



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/Z/24/3351421
57 Wilton Road, Salisbury SP2 7ER

- The appeal is made under regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning Act (control of advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Wildstone Estates Ltd against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/04269.
 - The advertisement proposed is for the conversion of poster advertisement display to support digital poster.
-

Decisions

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on visual amenity and the setting of the Old Manor Hospital Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the eastern flank elevation of 57 Wilton Road, an end terraced two storey dwellinghouse located at the junction of Wilton Road (A36) with Ashfield Road. It is in close proximity to the western boundary of the Conservation Area from within which the site is clearly visible when travelling in a westerly direction along the A36. The Conservation Area comprises a number of high quality historic and contemporary building forms, including the Salisbury Law Courts and the former Hospital buildings opposite. The immediate locality around the appeal site is residential in character with the exception of the Horse and Groom Public House opposite. The existing sheet poster advertisement hoarding appears to have been in situ for a number of years and it is common ground that this is in excess of 10no. This is nonetheless unilluminated and by virtue of its landscape orientation between the 2no first floor windows of the host property is not unduly incongruous.
4. I noticed on my site visit that there is some signage on the Tesco Express store further west along the A36, although its corporate signage is relatively low-key; and a Shell petrol filling station is in the far distance such that I consider that advertisements are not an overly common feature within the immediate locality of the appeal site.
5. I note the examples cited by the appellant, and whilst each case must be assessed on its own merits, with specific reference to the petrol filling station,

the digital advertisement hoarding on the west facing flank elevation of 117 Wilton Road is within an area of a very different character, with the petrol station itself having a high degree of illumination, including from signage, its canopy, shop and electric vehicle charging points. Consequently, I consider that the appeal for that which was allowed by my colleague¹ does not set a precedent for the case that is before me.

6. I have had regard to the evidence in respect of photographs showing digital advertisement displays during different times of the day in other locations, and whilst I acknowledge that brightness levels can be controlled, nonetheless the images are proposed to be illuminated and therefore during the hours of darkness will clearly be more noticeable than the existing situation. In addition, the proposed advertisement will be of a larger size than the existing one and its portrait orientation would give rise to an increased verticality that would appear more visually dominant than the existing landscape format. The very fact that the digital poster display would display multiple static advertisements on a rotation also reinforces my concerns that it would attract far greater attention and appear as a far more strident feature in the street scene than the existing situation.
7. I note the appellant's opinion that the ability to carry multiple adverts would cater for demand in the area and reduce the pressure for new locations, but this has not been substantiated. Nonetheless, I do accept that a consolidation of 'multi-panel' sites into single panels is an increasing trend. However, it falls upon me to determine the proposal before me which would essentially replace one advertisement hoarding with another, the visual impacts of the latter being significantly greater notwithstanding that a reduction in vehicle trips to re-post adverts every few weeks is a benefit in its favour.
8. I have also had regard to the other benefits of digital advertising that have been cited by the appellant, however these do not outweigh the harm that would result upon the visual amenity of the area, including upon the setting of, and views from, the designated heritage asset.
9. I consider that the proposal conflicts with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework and whilst not decisive, I have had regard to Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy adopted January 2015 which require the sensitive design of advertisements which are appropriate and sympathetic to their local setting by means of scale, design, lighting and materials, and require proposals to conserve the settings of designated heritage assets, including the special character or appearance of Conservation Areas, especially in regard to orientation, size and night-time illumination.

Conclusion

10. Therefore for the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Y3940/Z/23/3318796