



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: 13 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/25/3375629

Pavement o/s 152 Waterloo Road, London SE1 8SB

- 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 Richard Wilson, NWP Street Limited, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/01737/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is installation of 1no. new communications kiosk with integrated advertising display, and associated telephone kiosk removal.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have also determined the appeal against the Council's refusal of the corresponding planning application¹. 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.

Main Issue

4. 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

5. The appeal proposal is for 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.
6. The appeal site is within the Lower Marsh Conservation Area (CA) towards the outer edge of the pavement outside 152 Waterloo Road, close to the intersection of Waterloo Road, Baylis Road and The Cut. There are 2 Grade II Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site, the Old Vic Theatre² is across the road to the southeast and

¹ 6001558

² 1068710

the Former Waterloo Road Fire Station (Former Fire Station)³ is a few metres along the pavement.

7. The site is situated within a predominantly commercial setting, consisting of a range of food and drink establishments, offices, and public buildings, as well as residential apartments.
8. There are various items of existing street furniture within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, including Sheffield cycle stands, lighting columns, CCTV columns, bins, railings, and bollards. The presence of street furniture is therefore an established characteristic of this area, and I found the balance between the proliferation of items on the pavement and a clear and welcoming area for pedestrians to be delicately poised.
9. The proposed kiosk would occupy a prominent position close to a busy junction. Through a combination of both its height and width the kiosk would be a visually intrusive and bulky addition to the street scene in comparison to other existing items of street furniture in the immediate area. Furthermore, the introduction of this new piece of street furniture, would result in a reduction in the space between existing street items along this section of Waterloo Road, adding visual clutter to this part of the street.
10. Additionally, the position of the kiosk, along with its bulky appearance, would dominate and partially obscure the sight lines and views along Waterloo Road to the detriment of the visual amenity of the street scene and the character and appearance of the CA. The design and siting of the hub would also partially impede views of the nearby Listed Buildings.
11. Given the commercial character of the area, there are a variety of advertisements in the locality, including illuminated and non-illuminated fascia signs, along with projecting signage, on shop fronts. There are also digital advertisements in the vicinity of the appeal site, across the road is a large digital advertisement display that is incorporated into the structure of a bus shelter and there is a similar communications kiosk on Waterloo Road, closer to the Old Vic Theatre.
12. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the fact that the digital advertisements detailed above were granted permission by the Council⁴. One of these existing adverts is incorporated within the structure of a bus shelter and the other digital display was part of a replacement kiosk. In each instance the adverts did not result in additional street furniture or contribute to a proliferation of visual clutter within their respective areas. Therefore, the circumstances in each of these examples do not reflect the appeal before me.
13. Furthermore, I also find the addition of the rotating digital images on the proposed kiosk, in conjunction with the rotating images on these existing adverts, would result in cumulative visual harm from digital advertisements within the locality. Consequently, the incompatible and prominent siting of the proposed digital advertisement, made more conspicuous by its illumination and changing images, would result in the over proliferation of street furniture in the area, resulting in visual clutter that undermines the attractive qualities of the townscape and public realm within this part of the CA, causing harm to visual amenity.

³ 1249651

⁴ 24/03377/ADV and 21/04834/FUL and 21/04835/ADV

14. The appellant states that the proposed kiosk would replace three other kiosks in the wider area. Whilst I have had due regard to the removal of these units, issues relating to the impact of a proposal upon the visual amenity of an area is a matter of planning judgement based on the site-specific circumstances and surroundings.
15. In this regard, I have been provided with limited information in respect of these kiosks that would enable me to draw any direct comparisons with the specifics of the appeal site and scheme before me, including specific details of the relationship between them and neighbouring heritage assets. Therefore, their removal carries limited weight in my determination of this main issue.
16. Consequently, I do not find that the removal of existing kiosks elsewhere, to provide clear and convincing justification for the harm that would be caused to the visual amenity of the area.
17. 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

18. 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

19. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR