



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/25/3375363

Petrol Filling Station, London SW2 4PB

- 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 Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/02368/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is an illuminated small format advertising display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of an illuminated small format advertising display, at Petrol Filling Station, London SW2 4PB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02368/ADV. 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, and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The advertisement hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the following approved details:
FS796/PA/01 Site Location Plan
FS796/PA/03 Proposed Site Plan
FS796/PA/04 Proposed Site Plan
FS796/PA/05 Existing and Proposed Elevations
FS796/PA/06 Specification
FS796/PA/07 CGI
 - 2) The advertisement hereby permitted shall incorporate no moving images, animation, video or full motion images.
 - 3) In the hours of darkness, the advertisement display luminance shall be no greater than 300cd/m² in accordance with the recommended maximum night time luminance value set out in Table 10.4 within the Institution of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m².
 - 4) In daylight hours, the advertisement display luminance shall be controlled in order to reflect ambient light conditions (to ensure it is neither too bright or too dull), and shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in Table 10.5 within the Institution of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05)

'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m2.

- 5) The minimum display time for each advertisement shall be 10 seconds, and the advertisement shall not include any features which would result in interactive messages / advertisements being displayed.
- 6) The interval between successive advertisements shall be no greater than 1 second and the complete display shall change without effect. The display shall include a mechanism to default to a blank or black screen in the event of malfunction, or if the advertisement is not in use.
- 7) No images displayed shall resemble official road traffic signs, traffic lights or traffic matrix signs.

Preliminary Matters

2. 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 appeal on this basis.
3. The appeal site is located outside, but close to two Conservation Areas (the CAs): the Telford Park Conservation Area (the TCA) and the Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill Conservation Area (the SCA). I have therefore had special regard to the statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CAs.
4. The Council's officer report and decision notice refer to Policies Q17 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020–2035, Adopted September 2021 (the LLP). I have been provided with Policy Q17, which appears within the policy list in the officer report. However, that list does not include Policy Q22, nor have I been provided with its wording. I have instead been provided with Policy Q2, which is listed and is relevant to the matter of amenity. On the evidence before me, there is no basis to conclude that Policy Q22 is engaged or that any conflict with it arises. My assessment has therefore been undertaken with reference to Policies Q2 and Q17 of the LLP.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed advertisement would have an acceptable effect on visual amenity, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CAs.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is an established petrol filling station (PFS) fronting Sternhold Avenue. It already features a notable level of illumination and a range of advertisements and operational signage typical of such forecourts, including canopy lighting and an illuminated totem sign.
7. The TCA is a predominantly residential area and extends to include the land on the opposite side of Sternhold Avenue. The TCA derives its significance primarily

from its architecturally distinctive houses, valued for their style, appearance, and setting.

8. The SCA is an expansive area stretching along Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill to the east of the site, forming a continuous ribbon of predominantly commercial frontage along a major arterial route towards Central London. The SCA's significance lies predominantly in its historic streetscape and established commercial character, which contribute to the architectural and cultural identity of the area.
9. The proposed digital display would be positioned along the eastern boundary of the PFS, away from the predominant pump, kiosk and totem signage. It would sit adjacent to utilitarian forecourt features including a jet wash, air/water and vacuum machines, and below the height of the boundary wall to the neighbouring residential property. The display face would be turned into the forecourt rather than towards that dwelling.
10. In this context, the installation would read as a modest and unobtrusive addition to an already established commercial setting. The site is characterised by existing signage, lighting and other operational elements, and the display's limited scale and discrete siting would assimilate with these features rather than create a dominant addition to them.
11. The advertisement would not be visible from within the SCA. While it would be seen in the foreground of some outside views towards that area, the screening and prevailing commercial character of the PFS mean its visual effect would be limited, preserving the SCA's significance. Whilst the installation would be perceptible from within the southern edge of the TCA, in those views it would remain embedded in the utilitarian context of the forecourt, separate from the positive attributes that underpin the TCA's significance.
12. Taking these findings together, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of both CAs, causing no harm to their significance. As such, it is not necessary to consider the public benefits of the proposal as set out in the Framework. Furthermore, the proposal would preserve the area's wider visual amenity.
13. The Council's reference to historic refusals and dismissed appeals at the site is noted. However, the current scheme must be determined based on the specific proposals before me, and within the framework of today's legislative and policy context, which differs materially from that in place when previous proposals were determined. As such, those earlier decisions carry limited weight and do not persuade me to reach a different conclusion from that set out above.
14. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would not harm the visual amenity of the area and would also preserve the character and appearance of the nearby CAs. It would therefore accord with the relevant provisions of the 2007 Regulations and Policies Q17 and Q2 of the LLP, which collectively seek to ensure advertisements are appropriate to their context and do not adversely affect amenity.

Conditions

15. All advertisements granted express consent are subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations.
16. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that additional conditions can be imposed where they are supported by specific and relevant planning reasons. Both main parties have suggested additional conditions, which I have considered against these provisions and the tests for conditions in the Framework and PPG. Where necessary, these conditions have been omitted or amended to ensure full compliance with those requirements.
17. It is not necessary to impose a standalone condition limiting the display of the advertisement to five years, as that time limit applies by default to all express consents granted under the 2007 Regulations.
18. A condition listing the approved details is necessary in the interests of certainty.
19. Conditions preventing moving images, interactive features, and images that resemble traffic signs are necessary in the interests of amenity and public safety. For the same reasons, conditions controlling luminance in both daylight and hours of darkness are also required.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and express consent granted subject to the conditions listed in my formal decision.

P Storey

INSPECTOR