



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2025

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/Z/25/3369936
513 Fulham Road, London, SW6 1HH

- 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 of Blow Up Media UK Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2025/01467/ADV.
 - The proposed advertisement is described as a painted wall mural advertisement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The advertisement proposed is a mural painted onto the currently blank end wall of an end of a three-storey terrace mixed use property. The advertisement would be approximately 8.6m wide by 5.6m high and would be set just over 5m above ground level. The proposed is described as a mixture of art and advertisement, to be painted by a selection of street artists. The display would be subject to change at non-specified intervals.
3. The site is included within the Moore Park Conservation Area (CA). Diagonally opposite to the site is the Sir Oswald Stoll Foundation, a Grade II listed building (LB), whose significance derives from its special historic and architectural interest as an English Baroque style building. Its gates, piers and railings are also listed. Also on the other side of Fulham Road is an entrance to Stamford Bridge, the home of Chelsea FC.
4. Reference has been made to three previous appeals affecting the site. The first¹ related to a discontinuance notice served by the Council; the second² related to an internally illuminated poster banner, and the third³ related to a more recent proposal to display a non-illuminated banner advertisement at the site. All appeals were dismissed, and the decisions are material to my considerations.
5. Reference has also been made to the *National Planning Policy Framework*. Its guidance underlines the fact that the powers under the current Regulations to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and

¹ APP/H5390/H/152/2172712

² APP/H5390/H/14/2219083

³ APP/H5390/Z/24/3344071

public safety. The Council has objected solely on amenity grounds. The development plan policies referred to have been treated as material considerations.

Main Issues

6. These are the effect of the advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

7. The appeal site stands at the junction of Fulham Road and Britannia Road, with the latter street being predominantly residential in character. Fulham Road is more commercial in character and carries a significant amount of vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The site is prominent locally and in views from the west, and its proximity to the LB persuades me that it falls within its setting. However, I acknowledge the appellant's point that the entrance to Stamford Bridge is a material factor in defining local character.
8. The advertisement would be significantly larger than the advertisement refused consent on appeal last year, occupying about half the area of the end wall. Whilst the proposed advertisement would be painted onto the wall, it would nevertheless constitute a large and prominent advertisement. Although non-illuminated, it would borrow light from nearby street lamps, thus enabling it to be seen at night. On account of its size and prominence, I regard the proposal as visually intrusive. I see very little to distinguish the proposal from that subject of the last submission and there is, in my opinion, no convincing or persuasive reason to arrive at different conclusions to my colleague, who dealt with a smaller advertisement proposal in 2024.
9. I conclude that the size and prominence of the advertisement would be such as to impinge harmfully on local visual amenity. It would also devalue the appearance of the CA and harm the LB's setting.
10. All other matters raised in the representations have been considered, including the references to the National Planning Policy Guidance on advertisements. No other matter outweighs the considerations that led to my conclusions, and the appeal is therefore dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR