



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by **L Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/25/3376542

The Paxton, 255 Gipsy Road, Lambeth, London SE27 9QY

- 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 Simon Pettifer of Greene King Brewing against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref is 25/02634/ADV.
- The advertisement proposed is installation of replacement signs to include 1x projecting sign, 1x shaped transom sign, 1x set of individual letters, 5x sets of sign-written letters to building render.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 1x projecting sign, 1x shaped transom sign, 1x set of individual letters and 5x sets of sign-written letters to the building render at The Paxton, 255 Gipsy Road, Lambeth, London SE27 9QY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02634/ADV, dated 18/08/2025. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved documents for this Advertisement Consent, which comprise:
 - 195330 (REV Q) Proposed signage - Page 5 of 12
 - 195330 (REV Q) Proposed signage - Page 6 of 12
 - 195330 (REV Q) Proposed signage - Page 7 of 12
 - 195330 (REV Q) Proposed signage - Page 8 of 12
 - 195330 (REV Q) signage - Page 9 of 12
 - 195330 (REV Q) Proposed signage - Page 10 of 12
 - 2) The luminance levels of the advertisement display shall be no greater than the luminance value set out in Lambeth's Advertisements Signage Guidance 2016 (or in a replacement guide).

Preliminary Matters

2. From the evidence before me and observations on site, it was clear that the advertisements and lighting have already been erected on the appeal premises (No 255) as set out in the plans. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis, and advertisement consent is sought retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) sets out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised only in 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.
4. The Council does not object to the siting of the advertisement on public safety grounds, and, following my site visit, I see no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the amenity grounds, including the appeal property itself, which is locally listed and a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

Reasons

5. The Council describe the significance of the appeal building as a mid-19th-century Public House, originally the Paxton Tavern (now the House of Mobo), in honour of Sir Joseph Paxton, who designed the Crystal Palace building for the Great Exhibition of 1851. It comprises predominantly two-storeys with a three-storey central tower constructed from stock brick with stucco window and door architraves, decorative eaves brackets and decorative metal work at the first floor and the entrances. It is a local landmark added to the local heritage list in 2012 for its architectural history and townscape contribution. The significance of the building for the purpose of this appeal is therefore largely derived from its surviving architectural and historical interest.
6. No 255 is set close to the junction with Gipsy Road and Gipsy Hill. It is also close to a landscaped roundabout and a mature landscape verge to the front of the Paxton Green Medical Centre. Despite the mature landscaping, I saw that No 255 was easily seen from several locations and its significance could be appreciated. Notwithstanding this, it is also located near several commercial premises and, from my observations, has a distinctly urban context.
7. The Council does not dispute that there was existing signage, but contends that this was either painted or applied lettering onto the stucco and timber fascias on the tower. It also does not dispute that it had trough lighting and an externally illuminated projecting sign at the first floor, and 8 lantern lights at the ground floor.
8. The appellant has provided photographic imagery¹ of No 255 as The Paxton. The images show a mix of signage and external illumination to the three-storey central tower, comprising painted or applied lettering at the second-floor front elevation, trough-lit painted or applied lettering to the front and side elevations and an externally lit projecting hanging sign to the front at the first floor, and an externally lit painted or applied lettering to the ground floor front elevation.
9. The advertisement application seeks consent for a number of illuminated and non-illuminated signs, which the appellant contends are replacements. These would include 1x projecting sign, 1x shaped transom sign, 1x set of individual letters and 5x sets of sign-written letters to the building's render.

¹ 195330 (REV Q) Pages 1 of 12 and Page 2 of 12

10. With regard to the projecting sign, the appellant has provided² four Google Street View images dated 2008, 2016, 2019 and 2025, which show different hanging signs at the appeal site. Whilst this imagery is focused on the hanging sign and is difficult to see its size compared to the building, the appellant's imagery³ does show it in context. Whilst neither party have provided me with the dimensions, it appears from the images that it was externally lit and its depth extended from its hanging bracket well below the top opening of the doors at the first floor. In the appeal before me, the hanging sign extends marginally below the top opening of the doors at the first floor and retains a vertical emphasis despite being a different shape. Whilst the overall dimensions of this sign may exceed those sited in Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (Local Plan) Policy Q17, from my observations, its presence does not look incongruent or materially out of place on the Public House or on the NDHA.
11. I saw that the halo-illuminated aluminium signage is set within the stepped front elevation and positioned within the top transom of the ground floor, and recessed within the arched moulded architrave to the entrance. Whilst modern in its design and material, the size of the lettering is proportionate to the size of the transom and scale of the overall entrance.
12. With regard to the high-level halo illuminated fascia sign, I acknowledge that the signage may have traditionally been timber or rendered; however, this is not what is before me. I saw that the lettering of this sign retained space around the fascia board, and its size and positioning appeared proportionate to the overall scale of No 255. This signage therefore did not dominate the front elevation when viewed from Gipsy Road or within the wider streetscene.
13. The Council do not dispute that the painted signage, largely replicate signage previously on No 255. In my mind, the dispute therefore falls with the illumination. Photographs⁴ submitted by the appellant alongside their original application shows that while there was no lighting to the blind casement, there were trough lights at the first floor and a number of lanterns to the ground floor. Notwithstanding this, the Council contend that the flood lighting is excessive.
14. Mindful of the Council's concerns, I returned to the appeal site during the hours of darkness. I saw that No 255 and its immediate vicinity are currently lit at night by a Zebra crossing with internally illuminated flashing yellow globes, a number of street lights, and display windows associated with nearby commercial premises. This lighting resulted in the area surrounding the appeal site being well-lit.
15. I also saw that the halo illumination was integrated into its design, and that this form of back-lighting was discreet when viewed alongside other lighting within the streetscene. Neither the signs nor their means of lighting dominated No 255 in such a way which detracted from the visual amenity, nor did they diminish the significance of the NDHA.
16. While I saw that the trough lighting at the first floor was bright, and from certain angles the glare made reading the signage difficult, I am mindful that No 255 previously had trough lighting at this level. Furthermore, the appellant contends that the level of lighting is in accordance with illuminance levels outlined in the

² Appeal Statement paragraph 5.8

³ 195330 (REV Q) Page 1 of 12 and 2 of 12

⁴ 195330 (REV Q) Page 2 of 12

Advertisements Signage Guidance 2016 (ASG). In the absence of anything to the contrary, I have no reason to take a different view.

17. There is a clear distinction between the modern materials and lighting and the old materials on the NDHA. This, in my mind, enhances the appreciation of the architectural qualities of the building through their juxtaposition. Taken together, the number and method of illumination of the advertising sought, are well related to the building and do not detract from the high-quality frontage of No 255. Furthermore, neither the signage nor the lighting diminishes the identifiable frontage of No 255 as an NDHA.
18. With regard to the external painting of No 255, the Council confirm that it has no control. As these works have already taken place, and in the absence of anything to the contrary, I have no reason to take a different view or comment further.
19. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the amenity or diminish the significance of the NDHA. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Local Plan Policies Q17 and Q23, which collectively seek to ensure that advertisements are well integrated into their context and do not diminish the setting or significance of heritage assets.

Conditions

20. In addition to the standard advertisement consent conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations, and despite current levels of illuminance meeting lighting levels within the ASG, it is necessary to impose a condition to control luminance. This is to ensure that the luminance never exceeds the ASG guideline figure, in the interests of amenity. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt, I have also imposed a condition requiring the consent to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

L Clark

INSPECTOR