

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2025

**By SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Z/25/3366320**

**61-71 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0HW**

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
  - The appeal is made by Infinity Outdoor Ltd against the decision of the Council of the City of Westminster.
  - The application Ref is 25/01022/ADV.
  - The proposed advertisement is described as 'temporary display of 1:1 replica façade building wrap to the north elevation incorporating a non-illuminated static advertisement measuring 13.4m x 11.4m (Landscape) for a period of 24 months'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for temporary display of 1:1 replica façade building wrap to the north elevation incorporating a non-illuminated static advertisement measuring 13.4m x 11.4m (Landscape) for a period of 24 months at 61-71 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0HW in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 25/01022/ADV. The consent is for 24 months 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 condition:
  1. The advertisement permitted by this consent shall be removed from the site no later than 24 months from the date of this decision.

### Procedural Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations) and paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 state that advertisements should be subject to control in the interests of amenity and public safety. In this case, the Council has raised no issue regarding public safety and I have found no reason to disagree.
3. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan only in so far as they are material.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area.

### Reasons

5. The appeal site lies on Victoria Street, a key commercial corridor within London's Central Activities Zone. It is a heavily trafficked route with a high level of activity,

featuring large scale buildings and having a predominantly commercial character. Planning permission (Ref: 24/03540/FULL) has been granted for the redevelopment of the site into a hotel. The appeal proposal includes a scaffold shroud featuring a 1:1 image of the building's Victoria Street elevation, incorporating a centrally positioned, non-illuminated advertisement (13.4m x 11.4m) at first to third floor levels, to be displayed during construction works over a temporary 24-month period.

6. The site lies within the Broadway and Christchurch Gardens Conservation Area (CA). Under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I am required to give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. I have also had regard to the potential impact of the proposal on nearby heritage assets, including Westminster Abbey and the World Heritage Site (WHS).
7. With reference to the Conservation Area Audit 2008 (CAA), the historic and architectural significance of the CA derives in part from its lively, mixed character, reflecting its busy central location, mixture of land uses and gradual historical development. Victoria Street divides the CA in two and is characterised by its larger scale buildings. A local view of importance east along Victoria Street towards the towers of Westminster Abbey and the London Eye is identified in the CAA. This also indicates that whilst making reference to the architectural detail of the adjoining mansion flats, the 1980s appeal building makes a neutral contribution to the CA.
8. The proposed advertisement would be positioned facing Victoria Street and would be visible in oblique views along the east–west axis of the street and when looking south from Broadway. While located above ground floor level and within an area where high level signage is not prevalent, the advertisement would be relatively modest in scale and carefully framed within the larger 1:1 architectural façade image applied to the temporary shroud. This façade image would remain the dominant visual element and would play a key role in preserving the architectural rhythm and composition of the host building and streetscape during construction. By contrast, the static, non-illuminated advertisement would be set at lower levels, ensuring it remains visually recessive and clearly subservient to the overall façade treatment.
9. Within its highly active commercial context, the integrated nature of the advertisement would ensure that it would not compete with or detract from the prevailing character of the area. As such, the proposal would preserve the architectural and historic significance of the CA.
10. Westminster Abbey and the WHS lie a considerable distance away, and the relevant views are experienced within the context of a busy urban environment. While the proposed advertisement may be discernible in certain oblique views of the abbey, its modest scale, non-illuminated nature, and careful integration within the architectural design of the shroud would significantly limit its visual presence. Its elevated siting would not result in undue prominence or any perceptible competition with the significance or appreciation of Westminster Abbey and the WHS. Accordingly, in this instance, the visual impact would be limited and would not result in material harm.

11. Typical construction hoardings or blank shrouds can often appear stark, intrusive or visually disruptive in sensitive heritage settings. However, the proposal would provide a more thoughtful and sympathetic intervention, which would add interest and contribute positively to the townscape during construction works. Furthermore, the temporary and clearly transitional nature of the proposal would be immediately apparent to passers-by, thereby reinforcing its limited and short-term presence in the streetscape.
12. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) notes that buildings which are being renovated or are undergoing major structural work and which have scaffolding or netting around them may be considered suitable as temporary sites for shroud advertisements or large 'wrap' advertisements covering the face, or part of the face, of the building<sup>1</sup>. Given the above, I consider that the appeal site is one such suitable occasion.
13. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the significance and setting of the designated heritage assets identified above and would not harm the amenity of the area. As far as it is material it would not conflict with Policies 38, 39 and 43(G) of the City of Westminster City Plan 2019-2040 (April 2021), which collectively seek to ensure that developments conserve and positively contribute to the townscape, streetscape and heritage assets of Westminster.

### **Other Matters**

14. I note the concern regarding the untreated Strutton Ground elevation. However, I must determine the appeal based upon the proposal before me. The lack of shroud or advertisement proposal for this elevation does not alter my finding that the proposed advertisement would be acceptable in its context.

### **Conditions**

15. The five standard conditions set out in the Regulations apply. I have considered the additional conditions suggested by the Council. A modified condition specifying the temporary period of consent is necessary to reflect the duration of construction works and the time sought in the application. A condition requiring the Council's approval of advertisement content, which is already subject to separate regulatory controls, is not justified or enforceable in this context. A condition relating to parking control is unnecessary as compliance with existing on-street parking and traffic regulations is already enforceable by the relevant highway authority.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

*SJ Desai*  
INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 005 Reference ID: 18b-005-20140306