



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Z/25/3368849

63-65 Piccadilly, London W1J 0DY

- 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 Giovanni Leuzzo - Infinity Outdoor Limited against the decision of the City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03727/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of a non-illuminated 16.7m (width) x 4.4m (height) advertisement set within a 1:1 façade replication building wrap for a temporary period of 9 months.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of a non-illuminated 16.7m (width) x 4.4m (height) advertisement set within a 1:1 façade replication building wrap for a temporary period of 9 months. The consent is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) The advertisement hereby granted express consent shall be permanently removed and the use of the site for the display of advertisements will be discontinued 9 months after the first display of the advertisement, or upon completion of the external building works, whichever is the sooner.
 - 2) The 9 month consent period shall begin from the first display of the advertisement or from 6 months from the date of this decision, whichever is the sooner.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. On 16th August 2025, the Council adopted the Westminster's Streets and Spaces Public Realm Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a copy of which was provided for my consideration during the course of the appeal. As this document now forms part of the Council's planning guidance, I have had regard to it in reaching my recommendation.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a six storey Grade II listed building located on the corner of Picadilly and Albemarle Street, within the Mayfair Conservation Area (MCA). Section 72(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. This duty applies in advertisement appeals insofar as it relates to amenity. The statutory duty under Section 66(1) of the same Act pertaining to listed buildings only applies to the consideration of whether to grant planning permission. However, the fact that a building is listed is a relevant factor in advertisement appeals, in considering the effect of the proposal on amenity.
6. The MCA is predominantly characterised by 18th and 19th century buildings, many of which are listed, which reflects the evolution of Mayfair from an elite residential quarter to a vibrant commercial and cultural hub. The significance of this part of the MCA, in so far as it relates to this appeal, is derived from the grand architecture and historic significance of its streets and buildings.
7. The imposing stone-built appeal premises showcases classical architectural design, including well-proportioned fenestration and decorative details such as arched recesses, colonnades and balconies. The historic features of the building have been well preserved and there is no dispute between the main parties that the building has a presence in the street scene that contributes positively to visual amenity.
8. Scaffolding along with a proposed exterior wrap are to be erected to facilitate the renovation of the appeal property. The wrap would cover the appeal site's two elevations, from above ground level to just over the ridge of the roof. Given the substantial size of the shroud, the inset advertisement panel would cover a relatively small proportion of the building's façade and would see most of the Picadilly frontage, as well as the entire Albemarle Street elevation covered by the 1:1 printed image. The inset panel would not therefore appear unduly large in scale and would allow the vast majority of the building's architectural details to be readily appreciated from the public realm.
9. This is also a busy commercial thoroughfare, leading to Picadilly Circus, where there are various examples of large, high-level advertisements. Even if the inset panel would be off-centre and more vibrant than that shown on the appellant's visualisation drawing, for the above reasons, I find that it would represent a proportionate addition to the shroud that would overall, be well-designed and respond sensitively and appropriately to its historic, commercial context. In this particular instance therefore, I find that the appeal scheme would generally accord with the guidance contained in the SPD.
10. Whilst I accept that inset advertisement panels are not a feature of the immediate vicinity, there are numerous buildings along Picadilly and the surrounding streets that are currently undergoing renovation and are displaying scaffolding wraps of differing materials and designs. It seems to me that the appeal scheme, would be

aesthetically preferable to the mostly stark and untidy alternatives that I observed in the area when I visited the site. Moreover, the evidence indicates that, irrespective of the outcome of this appeal, the building would be covered for the duration of the construction phase by a mesh scaffolding wrap and the contribution of the appeal site to the street scene would thus be significantly reduced during this time.

11. Accordingly, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the MCA. In addition, it would also not harm the character and appearance of the appeal building and other listed buildings or the visual amenity of the area as a whole.
12. Therefore, to the extent that they are material considerations relevant to the main issue, the proposal would accord with Policies 38, 39 and 43 of the City Plan 2019 - 2040 (2021) which, among other things, seek to ensure high quality urban design, to place heritage at the heart of place making, and to ensure advertisements are sensitively designed in terms of their size, location and their impact on the building on which they are displayed, local context, street scene and wider townscape. For the same reasons, it would also generally accord with the guidance contained in the SPD (2025).

Conditions

13. In addition to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations it is necessary to define the period of consent to provide clarity. It would also be reasonable, as addressed in the Regulations, that the 9 month period does not commence immediately given that a lead-in time for works is usually required. A relevant condition is recommended to provide clarity and precision.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

A Walker

INSPECTOR