



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by **C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/25/3375477

Pavement OS Pico, 74 Albert Embankment, London SE1 7TL

- 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 Mr Nathan Still, In Focus Public Networks Limited, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/02731/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is replacement and updating of a communication apparatus comprising an open access call box and advertisement display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have also determined the appeal against the Council's refusal of the corresponding planning appeal¹. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.
3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require that decisions are made only in the interest of amenity and public safety. Therefore, whilst I have taken account of the policies that the Council considers to be relevant, these have not been decisive in my determination of this appeal.
4. My attention has been drawn to previous appeals for planning permission and advertisement consent² for 'the replacement and upgrade of an existing illuminated and advertised enclosed telephone kiosk with a multifunctional communication Hub including advertisement display', which was dismissed at appeal in November 2023. The Inspector's decision in regard to these appeals is a material consideration in my assessment of the proposal.

Main Issue

5. Having regard to the reasons for refusal in the Council's decision the main issue in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

6. The appeal proposal is for the replacement of an existing semi-enclosed telephone kiosk (incorporating a non-illuminated static poster advert) with a new telephone kiosk hub featuring a digital display on one side. The digital advertisement screen would portray static adverts that could be changed remotely as required.

¹ 6001476

² 3316134 and 3316137 (linked)

7. The appeal site is towards the outer edge of a wide pavement which is in front of railway viaduct arches which house some commercial businesses. The Albert Embankment road at this point is wide and the site is on the eastern side, outside no.74, close to the junction with New Spring Gardens Walk which passes under one of the arches.
8. In the vicinity there are, amongst other things, street trees, outdoor seating and a wide area of raised soft landscaping which separates the commercial uses from the wide pavement, rendering them less visible in the street scene. There is an existing phone kiosk in the position of the replacement unit, which is proposed to be removed. The road is a busy one and vehicles travelling southwards would be closest to the proposed kiosk and the new digital advertising screen.
9. Other street furniture in the vicinity includes a litter bin, road signs, streetlights, digital advertising (a BT communications hub) and a bus shelter with advertising panels. In spite of the busy and wide road, a successful, distinctive and sympathetic pedestrian environment has been created in the area.
10. The Albert Embankment Conservation Area (CA) extends along one half/side of the River Thames, with views from it to the Westminster World Heritage Site (WHS). Its significance includes its relationship with the cityscape along both sides of the Thames, including views of the WHS and the multitude of landmarks and heritage assets along the Embankment. Standing on the appeal site itself the view to the west is of the large post war buildings on the west side of the Albert Embankment including Camelford House. There are no direct views to the WHS but it is nevertheless part of the 'approaches' to the WHS as well as being within the CA itself.
11. While the appeal site is not on the riverside, the Albert Embankment Conservation Character Appraisal May 2017 (the Appraisal) highlights this part of the CA as providing open space and greenery. I have no reason to disagree with this view and found that several mature street trees and minimal street furniture gives the pedestrian environment a pleasing verdant quality.
12. The proposed location of the call-box is in close proximity to the WHS which means that it is located within its 'approaches' i.e. the public realm leading to the WHS. In accordance with the WHS Management Plan the Council is committed to managing these approaches to ensure they present a high quality, clutter-free public realm. The Appraisal notes that illuminated bus shelter advertisements and free-standing advert panels cause harm to visual amenity on Albert Embankment resulting in harm to the approach to the WHS.
13. The appeal proposal would replace an existing call box and would be narrower and only marginally taller, in that sense it would not add to a proliferation of street furniture in the area. It is also notable, that based on the evidence before me, the proposal would be smaller than the communication hub proposed under the previous scheme at the site detailed above. However, the illuminated LCD advertisement display would have an overtly more modern and eye-catching appearance.
14. Consequently, it would have a greater degree of prominence in the street scene which would distract from the visual amenity of the area and would introduce an incongruous element that would harm the significance of the CA. It would also distract from the 'approaches' to the WHS where discordant features, such as

digital advertising impact negatively on the experience of the WHS as a whole. This would be the case even if the levels of illumination and the speed and frequency of image transitions on the display screen was carefully controlled. My concerns in this regard are not resolved by examples of large scale contemporary architecture within the wider streetscape.

15. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area and would therefore conflict with the Regulations.

Other Matters

16. My attention has been drawn to a recently approved application for advertisement consent for the display of a double sided, internally illuminated LDC advertisement panel³ on a bus shelter. The application site for this advert is close to the appeal site. However, in that instance the LDC panel was replacing signage that was already internally illuminated, and the structure of the existing bus shelter remained unchanged. The appeal proposal includes the replacement of an existing call-box which incorporates an advert that is a non-illuminated paper display. As such the circumstances in the example provided are not the same as the appeal before me.
17. I considered the environmental, social and economic benefits of digital advertisements as outlined by the appellant. Whilst these could be considered to be factors in favour of the proposal, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Moreover, the Regulations require that I exercise my powers only with regard to amenity and public safety albeit these benefits may be considered as other relevant factors.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR

³ 25/00113/ADV