



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 November 2025

by **P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/U5360/Z/25/3375043

Wick Road (South Side C/O Chapman Road) Hackney, London E9 5JB

- 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 of Build Hollywood Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1448.
 - The advertisement proposed is 48 sheet size timber billboard (non illuminated) for general poster advertising measuring 6 x 3 metres.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/U5360/Z/25/3375047

Adj Rail Bridge, Wick Road (South Side Adj Railway Bridge by East Cross Route), Hackney, London E9 5DH

- 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 of Build Hollywood Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1449.
 - The advertisement proposed is two timber billboard displays (non-illuminated) for the display of 4-sheet printed posters each measuring 6.2 x 1.7 metres.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/U5360/Z/25/3375114

Adjacent Railway Abutment Wall, Wick Road (North Side by Railway Abutment Wall), Hackney, London E9 5DH

- 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 of Build Hollywood Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1445.
 - The advertisement proposed is 48 sheet size timber billboard (non illuminated) for general poster advertising measuring 6 x 3 metres.
-

Appeal A Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of “48 sheet size timber billboard (non illuminated) for general poster advertising measuring 6 x 3 metres”, at “Wick Road (South Side C/O Chapman Road) Hackney, London E9 5JB”, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/1448. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.

Appeal B Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal C Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of “48 sheet size timber billboard (non illuminated) for general poster advertising measuring 6 x 3 metres”, at “Adjacent Railway Abutment Wall, Wick Road (North Side by Railway Abutment Wall), Hackney, London E9 5DH”, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/1445. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

4. As set out in the banner headings above, this decision letter relates to 3 appeals on neighbouring sites. All appeals have been submitted by the same appellant and relate to advertisements of a similar nature. Whilst I have determined each proposal against its specific considerations, I have dealt with common issues together in the interests of conciseness and to avoid duplication.
5. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the 2007 Regulations) and paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), make clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. I have approached the appeals on this basis.
6. In all cases, the advertisements subject to the appeals are already in place. My site visit confirmed that the displays correspond with the submitted plans and supporting details for which consent is sought. My assessment has therefore been made on that basis.

Main Issues

7. The main issues in all appeals are the effect of the proposed advertisement(s) on:
 - the visual amenity of the area; and
 - public safety, with specific regard to the safety of vehicles and pedestrians using the adjacent highways.

Reasons

The appeal sites and their context

8. All appeal sites are located adjacent to Wick Road and are within approximately 50 metres of one another.
9. The Appeal A site is located on the south side of Wick Road, opposite its junction with Eastway and at the point where Wick Road transitions into Chapman Road. It sits at the back edge of the footway, fronting a busy signal-controlled junction. The immediate surroundings are dominated by transport infrastructure, notably an elevated railway viaduct, and include mixed land uses with commercial activity at street level on Eastway and some residential elements along Chapman Road. The

billboard subject to the appeal is positioned in front of a vegetated area associated with the rail infrastructure.

10. The Appeal B site is situated on the south side of Wick Road near the slip road entrance to the A12. The two displays subject to the appeal are arranged around the base abutment wall of the railway viaduct and its supporting structure, flanking a larger billboard that is understood to benefit from separate advertisement consent. Both displays are positioned immediately adjacent to the public footway, with the westerly display elevated above two pavement-mounted equipment cabinets. The surrounding context is heavily influenced by major road and rail infrastructure, being primarily characterized by a busy signalised junction leading to the A12 slip road.
11. The Appeal C site lies on the north side of Wick Road, broadly opposite the Appeal B advertisements and partially beneath the railway viaduct. It shares a similar context dominated by road and rail infrastructure. The display is affixed to a substantial brick buttress forming part of the viaduct base structure, which is set back from the public footway behind a fenced off area of vegetation.

Policy context

12. Policies D3 and D8 of the London Plan, March 2021 (the LP) collectively require development to respect local context, enhance public realm, and avoid intrusive or cluttered features. LP Policies T2 and T4 seek to promote walking, cycling, and public transport, and ensure transport impacts are mitigated without increasing safety risks.
13. Policies LP1 and LP7 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033, Strategic Planning, Adopted July 2020 (the HLP), demand high design quality and prohibit unsightly proliferation of signage, while Policies LP41, LP42 and LP43 seek safe, accessible environments that reduce car dominance and support active travel.
14. Policy BN.16 of the London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan 2020 to 2036, Adopted 21 July 2020 (the DCLP) requires advertisements to avoid visual clutter, protect amenity and heritage, and respect character and scale.

Visual amenity

15. Concerns raised by the Council and interested parties in relation to Appeal A include visual intrusion, tree removal, and cumulative clutter, with references to alleged illegal siting and enforcement history. Whilst these matters have been considered, allegations regarding illegality and landowner consent are not material to the assessment of amenity under the 2007 Regulations.
16. The Appeal A site lies within a clearly urban environment, and the display is a single, freestanding panel positioned where advertisements might reasonably be expected in such a context. It does not detract from any notable architectural features or heritage assets, nor does it introduce an accumulation of signage at this location. Although visually prominent, this is inherent to its function as an advertisement. Given its nature and surrounding context, I am not persuaded that the proposal would result in an unsightly proliferation of signage or undermine the character of the locality to the extent that it would harm visual amenity.
17. Similar concerns were raised by the Council and interested parties in respect of Appeal C, including the residential nature of the area, pedestrian sensitivity, and

cumulative clutter. However, that display is also a single panel affixed to a substantial viaduct buttress, viewed against a backdrop of transport infrastructure rather than sensitive townscape or any recognised heritage assets. While prominent, the advertisement is proportionate to its host structure and does not introduce clutter. The appellant's argument that the display provides visual interest in contrast to the plain brickwork is noted, and against this utilitarian backdrop it does not appear incongruous. I therefore find that the Appeal C advertisement would not result in harm to the area's visual amenity.

18. In the case of Appeal B, the appellant contends that the site has hosted advertising for over a decade and that the displays are compatible with their surroundings. Whilst the context is similar to that of Appeals A and C, the Appeal B proposal involves two advertisements flanking an existing large billboard, creating a cluster of three displays in close proximity. The combined effect is materially different, resulting in an over-concentration of signage at a single location and introducing visual clutter and a sense of dominance that exceeds what might reasonably be expected, even in an urban setting. Although the appellant suggests potential for a split decision, this would not address the key issue of proliferation. For these reasons, I find that the advertisements in Appeal B would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area.
19. To conclude on this issue, I find that Appeals A and C would not result in unacceptable harm to visual amenity and are consistent with the aims of the 2007 Regulations, LP Policies D3 and D8, HLP Policies LP1 and LP7, and DCLP Policy BN.16.
20. Appeal B, however, would harm visual amenity through an accumulation of advertisements that creates visual clutter and dominance, contrary to the provisions of the 2007 Regulations and the policies set out above.

Public safety

21. The Council contends that the advertisements, by reason of their size and siting, would distract drivers and pedestrians at busy junctions, create hazards during maintenance, and exacerbate risks in locations with recorded collisions. Interested parties echo these concerns, citing proximity to signal-controlled crossings and high traffic volumes.
22. Although collision data has been cited, it lacks specific detail and provides no substantive evidence linking incidents to advertisements. Whilst the noted concerns have been considered, they must be weighed against the available evidence and my site observations in the context of the 2007 Regulations and relevant policies.
23. My site visits confirm that traffic in the vicinity of all three sites is generally slow-moving, with signalised junctions controlling flows. All advertisements are positioned at or near these junctions, where drivers are accustomed to stopping and scanning their surroundings. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that the existing advertisements have contributed to past collisions, nor that their retention would materially increase risk. The Council's evidence provides limited detail of past incidents, and its reliance on collision clusters is not supported by analysis of the causes of incidents. Given the high traffic volumes on these routes, some incidents are statistically inevitable regardless of roadside advertising.

24. Notably, no technical objections were raised by Transport for London or the local highway authority on these grounds. This absence of objection limits the weight I attach to the Council's case that the proposals pose an unacceptable safety risk.
25. In respect of Appeal A, the single freestanding panel is parallel to the carriageway and does not obstruct sightlines or traffic signals. Its static, non-illuminated format is familiar in urban contexts and unlikely to distract drivers exercising reasonable care. No evidence suggests that its presence would compromise pedestrian safety at the adjacent crossing. Similarly, Appeal C involves a single display affixed to a substantial structure and set back behind a fenced area. It does not impede visibility of signals or junction layouts. Given the controlled traffic environment and absence of highway authority objection, the evidence suggests the risk of distraction caused by the advertisements is minimal.
26. Notwithstanding my amenity findings on Appeal B, although the proposal results in a concentration of advertising, the displays are static, non-illuminated, and positioned at street level in a context where drivers are already required to slow or stop at signals. There is no compelling evidence that this arrangement would materially increase risk to highway or pedestrian safety.
27. I therefore conclude that all three proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on public safety, with specific regard to highway and pedestrian safety. In respect of this issue, the proposals would therefore accord with the relevant provisions of the 2007 Regulations, LP Policies T2 and T4, and HLP Policies LP41, LP42 and LP43.

Conditions

28. All advertisements granted express consent are subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.
29. The Council's questionnaires for all appeals suggest an additional condition limiting the display of the advertisements to five years. However, this reflects the standard provisions of the 2007 Regulations, which apply to all advertisement consents by default. I am therefore not satisfied that imposing such a condition would meet the tests of necessity set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

Conclusion – Appeals A and C

30. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeals should be allowed subject to the conditions set out in my formal decisions.

Conclusion – Appeal B

31. For the reasons given above, although I have identified no harm in respect of public safety, the advertisements proposed would harm visual amenity. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR