



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Z/25/3375265

88 Wigmore Street & 1 Mandeville Place, London W1U 3RB

- 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 King Media Ltd against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/05873/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as the display of an advertisement sign (10m x 5.89m) at 88 Wigmore Street and 1 Mandeville Place within temporary scaffolding shroud incorporating a 1:1 facsimile of the building and its architectural features printed on it.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of an advertisement sign (10m x 5.89m) at 88 Wigmore Street and 1 Mandeville Place within temporary scaffolding shroud incorporating a 1:1 facsimile of the building and its architectural features printed on it. The consent is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional condition:
 - The advertisement hereby granted express consent shall be permanently removed and the use of the site for the display of advertisements will be discontinued no later than 13 January 2027, or upon completion of the external building works, whichever is the sooner.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations) require that advertisements be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. require that applications for the display of advertisements are considered in terms of amenity and public safety. Whilst the reason for refusal refers to policies contained within City Plan 2019 – 2040, adopted April 2021 (the City Plan), they are material considerations rather than being decisive in the determination of this appeal.
3. The appeal site is located within a conservation area. As a result, in reaching my decision, I have had special regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. The Council has not raised any issues of public safety. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to reach an alternative view.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a substantial four-storey red brick and dressed stone building, with mansard level and is prominently located on the corner of Wigmore Street and Mandeville Place. It is within the Portman Estate Conservation Area (PECA) and is identified as an unlisted building of merit.
7. Wigmore Street is a busy, commercial street where advertisements of varying styles are prevalent. The advertisements found on Mandeville Place typically reflect the use of the building, for example external flags to a hotel and modest signage on professional buildings. I therefore acknowledge that the area is primarily characterised by advertisements located at a lower level.
8. The proposal seeks consent for the display of a non-illuminated sign which would be positioned within a scaffolding shroud displaying a 1:1 facsimile of the building. The scaffolding would be erected to enable works to be carried out to the building, and I have considered the alternative of a plain covering.
9. 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.
10. The Westminster Streets and Spaces Public Realm Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (adopted August 2025) advises that large advertisements above ground level are generally discouraged. However, in this case, whilst the proposed advertisement would be positioned at the corner of Wigmore Street and Mandeville Place, the advertisement would occupy only a small proportion of the overall elevation, and the printed image of the building would replicate its architectural detailing, ensuring that the heritage character remains visually appreciable during the works. Furthermore, the display would be static, without illumination or moving imagery, and would be installed for a temporary period. Consequently, the majority of the building would appear as a 1:1 representation of its original form, safeguarding the architectural integrity and townscape quality of the area.
11. Therefore, whilst I accept that the proposed advertisement would be the only high-level advertisement found within the immediate surrounding area, given these measures and temporary nature of the proposal, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the area or to the significance of the PECA.
12. My attention has been drawn to a number of similar proposals¹ which have been dismissed at appeal. Nevertheless, I conclude that these instances are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal due to differences in the respective advertisement's sizes, placements in relation to the host building, and their impact on the immediate townscape. Accordingly, the circumstances of these other appeals do not represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, and I have therefore afforded them limited weight.

¹ Appeal Ref: 3364190, 3327266, 3318455, 3305473, 3296874, 3274078 and 3275540.

13. For the above reasons, I therefore find that the proposed temporary advertisement would preserve the character and appearance of the PECA as a whole, would not adversely affect the significance of the unlisted building of merit, and would cause no harm to the visual amenity of the area. I have taken into account Policy 43(G) of the City Plan, which requires advertisements to be sensitively designed in terms of size, location and the impact on the building on which they are displayed, local context and wider townscape. As the proposed advertisement would cause no harm to amenity, I find no conflict with this policy.
14. I have also had regard to Policies 38 and 39 of the City Plan, but these relate to development. Advertisements are not development in planning terms, and these policies are therefore not directly relevant to the appeal scheme. In any event, given that the proposed advertisement would not harm amenity and preserve the significance of designated heritage assets, there would be no conflict with these policies.

Conditions

15. In addition to the five standard conditions, I consider that it is necessary to add conditions to limit the duration of consent. The council have requested a condition that would require removal of the advertisement by 13 January 2027, after which it must be removed without delay.

Conclusion

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

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR