



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2025

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Z/25/3373918

1 Lower John Street, London W1F 9DT

- 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 Justin Myers, Blow Up Media UK Ltd, against the decision of the City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/05899/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is described on the application form as a temporary decorative scaffold shroud advertisement printed onto pvc comprising a 1:1 replica image of the building facade with an inset area for sponsors advertising measuring 10.4 x 3.7 metres without illumination.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) require that applications for the display of advertisements are considered 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. Factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest.
3. The Council has not suggested that the proposal would affect public safety, and I see no reason to disagree.
4. The appeal site lies within the Soho Conservation Area (the SCA) and is directly bordered by the Regent Street Conservation Area (RSCA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) applies to the exercise of functions under the Planning Acts. I have therefore had special regard to section 72(1) in so far as it relates to the consideration of 'amenity'.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effects of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area, with particular regard to the character and appearance of the SCA and RSCA.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a four-storey building located in a busy part of central London close to Regent Street and Piccadilly Circus. It occupies a relatively prominent corner site at the junction between Lower John Street and Brewer Street. The immediate surroundings comprise narrow streets bordered by buildings of 4 or more storeys with shops, cafes and bars on the ground floor facing the streets. The signage and advertisements associated with these uses are relatively discreet particularly compared to the signage seen in the nearby main streets. At the time of my visit the street frontages of the appeal property were enclosed by scaffolding covered with standard scaffolding sheeting.
7. The appeal site is situated within the SCA and immediately neighbours the RSCA. The significance of these Areas is derived from their vibrant mix of uses, the scale and appearance of buildings, and the relatively dense layout and street patterns alongside areas of formal open space, which together contribute to its overall architectural and historic interest. The appeal site contributes to this significance.
8. The proposal would comprise the installation of a shroud with a 1:1 printed replica image of the appeal property including the existing ground floor level fascia signage. Above this a non-illuminated inset advertising area measuring about 3.7m by 10.4m would be provided. Consent is sought for a temporary period of 6 months.
9. A proposal for a similar scheme including a 5.7m by 10.8m illuminated advertising area was recently dismissed at appeal¹. Whilst I attach significant weight to my colleague's observations in respect of the earlier appeal, I note that the proposed advertising area before me would be materially smaller than previously proposed and would not be illuminated.
10. The installation of a shroud with a 1:1 image of the appeal property's street frontages for a 6-month period would have a lesser visual impact than would occur with standard scaffolding sheeting in place. Whilst smaller than previously proposed the advertisement area would still be more than a storey in height and would extend in front of both street frontages. As a consequence of its size and siting it would be a visually intrusive element in the street scene that would dominate its setting and be out of scale and character with the smaller-scale and more restrained nature of other advertisements in the immediate area. This negative impact would outweigh the benefits of the replica image of the building.
11. For these reasons, and having regard to Planning Practice Guidance on shrouds attached to scaffolding, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on visual amenity and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the SCA and RSCA.
12. I note the appeal decision cited by the appellant that allowed a shroud with an advertisement at 1 Dorset Street² and the many dismissed appeals for similar forms of advertisement referred to by the Council. However, as each application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits, taking into account the local context, I attribute limited weight to these matters.
13. In accordance with the Regulations, I have taken into account the provisions of the development plan so far as they are relevant to amenity. Policies 38, 39 and 43 of

¹ Appeal Decision ref APP/X5990/Z/25/3369568

² Appeal Decision ref APP/X5990/Z/24/3356514

the City of Westminster City Plan 2019-2040 seek to protect amenity, therefore they are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.

Other Matters

14. I recognise that the advertising area may pay for the 1:1 decorative shroud and could potentially help fund the building works which I note would involve the erection of a mansard roof extension and the creation of flats. As there is no compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that adequate finance to refurbish the building cannot be raised without the proposed advertisement I attribute limited weight to these matters.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR