
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2026

by K Dryden BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/Z/25/3376130

32 Lavender Hill, Wandsworth, London SW11 5RL

- 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 Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2025/2991.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of one digital poster display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 16 December 2025 the Government published a consultation 'Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system', together with an accompanying Written Ministerial Statement. The proposed reforms are draft and therefore may be subject to change. Whilst the draft Framework is a material consideration, there is no proposed change to the consent process for advertisements. It has therefore not been necessary to consult the parties on the proposed reforms.
3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 require that decisions are made only in the interest of amenity and public safety. Therefore, whilst I have taken account of the policies the Council considers to be relevant, these have not been decisive in my determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

4. The Council has raised no objection in respect of public safety and based on my observations at the site visit and the evidence provided, I have no reason to take a different view. The main issue in dispute is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to an end of terrace corner property, prominently positioned at the junction of Lavender Hill and Basnett Road. The surrounding area is predominantly commercial at ground floor level, with mixed commercial and residential uses on the upper storeys. While the site is not designated as part of a conservation area, the locality displays a coherent pattern of development, with consistent building lines and attractive, period properties that contribute positively to its established character and visual interest.

6. An existing non-illuminated advertisement panel is positioned on the flank wall of the appeal property, fronting Basnett Road, and the proposal seeks to replace it with a larger, illuminated digital advertisement display. On the opposite side of the road, directly facing the appeal site, there is a further large non-illuminated advertisement panel. From the evidence before me, both parties agree that the advertisements have been in place for a number of years, although the Council maintains that the existing advertisement at the appeal site does not benefit from advertisement consent. In any event, based on my observations during the site visit, I find that the existing large advertisement detracts from the character and appearance of the area, and its presence does not weigh in favour of the appeal. Whilst there are some exceptions, as referenced above, advertisement signage within the locality typically comprises modestly sized fascia signage and projecting signs that are proportionate to the scale of the shopfronts with a limited number of digital screens.
7. The size and scale of the proposed advertisement within its associated structure would appear excessive and visually intrusive in this location. Its height would exceed that of the second-floor window on the flank wall and would fail to integrate successfully with the side elevation of No 32, instead dominating the appearance of the property. In addition, the advertisement would be positioned near the corner of the building, where the terrace group appears more noticeable than the adjoining terraces to the east, due to the curve of the road. Accordingly, even if there are similarities between illuminated and non-illuminated displays, the proposal would appear unduly prominent within the street scene.
8. Given the substantial size and positioning of the advertisement, together with its proposed illuminated display screen, the proposal would be clearly visible in long vistas looking west along Lavender Hill from the crossroads junction with Wandsworth Road, Queenstown Road and Cedars Road, thereby resulting in a conspicuous and incongruous feature that would undermine the established character of the area.
9. Furthermore, the appeal building contains residential accommodation, with several windows positioned very close to the proposal. The building opposite also appears to contain residential development, with facing windows at a high level. Given the advertisement's excessive size, positioning and illumination, together with its close proximity to these windows, the proposal would give rise to a distracting and visually intrusive display, resulting in unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers.
10. Whilst planning conditions could be used to control the level of brightness, frequency of image change, and hours of illumination, this would not overcome the harm found to the visual amenity of the area where the large, illuminated display would appear as a conspicuous and discordant feature that would undermine the established character of the area.
11. There are other advertisements and street lighting within the locality. However, given its excessive size and prominent siting, the impact of the proposed illuminated display would be significantly greater than any existing signage or lighting in the local context, detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the area due to its size, positioning and

illumination. Although not determinative to this appeal, I have had regard to the policies of the development plan, including Policies LP1, LP2 and LP9 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) which, amongst other things, require proposals to be of an appropriate scale which relates to the prevailing local character, and not compromise the amenity of adjoining sites. They also require new advertisements to respect local context and avoid visual intrusion of light pollution. The policies have been considered as far as they are material, and in this respect, the scheme would conflict with the development plan.

Other Matters

13. While I have had regard to the appellant's reference to communication with the Council, this matter has not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issues of this appeal.
14. Several public benefits of the proposal have been raised by the appellant. These include a reduction in vehicle trips to repost advertisements every two weeks and associated environmental benefits from the use of LED technology, which allows remote updating. They also refer to high-quality designs, well-maintained sites and the consolidation of multiple advertising locations, thereby reducing clutter and waste. Further claimed benefits include greater flexibility for local businesses to access advertising space, the ability to broadcast emergency messaging, the use of void periods for public information and public art campaigns, and the potential to integrate additional hardware to support Smart City objectives. Economic benefits have also been cited, such as increased rent and business rates payable to the Council. However, I afford these public benefits limited weight as I have been provided with insufficient information to demonstrate that the benefits of the proposal cannot be provided in a less harmful way or in a less sensitive location.
15. I have been provided with a number of examples where digital advertisement displays have been granted consent, this includes an appeal decision for a site in Manchester, in addition to various sites within London. Whilst I do not have full details of these cases, the addresses provided do not have the same site context as this appeal, and are sited a significant distance from the appeal property. Each proposal must in any event be assessed on its own merits. Accordingly, these examples are of limited weight in my decision and do not outweigh the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Dryden

INSPECTOR