



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/H/24/3356248

The London Pavilion, 1 Piccadilly, City of Westminster, London W1J 0DA

- 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 Ms Maddalena Sanvito of Streetvox against the decision of the City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06526/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is scaffolding shrouds with 1:1 printed image of building and 2x inset illuminated advertising areas measuring 12.5m x 12.0m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of the Scaffolding shrouds with 1:1 printed image of building and 2x inset illuminated advertising areas measuring 12.5m x 12.0m at The London Pavilion, 1 Piccadilly, City of Westminster, London W1J 0DA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/06526/ADV. The consent is for five 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 conditions:
 - 1) The intensity of the illumination of the advertisements permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 300 candela per sqm and statically illuminated only.
 - 2) The advertisements permitted by this consent shall not be displayed on the site after the date of completion of building operations or after expiry of 5 months from the date of this decision, whichever occurs first.

Preliminary Matters

2. The period for which advertisement consent was initially sought has expired. Comments were sought from the main parties on this, with the appellant confirming that consent is sought for 5 months from the date of any decision.
3. Advertisement consent, planning permission and listed building consent has been granted recently for various works and developments at the site, including two LED advertising screens facing on to Piccadilly Circus in a similar location to the inset illuminated advertising areas subject to this appeal.¹
4. There is advertisement consent for a similar scheme with different size insets to the one before me, that has a resolution for approval from the Council². As I cannot be certain whether the shroud and inset areas in place at the time of my

¹ APP/X5990/W/23/3334774, APP/X5990/Y/23/3334775, APP/X5990/H/23/3334776

² 25/00205/ADV

site visit are those subject to this appeal, I have considered the appeal as a proposed scheme.

5. It was not clear if the scaffolding to which the advertisements are attached, is connected to The London Pavilion (the Pavilion). Whether listed building consent or planning permission is required for the advertisements is not a matter for this appeal and not being considered as part of it.
6. As the proposal is in a conservation area, I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).

Main Issue

7. The main issue is the effect of the advertisements on visual amenity, with particular regard to designated heritage assets.

Reasons

The Pavilion

8. The Pavilion is a triangular block originally constructed as a theatre, later used as a cinema, exhibition space and shopping arcade. It is currently having repair and renovation works being carried out with scaffolding around all sides of the building.
9. Despite extensive alterations internally its external appearance is of architectural interest. In particular, the symmetrical principal elevations facing Shaftesbury Avenue and Coventry Street. These include central pavilions and column porticos as well as tall arcades and ornate window detailing at first floor level which make it a fine example of Victorian eclectic classicism. It is linked to the historical entertainment use of the area.
10. The setting of the Pavilion includes Piccadilly Circus which is a busy and vibrant area in London's West End. There are many historic buildings of different scale, materials, form and age nearby. Given the commercial nature of many of these and the vast number of visitors to the area, there are a variety of existing and historic advertisements nearby, most notably the curved illuminated digital screen known as 'Piccadilly Lights' and examples of advertisements at listed buildings.

Conservation Areas

11. The Pavilion is identified as a landmark building within the Soho Conservation Area (SCA). The SCA has a vibrant and diverse character of residential and business uses, and the architectural interest is in its somewhat varied built form.
12. The site is adjacent to and in the setting of the Regent Street Conservation Area (the RSCA) and the Haymarket Conservation Area (the HCA). The RSCA has a planned arrangement of impressive and largely uniform architectural style buildings, materials and scale leading from Regent's Park.
13. The HCA comprises generally late 19th and early 20th century varied architecture. Although there also are some more historic and recent buildings reflecting its continuing development since its origins as a hay market.

Nearby Listed Buildings

14. The appeal site is also in the setting of several other listed buildings. The Shaftsbury Memorial (Grade I) is a fountain surmounted by a winged archer representing the Angel of Christian Charity commemorating Lord Shaftesbury. It is positioned centrally in Piccadilly Circus and on top of a stepped platform. This gives it a prominence and landmark status as a busy meeting point, and it has architectural and historic importance.
15. The Grade II* listed Criterion Theatre has an eclectic classical style with pavilion wings and ornate detailing. It is linked to the historical entertainment uses of the area. The exterior appearance of the Grade II listed 18-20 Coventry Street has carved enrichments, turret to corner and arcaded ground floor stunted columns. It is also part of the wider entertainment uses nearby.
16. In the wider area there are several other Grade II listed buildings, many relating to The Quadrant³ which includes several properties part of Sir Reginald Blomfield's grandiose rebuilding of Nash's Regent Street Quadrant with its classical architectural compositions forming an important part of their appearance. No 27-37 Lower Regent Street, 217 Piccadilly along with 14 and 15 Jermyn Street are similarly related to the rebuilding of the Regent Street Quadrant and the reorganisation of Piccadilly Circus. They are formal classical architectural compositions. The County Fire Office also links to the Quadrant rebuild and has classical detailing. No 215-216 Piccadilly forms part of a group listing utilising Portland Stone materials and eclectic baroque details.
17. The Piccadilly Circus Underground Station Booking Hall Concourse and bronze work to pavement subway entrances is an example of Charles Holden's modernising new approach and distinctive and rich neo-Classical detail.
18. The nearby CA's and listed buildings, including the Pavilion are in part experienced in different directions around Piccadilly Circus and its varied architectural form. This includes the diversity of signage and the bustling and lively character of the area, including Piccadilly Lights and this setting contributes positively to the area.

