
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2023

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/Z/23/3327967
57 Estcourt Road, Salisbury, SP1 3AS

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2023/00848, dated 3 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2023.
 - The proposal is an upgrade of existing 48 sheet advert to support digital poster.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity.

Reasons

3. The Council refers to development plan policy. The Regulations require that decisions be made only in interests of amenity and public safety. Therefore, development plan policy alone cannot be decisive, but I have taken it into account as a material consideration.

Amenity

4. The existing and proposed poster site is located on the gable end of 57 Estcourt Road, at the junction with Park Street. There is a similar traditional poster display opposite. The host property is a two-storey building, with a commercial ground floor and a residential unit above. This mix of business and residential use is the predominant pattern for this single sided stretch of Estcourt Road. Park Street almost wholly comprises modest two storey dwellings in terraced form running north west from the site. The undeveloped side of Estcourt Road abuts the higher-level dual carriageway of the busy A36.
 5. The proposal is as described above and the 'D-Poster' would have the same dimensions as a standard 48-sheet display, measuring 6m(w) x 3m(h) x 0.1m (d) and would be positioned 3.58 m above ground.
 6. In general terms, even with the local businesses and a well-used road abutting, the locality struck me as quite low key in nature; low level premises, limited, usually directly related advertising where in commercial use, and, overall, an aesthetic which is far from brash or impactful. The sense is that homes
-

predominate in the bigger picture and the inherent residential amenity is a pleasant one.

7. There are other relevant contexts because the planned scheme would regrettably be seen from the nearby elevated Milford Hill Conservation Area and by many more people as they drive southwards down the A36. These vehicle occupiers have the main vista of the Grade I listed Salisbury Cathedral in front of them and appeal site not far off to one side. It is fair to say that this is an iconic view and of appreciable visual amenity.
8. The urban framework I describe all goes, in my mind, to make even the existing hoarding, with its size and positioning, an anomaly. I would say this is unfortunate but clearly opposite decisions have been taken in the past and the poster display rests where it is and presumably will continue in situ. The Appellant underlines this fact. Against the important visual backdrop and the area's local character I would not support what would appear a less low-key format in this prominent position. Even with restricted and variable luminance and limited light spread and the technical case put forward by the Appellant, it would undoubtedly be a more eye-catching display to people passing and to some local residents during the day and more so in hours of darkness. The visual qualities of the area would diminish with an incongruous and obtrusive display feature which was bolder than the existing regrettable situation and it would simply not be suited in these environs.
9. In summary, the scheme would result in a negative impact on amenity.

Other matters

10. I have considered both the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance advice on advertisements and the factors embodied in these documents on matters such as economic and business encouragement. However, the Framework explains that control in the interest of amenity is valid where there would be appreciable impacts such as I have described. I recognise that there is not a public safety issue in this case.
11. The Appellant has submitted various images of digital posters from elsewhere but by reason of immediate and wider context I would say the situations were not directly comparable. Furthermore, I would see some as not necessarily being an amenity benchmark, and in any event, I must judge the case before me on its own merits.
12. I appreciate the ability to control illumination levels and output via planning conditions as suggested by the Appellant and I do recognise that this display would be an upgrade rather than a new erection and sited in a more balanced way on the gable end. The points made over sustainability in all its senses over the sign and its remote operation with reduction of travel are noted. These along with factors such as possible community announcements, rationalisation of advertisement sites elsewhere, and poster-making waste reduction all have some credence and I give them limited weight.
13. I have carefully considered these and all the other points raised by the Appellant. However, these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in respect of the main issue identified above.

Overall conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would be unduly detrimental to amenity. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR