



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by Graham Chamberlain BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/Z/25/3375417

210-212 Borough High Street, Southwark, London SE1 1JX

- 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 King Media Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref is 25/AP/2327.
The advertisement proposed is described as *Temporary display (for a period of ten months) of one externally illuminated advertisement sign, within temporary scaffolding shroud, incorporating a 1:1 facsimile of the building and its architectural features printed on it. Material - Kavalan non-PVC woven polyester Max height of individual letter/symbol used in advert - 200cm Colour of text and background – various Static external illumination - 300cd/m2.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the temporary display (for a period of ten months) of one externally illuminated advertisement sign, within a temporary scaffolding shroud incorporating a 1:1 facsimile of the building and its architectural features printed on it (Material - Kavalan non-PVC woven polyester Max height of individual letter/symbol used in advert - 200cm, Static external illumination - 300cd/m²) at 210-212 Borough High Street, Southwark, London SE1 1JX in accordance with the terms of the application 25/AP/2327. The consent is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following condition:
 - 1) The express consent hereby granted shall be for a period of 10 months and shall begin on the date of the commencement of the display or 6 months from the date of this decision whichever is the earlier.

Preliminary Matters

2. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the Regulations (as referred to above) and the Planning Practice Guidance, my consideration of this appeal is confined to the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are material and any other relevant factors. 'Other relevant factors' in this instance, are those relevant to considering public safety and amenity.
3. When dealing with an appeal for an advertisement in a conservation area, the duty in s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant in so far as it relates to the consideration of 'amenity'. However, the statutory duty in s66(1) of the Act relating to the setting of listed buildings does not apply because it only relates to applications for planning permission.

Main Issue

4. Despite the concerns raised by the Borough Transport Policy Team, the Council has raised no issue in respect of public safety. After assessing the proposal, including the Council's analysis, I share this view. The 2007 Regulations explain that factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest. Consequently, the presence of a conservation area and listed buildings, and the impact of the scheme upon them, are an important consideration.
5. As such, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the area, with particular reference to the effect on the significance of the Liberty of the Mint Conservation Area (CA), St George the Martyrs Church (The Church), a Grade II* listed building, and surrounding locally listed buildings (LLB), as features of historic and architectural interest.

Reasons

6. With reference to the Liberty of the Mint Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) and my site visit, it is apparent the CA encompasses a reasonably intact surviving section of townscape that predominantly dates from the late 19th Century. Of note is the historic examples of Victorian social housing and former warehouses. The CA therefore has historic, evidential and aesthetic value as an attractive and discernible collection of buildings, streets and spaces.
7. The appeal site is in a perimeter block of development occupying the eastern extent of the CA. The buildings in the block are tight to the back of the pavement. Those facing onto Borough High Street have rhythm and harmony to their appearance due to similar heights, vertical emphasis to the form and fenestration, and consistent styling and use of materials. This imparts an attractive quality to the town scape which adds to the aesthetic value and significance of the CA.
8. 210-212 Borough High Street is located centrally in the row of buildings within the CA that front onto Borough High Street. A date stone suggests it was built in 1990, although the Council speculate that it may be as early as 1916. It has been designed to reflect a classical style from the early 19th Century with a simple brick façade broken up by symmetrically placed sash windows. There is a commercial use at ground floor. Like other nearby buildings, there is a fascia at ground floor but no advertisement at first floor level or above. The regularity in the position and size of advertisements is another feature that brings a pleasing degree of harmony and composition to the street scene of the CA.
9. The appeal site is located near to LLBs (Nos 202-206, 214-216 and 222-224 Borough High Street within the same frontage and 239 Borough High Street opposite). These buildings are read together as a collection of period structures dating from the late 19th and early 20th Centuries. The LLB to the north is an inter war pub and differs in height and general style from the other LLBs. Nevertheless, the buildings taken together have a harmony and aesthetic value. As explained above, the appeal building has a 19th Century appearance and therefore complements the LLBs and is a positive feature within their settings.
10. St George the Martyrs Church was listed in 1950 and is a fine example of an early 18th Century church. It exhibits a polite classical style due to the symmetrical composition with large columns marking the entrance. The tower with the ornate

spire intentionally draws the eye. Unlike other buildings nearby, it has space around it which further heightens its importance and prominence in the street scene. The building has considerable architectural, historic and aesthetic value. The setting of the building better reveals its significance as an important focal point. That said, the setting has been notably compromised by the erection of tall buildings in its backdrop. Indeed, The Shard has a looming presence behind the Church in the vista looking northeast along Borough High Street. The appeal building is in the foreground of the busy and variable view towards The Church along Borough High Street and helps frame it. It is not especially prominent though, being a peripheral component of this view. The building does not form part of the backdrop of views towards the Church from the north looking south along Borough High Street due to a subtle curve in the road.