Assessment

19. Planning Practice Guidance states 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' advertisements⁴. Although the scaffolding has been in place for some time, the PPG does not specify an upper limit of 'temporary'.
20. Consent is only sought for a further 5-month period and the scaffolding is already in place. The third elevation of the Pavilion facing Great Windmill Street had no shroud or advertisement, and the scaffolding and netting was visible. I observed that the scaffolding and netting obscured much of that elevation and was not attractive or welcoming.

³ 9-18 Piccadilly, The Quadrant, 49-63 Regent Street, 14-18 Quadrant Arcade, 15a Air Street, 5-17 Quadrant Arcade, 52-100 Regent Street, 9, 19, 27 And 29 Glasshouse Street and, 74a Regent Street

⁴ Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 18b-005-20140306

21. The proposal would largely surround and enclose 2 sides of the Pavilion. The 1:1 shroud element would replicate the appearance of the Pavilion and allow an appreciation of important architectural features such as the central pavilions and column porticos. It would mostly hide the scaffolding while it was in place and as such it would be appropriate.
22. The insets would be relatively large in themselves and attract the eye as advertisements aim to do. Unlike the 1:1 element, the insets would partly obscure elements of the building's attractive appearance without replicating it. Nonetheless, the area of the proposed inset advertisements would be the smaller aspect of the scheme, and they would be close to each other near one corner of the building approximately in the position of the approved LED screens. The position and size of the insets retain the main elevation symmetry of the building. The appearance of both the 1:1 and the insets would be preferable to that of the scaffolding itself.
23. The evidence indicates that the advertisements and scaffolding have been in place for some time and subject to several consents. The programme schedule provided with the application expired earlier this year. Notwithstanding this, the period sought is not overly lengthy and since the last consent for the scheme subject to this appeal, further works to the building, including the LED screens have been approved. As such, although there are no full details of any programme of works, a need for scaffolding for works associated with these recent consents is very likely.
24. There is an extensive range of advertisements at varying levels from ground floor to roof level in the SCA and the adjacent CA's. There is little consistency to the size, location, materials or illumination of advertisements. The insets are no higher or larger than the Piccadilly lights adjacent. The presence of the many other signs, including ones with differing illumination, mean the proposal would not be incongruous, dominant or at odds with the vibrancy of the area.
25. The Pavilion and other listed buildings referred to above are already experienced and in many cases, seen with, diverse advertisements. As such, there would be no harm from the proposal being within their setting. This would also be the case for the scheme being within the setting of the RSCA and HCA. Finally, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the SCA.
26. Consequently, the proposal would not harm visual amenity. It would accord with Policies 38, 39 and 43 of the City Plan 2019 -2040 insofar as they are relevant. These, in part, seek to ensure schemes have regard to, and maintain the character and appearance of the area and heritage assets, contribute to an attractive public realm and do not impact on the building on which they are displayed.

Other Matters

27. The appeal scheme is positioned amongst a mix of advertisements also near junctions, crossings and other pedestrian and vehicle routes. There is no clear evidence that these or the previous advertisements at the appeal site have given rise to any public safety concerns. I see no reason why the proposed ones would do so for the temporary period sought.
28. A separate licence is required for any scaffolding put up on the highway including pavements from the Council. Issues relating to the scaffolding being in place for a longer period than the advertisement consent is sought are not determinative to this appeal.

Conditions

29. In addition to the standard conditions set out in the Regulations, a condition requiring the removal of the advertisement at the end of the temporary period of consent is necessary as this reflects the time sought in the application. I have also conditioned illumination levels, and that illumination is static as outlined in the application form in the interests of visual amenity.
30. Many of the suggested conditions relate to LED screens and are therefore not relevant or reasonable to this appeal. A separate condition relating to likeness to traffic signs is not necessary as one of the standard conditions relates to not endangering persons using any highway.

Conclusion

31. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR