



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: 25 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/Z/25/3376917

The Clock Tower, 1 Rye Lane and 68-72 Peckham High Street, London, SE15 5DP

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations) 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/2568.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'display of one externally illuminated advertisement sign (13.4m x 9.4m) at The Clock Tower within temporary scaffolding shroud, incorporating a 1:1 facsimile of the building and its architectural features printed on it'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development set out in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The application form, appeal form and decision notice make clear that consent is sought for a period of 9 months and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. Documents submitted by the appellant include information relating to a site at Town Hall Chambers, 32 Borough High Street which was not referred to in the original application documents. The Council was given the opportunity to comment on this matter only but sought to introduce additional information. I only accepted the Council's comments made on the Town Hall Chambers case and the appellant had the opportunity to respond on these which I have considered.
4. The Council's Planning Officer's Report includes details of the response by its Transport Policy Team and the Council's provision of this response with the appeal documents does not amount to the submission of new information.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity and public safety.

Reasons

Visual amenity

6. The appeal site comprises the frontage of a substantial four storey, five bay wide building with projecting clock tower on the corner of Peckham High Street and Rye Lane in a busy commercial area. The structure is taller than the adjacent buildings,

including 74 Peckham High Street (No 74) which is only as high as the first floor of the appeal property.

7. The appeal site is within the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area (CA). According to the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA), the special significance of the CA derives in part from its three principal roads sharing the same pattern of development, each broadly characterised by different phases of the area's commercial and retail growth. The CA is largely characterised by a mixture of 18th to mid 20th century buildings.
8. The CAA notes the significant legacy of Rye Lane's two department stores, with the appeal site comprising a substantial remnant of the former Jones and Higgins department store. The remaining part comprises an 1890s stone-faced block with its prominent, landmark 1930s clock tower truncated in the 1950s. For these reasons, the appeal building makes a positive contribution to the architectural and historic interest of the CA.
9. The appellant outlines that the appeal building has been vacant for ten years which has led to some decay of the structure, including graffiti and water ingress. There is planning permission for use of the building as a mixed-use venue¹ which will bring it back into active use, and it is indicated that scaffolding and a shroud are required in association with the programme of works for that. There is extant consent for an illuminated advertisement within a temporary scaffolding shroud² which is in situ. The proposal is for a larger externally illuminated advertisement within a temporary shroud incorporating a printed facsimile of the building. There is no dispute that it would not harm residential amenity.
10. The Planning Practice Guidance recognises that buildings undergoing renovation and which have scaffolding around them may be considered suitable as temporary sites for shroud advertisements³. However, the proposed advertisement would be over 9m high and over 13m wide, significantly higher and wider than the one which has extant consent. It would occupy under 40% of the shroud and not impinge on the building's top storey, decorative cornice or clock face. Nevertheless, the advertisement would obscure most of the second and third storey frontage of the underlying structure, including most of the window bays at those levels.
11. The scheme would be in place only on a temporary basis, with the advertisement panel changed every 14 days, and some inactive or changeover periods when this would revert to a facsimile of the building underneath. However, due to its scale and elevated position on a landmark building, the proposed advertisement would fail to preserve the architectural and historic interest of the CA. The appeal scheme would be unduly prominent in views from the opposite side of Peckham High Street and when travelling eastbound along this road.
12. The extent of static illumination could be controlled by condition. Nonetheless, during hours of darkness the printed facsimile of the building on the surrounding shroud would not be as visible and the illumination of the advertisement would draw attention to it, exacerbating its harmful effect on the character of the CA.

¹ Planning permission ref 23/AP/2878

² Advertisement consent ref 25/AP/1567 'the extant consent'

³ Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 18b-005-20140306

13. It is stated that there would be greater harm of implementing the fallback position of a blank shroud which would create a void at a key site in the street scene. However, given the extant consent, I cannot be certain that this would be the case.
14. An appeal was allowed⁴ and there was a subsequent permission for a shroud façade and externally illuminated advertisement banner at No 74, adjacent to the appeal site though since removed. It occupied a much larger proportion of the shroud than the current proposal, but in contrast to the scheme before me it was lower, much smaller and not sited on a landmark building.
15. There is reference to an appeal decision⁵ and subsequent High Court judgment⁶ in respect of a proposed temporary shroud advertisement at Town Hall Chambers, 32 Borough High Street. In that case, the judge accepted that the Inspector had weighed the effects of the component parts of what was proposed, finding no overall harm to the character and appearance of that Conservation Area from that proposal. However, whilst also in an area with a vibrant character and set within a facsimile shroud, the proposed advertisement currently before me would be significantly larger than the one at Borough High Street and largely visible in longer range views when travelling eastbound along Peckham High Street. Therefore, it is not comparable to the advertisement allowed at Town Hall Chambers.
16. In accordance with the Regulations, I have had regard to the provisions of the development plan insofar as they are material to the issues. Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies P20 and P43 of the Southwark Plan 2022 (SP) are relevant to the issue of visual amenity. Together, these require developments to preserve the character or appearance of Conservation Areas, with advertisements required to avoid harm to the significance of the streetscape and heritage assets. As I have found harm to visual amenity, it follows that there would be conflict with these policies.
17. Policy P19 of the SP relates to statutorily listed buildings and their settings. As there is no suggestion that the proposed advertisement would harm any such buildings, I find no specific conflict with Policy P19 in reaching my conclusion.

Public safety

18. The appeal building faces towards the heavily trafficked A202 Peckham High Street, which has a 20mph speed limit and is part of the Transport for London (TfL) road network. The façade is evident to drivers of vehicles travelling eastbound along the road.
19. The Council's Transport Policy and Highways teams do not object to the proposal, but TfL considers that as the proposed advertisement would be larger than standard, it would likely be more distracting. TfL point out that it would be in a very busy location where drivers and other road users need to pay particular attention, with numerous collisions having taken place in the vicinity over the last ten years.
20. On the eastbound approach to the building, there is a road traffic junction with Bellenden Road where drivers heading east along Peckham High Street must negotiate traffic lights, a cycle lane, and vehicles turning right. Heading further towards the appeal site, drivers of vehicles need to avoid a bus lane which

⁴ Appeal ref APP/A5840/Z/20/3256545

⁵ Appeal ref APP/A5840/Z/24/3341298

⁶ London Borough of Southwark vs SSHCLG and Blow Up Media Limited [2025] EWHC 1556 (Admin)

contains a well-used bus stop on the approach to a busy pedestrian and cycle crossing linking the north side of Peckham High Street with Rye Lane.

21. The appellant has considered the proposal against TfL's Advertising Safety Guidance. The proposed advertisement would be within 20m of a controlled pedestrian crossing where adverts are not normally be permitted. There were many personal injury accidents, including ones resulting in serious injuries and a fatality on this section of the High Street in the five years to December 2024. The pattern of accidents did not change during the time that the shroud advertisement at No 74 was installed, but that advertisement was smaller and in a less prominent position than the current proposal.
22. The Council did not find harm to public safety for the extant consent. Nevertheless, the proposed advertisement would be significantly larger than the approved display, and due to the illumination, it would be particularly evident at night. It would be visible from locations where drivers need to pay careful attention to bus and cycle lanes, traffic junctions and vehicles turning right. Whilst it would not sit within the sight lines of any traffic signals or signs, due to its significant size, illumination and prominent position, the proposed advertisement would distract drivers travelling eastbound during hours of darkness. This would pose an undue risk to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.
23. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed advertisement would harm public safety. Policy P43 of the SP requires advertisements to not compromise safety. Given that the proposed advertisement would harm public safety, the appeal scheme would be contrary to this policy.

Other Matters

24. There would be opportunities for Peckham Platform, a charity and social arts organisation focussing on young people and the community, to showcase artwork by local artists. However, this benefit does not outweigh the harms I have found.

Conclusion

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

A Wright

INSPECTOR