
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2026

by **A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/Z/25/3376805

199 Brockley Road, London SE4 2RS

- 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 Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/141237.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'erection of 1xD-poster advertisement'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the gable end of a three-storey terraced building on the corner of Harefield Road and the busy Brockley Road. It is within a mixed-use area of shops and other businesses on the ground floor which have fascia signs with flats above. A Royal Mail delivery office lies on the opposite side of Harefield Road and there has been some recent local development, including at Coulgate Street.
4. The appeal site is within the Brockley Conservation Area (CA). According to the Brockley Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CACA), the special significance of the CA derives in part from it being a large Victorian suburb for the wealthy middle classes, with houses built in a variety of architectural styles.
5. The CACA does not identify buildings of interest in the CA, but it indicates that the shops on Brockley Road might have been built as houses originally with single storey shopfront extensions added at a later date. The upper floors of the terraced building on which the appeal site lies has stock brick walls, arched window openings, traditional chimneys and roof parapets, features which make a positive contribution to the architectural interest of the CA.
6. The existing non-illuminated advertisement and associated metal platform and railings which have been in situ over 17 years detract from views of the upper part of the terraced building from Harefield Road and Brockley Road. However, being a simple, non-illuminated paper and paste advertisement, its impact is significantly less than that which would arise from a more intrusive advertisement.

7. The proposal is to replace the existing advertisement with an internally illuminated digital LED advertisement display of the same size. The introduction of a large digital advertisement to a site clearly visible from the busy Brockley Road, at a higher level than the ground floor commercial premises, would draw the eye to its illuminated screen. Unlike the existing paper and paste advertisement, the proposed digital display would be illuminated at all times.
8. The intermittent changing of the display, with multiple static advertisements on rotation, would further draw attention to the advertisement. The proposed advertisement would not display moving images nor flashing lights and the extent of illumination and frequency of changes could be controlled by condition. Further, its orientation and position relative to residential properties would ensure no undue harm to nearby residents.
9. Nevertheless, although the unsightly front railings would be removed, due to its rotating display, illumination and siting, the digital advertisement would appear as an intrusive and highly visible feature, particularly at night. This would harmfully detract from the appearance of the terraced building on which it would be located, failing to preserve the architectural interest of the CA. The proposed advertisement would be particularly detrimental in views of the building when travelling northbound along Brockley Road during hours of darkness.
10. There are references to the Council's Streetscape Guide 2011 (SG) and Transport for London's Streetscape Guidance 2022, but these relate more to street furniture than advertisements fixed to buildings and thus have limited relevance to the proposal. In any event, guiding principle 4 of the SG seeks to reduce clutter, and the Council has not raised concerns in this regard.
11. The appellant refers to examples of digital advertisement proposals in London Conservation Areas where Councils granted consent and in Manchester where an Inspector dealing with an appeal found that it would adequately mimic the existing advert. However, those were to replace existing illuminated advertisements and are therefore not comparable to the appeal proposal.
12. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would harm visual amenity. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken account of the provisions of the development plan in so far as they are relevant. Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 (LP) and Policies HE1, HE2 and QD12 of the Lewisham Local Plan (LLP) are relevant. Together, these require proposals to preserve the significance of heritage assets, including the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. As I have found harm in this regard, it follows that there would be conflict with these policies.
13. Policy D8 of the LP and Policy QD3 of the LLP relate to proposals in the public realm. However, as the proposed advertisement would not be on publicly accessible land, I do not find these policies relevant to the scheme before me.

Other Matters

14. There would be fewer vehicle trips for reposting advertisements and a reduction in waste, with carbon costs spread out over a longer period than the existing fortnightly change in posters. The appellant also states that the proposed advertisement could increase business rate revenues and be used to promote

charitable campaigns or to display public art or emergency messaging. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have found.

15. The Council did not find harm to the setting of any listed buildings or in relation to public safety. From the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree.
16. The appellant considers that there could have been a different outcome to the determination of the application if the Council had worked proactively with them. Nevertheless, I have determined the appeal based on the plans and information before me.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the display of the proposed advertisement would be detrimental to visual amenity. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR