



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

**by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 November 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Z/25/3374728**

**65 Bayswater Road, London W2 3PH**

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning Act (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
  - The appeal is made by Catering UK Ltd (trading as Thai Square) against the decision of Westminster City Council.
  - The application Ref 25/05883/ADV.
  - The advertisements are described as 1no illuminated fascia sign and 1no non-illuminated panel sign.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the non-illuminated panel sign. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the illuminated fascia sign at 65 Bayswater Road, London W2 3PH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 25/05883/ADV, an express consent is granted for its display. 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.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The advertisements, the subject of this appeal, were in situ at the time of my site visit and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

### Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the panel sign on visual amenity, including upon the setting of designated heritage assets and whether the scheme would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bayswater Conservation Area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a narrow fronted unlisted building located at the junction of Bayswater Road with Elms Mews. Adjoining to the west is The Swan Public House and to the east on the opposite side of Elms Mews is 61 – 64 Bayswater Road which are all Grade II Listed. In addition, Kensington Gardens are located across the road, a Grade I Listed Registered Historic Park and Garden.
  5. Consequently, the context of the appeal site is of a high quality historic environment with the Bayswater Conservation Area being a mix of residential and commercial uses with grand stucco architecture and relatively limited signage.
  6. Whilst I commend the appellant for the renovations that have taken place on the premises, which quite clearly have drastically improved its character, the large red
-

square panel sign, located perpendicular to the main road fills the depth of the site's frontage where adjacent to the listed pub. When viewed from the east, the sign largely screens the pub's frontage which is of detriment to its setting. Admittedly, the sign abuts a metal railed frame which has an old bicycle set within it, but that in itself would allow visual permeability as opposed to the solid screen installed.

7. I accept that restaurants need to make their presence clear, as many of their customers will be visitors to the city and unfamiliar with the location. However, I consider that the fascia sign would more than adequately fulfil that requirement. With respect, I consider that it is quite clear where the entrance to the restaurant is without the need for the panel sign. I accept that there is an existing panel sign on the western boundary of The Swan, however, that is set back further from the pavement and is more conservative in its design. The same can be said for at 67 Bayswater Road too.
8. I acknowledge that the panel sign is primarily visible from the east, but nonetheless in this sensitive historic location I consider that it appears as a garish addition to the street scene and causes harm to the setting of the designated heritage assets.
9. Therefore, I consider that the panel sign causes harm to the visual amenity of the area and the setting of the listed pub building, as well as failing to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal conflicts with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework which stipulates that the quality and character of a place can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. Further, whilst not decisive, I have had regard to Policy 43 of the City Plan 2019 – 2040 (April 2021) which requires signs and advertisements to make a positive contribution to amenity by being sensitively designed in terms of their size, location, local context, street scene and wider townscape.

## **Conclusion**

10. The Council have not advanced any suggested conditions in respect of the appeal, however, bearing in mind the retrospective nature of the scheme, I consider it is not necessary to impose any additional conditions for the fascia sign other than the standard five conditions set out within the Advertisement Regulations.
11. Insofar as the panel sign is concerned, and having regard to all other matter matters raised, I conclude that that element of the appeal be dismissed.

*C J Tivey*

INSPECTOR