11. The owners of the appeal building intend to undertake a programme of maintenance including works to the front façade and roof. Although the need for this is disputed by the Council, the appellant has provided a reasonable level of evidence outlining the proposed works. As part of the appeal submissions the appellant updated the schedule of works to further explain why scaffolding is necessary and the Council has not disputed this despite being given a chance to comment. The works listed appear to be the type of sensible periodic maintenance a building such as this would require. Evidence is not before me to suggest the building has been subject to similar maintenance works recently.
12. The maintenance works would endure for up to 10 months. As is usual practice, a shroud would be installed around the scaffolding during the works to protect the structure from the elements and pedestrians from the risk of falling objects. A shroud is also aesthetically preferable to leaving the scaffolding exposed. That said, a typical scaffolding shroud can also be an unsightly addition to the street scene, as demonstrated by photographs in the appellant's statement. A similar installation at the appeal site would be undesirable.
13. To this end, the appellant is proposing a shroud detailing a facsimile of the front façade of the building printed at a 1:1 scale. Such an approach would be significantly more sympathetic to the aesthetic value and significance of the CA, The Church and LLBs than a conventional shroud. Indeed, the effect of the proposed shroud on the busy and varied street scene of Borough High Street for a short period would be reasonably benign. To pay for this enhanced approach an illuminated advert would be installed in the middle of the shroud. The advert would be elevated above the ground floor and relatively large when compared to other adverts nearby, which tend to be long and slim due to their positions within ground floor fascias. The proposed advert would therefore appear discordant.
14. However, some attempt has been made to respect the proportions of the building as printed on the shroud. Indeed, the advert would be clearly subservient to the façade as a whole and would be set in some way from the sides, much lower than the roof and aligned with the position of windows. The illumination would not be excessive in the context of a busy urban road. Crucially, the shroud and advert would only be in place for up to 10 months and therefore no lasting impact would occur to the street scene and the settings of the LLBs and The Church.
15. Taken in the round, the net effect of the appeal scheme, for a short temporary period, would be preferable in this location to the fall back of exposed scaffolding or a typical scaffolding shroud. On this basis, the proposal would not harm the

significance of the CA (its character and appearance would be preserved) or the setting of both the LLBs and The Church. In arriving at this view, I have carefully considered Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan and Policies P13, P14, P19, P26, P20 and P43 of the Southwark Local Plan. Together, these policies, supported by the Outdoor Advertisement Supplementary Planning Document, seek to ensure adverts safeguard amenity. As I have found that the proposal would not harm amenity if it is installed for a temporary period, there would be no conflict with these policies or Paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

16. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that buildings which are being renovated or are undergoing major structural work and which have scaffolding or netting around them may be considered suitable as temporary sites for shroud advertisements or large 'wrap' advertisements covering the face, or part of the face, of the building. Given my findings on the lack of heritage and other visual harm, the site would be suitable for such a wrap-around advertisement in the way proposed.
17. The Council has referred to appeal decisions where shrouds with an integral advert have been dismissed¹. However, these are contextual decisions where the Inspectors did not find the specific proposals before them appropriate for the locations. As such, there is no inconsistency between my findings and those of other Inspectors given the need to consider proposals on their own merits.
18. In conclusion, based on a temporary period and as an alternative to leaving the scaffolding exposed or wrapped in a conventional shroud, the proposal would not harm the amenity of the area.

Conditions

19. Despite my request, the Council has not provided a list of suggested conditions. Nevertheless, under Regulation 14(a) all advertisements which are granted express consent are subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations. In addition, it is necessary, in the interests of amenity, to limit the period that the shroud and advert can be displayed to 10 months.

Conclusion

20. The appeal is allowed for the reasons given.

Graham Chamberlain
INSPECTOR

¹ Including APP/A5840/Z/20/3251554, APP/A5840/Z/24/3336208 and APP/A5840/Z/24/3354634