless, the material finish would not alter

² Paragraph: 068 Reference ID: 18b-068-20140306

my findings on the adverse visual impact of the advertisement's scale, prominence and position.

Conclusion

23. While I have found no harm to public safety, the proposal would result in harm to the amenity of the area. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

SJ Desai
INSPECTOR