



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/Z/25/3370579

Haymarket House, 28-29 Haymarket, London SW1Y 4RX

- 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 Streetvox against the decision of the City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/04023/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is 2 externally illuminated static banner advertisements, set within a replica 1:1 scaffold shroud of the existing façades measuring 19m x 7m (landscape) fixed to the Haymarket elevation and 24.7m x 4.6m (landscape) fixed to the Coventry Street elevation, all located above fascia level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 2 externally illuminated static banner advertisements, set within a replica 1:1 scaffold shroud of the existing façades measuring 19m x 7m (landscape) fixed to the Haymarket elevation and 24.7m x 4.6m (landscape) fixed to the Coventry Street elevation, all located above fascia level. 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 14 January 2027, or upon completion of the external building works, whichever is the sooner.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form but I have excluded superfluous information.
3. 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. 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.
4. The Council has not suggested that the proposal would affect public safety, and I see no reason to disagree.

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 Haymarket House is an Art Deco Style building, arranged in a roughly reverse 'L' plan which has two distinct wings connected by a narrow corridor within the upper floors. The primary façade for one wing is on Coventry Street (Nos 25-29) and the other wing fronts onto Haymarket with ground floor shop frontages to both streets. It also has elevations facing onto Oxendon Street and Shaver's Place.
7. It is identified as an unlisted building of merit and is located within the Haymarket Conservation Area (the HCA). The significance of the HCA is derived from its predominantly 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. The appeal building is considered to make a positive contribution to the HCA, and it is within in the setting of the Soho, Leicester Square, Regent Street and Chinatown Conservation Areas.
8. The appeal site is also close to a number of listed buildings including, the Grade II* listed 34 Haymarket¹ and the Grade II Listed buildings 33 Haymarket², Prince of Wales Theatre³, Claireville House⁴, 8 Oxenden Street⁵ and 22 Coventry Street⁶.
9. 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.
10. The proposal seeks approval for the display of a scaffolding shroud displaying a 1:1 image of the building facade, together with two static externally illuminated advertisement. In respect of the Coventry Street elevation, the advertisement would measure approximately 24.7 metres wide by 4.6 metres high, occupying the full width of the façade of the building at first floor level. The advertisement on the Haymarket Street elevation would measure approximately 19 metres by 7 metres high. The consent is sought on a temporary basis, for a period of 12 months.
11. 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.

¹ List Entry Number: 1357092

² List Entry Number: 1066643

³ List Entry Number: 1386535

⁴ List Entry Number: 1251179

⁵ List Entry Number: 1066032

⁶ List Entry Number: 1356974

12. The appeal site is located in a busy location, where views of the site are available from a range of vantage points including from Piccadilly and Leicester Square. Whilst I acknowledge that inset advertisement panels are not characteristic of the immediate surroundings of the appeal site, there are numerous buildings along Piccadilly and adjacent streets currently undergoing renovation⁷, many of which display scaffolding wraps in varying materials and designs. There are also numerous examples of large-scale, illuminated advertisements within the vicinity of the site.
13. Therefore, whilst I accept that the advertisements are large, they would only occupy a small proportion of the overall building and thus would not appear unduly prominent or excessive in scale. The printed image of the building would replicate its architectural detailing, ensuring that the heritage character remains visually appreciable during the works. They would also only be in place whilst building works are being carried out and for a temporary period of no more than twelve months. Accordingly, due to the temporary nature of the proposal, I find that the proposal would not harm the setting of nearby listed buildings and would ensure that the overall character of the area is retained throughout this temporary period.
14. The Council has drawn my attention to a number of recent appeal decisions⁸ which were all dismissed. These appeal decisions relate to similar proposals for externally illuminated advertisements within scaffolding shrouds for a temporary period. However, from the information provided, none of the examples cited are directly comparable with those of the appeal proposal, which has been assessed on its own merits.
15. For the above reasons, I therefore find that the proposed temporary advertisement would preserve the character and appearance of the HCA as a whole, would not adversely affect the significance of nearby listed buildings, the appeal building as an 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.
16. 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

17. In addition to the five standard conditions, I consider that it is necessary to add conditions to limit the duration of consent to the temporary 12-month period.

⁷ These include New Zealand House, 80 Haymarket House, The London Pavillion, Her Majesty's Theatre, 13 Coventry Street, Marble Arch and 1 Berkeley Street.

⁸ Appeal Refs: APP/X5990/Z/23/3331747 and APP/X5990/Z/23/3328467; APP/X5990/Z/24/3340929 and APP/X5990/Z/23/3327266.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I the appeal is allowed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR