



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by JJ Packman MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/Z/25/3363795

26 High Street, Kingswood, Bristol, BS15 4AJ

- 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 Wildstone Estates Limited against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02994/ADV
 - The advertisement proposed is replacement of 1no. existing paper and paste display with 1no. digital display ("D-Poster").
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Having regard to the Regulations and the decision of the Council, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on amenity and public safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated at the junction of Poplar Terrace and Kingswood High Street (A420). It is proposed that the replacement advertisement would be erected on the end elevation of No. 26 High Street; an end of terrace property. The ground floor of No. 26 comprises a vacant shop unit. Other properties within the terrace (No.s 26-46) appear to be in residential use.
4. The area comprises a mixture of residential uses and commercial premises including a car dealership directly opposite the proposed advertisement and a Caravan and Camping Centre situated on the northern side of the High Street.
5. Although there are examples of neglect, there is also evidence of architectural quality within the local area; with many attractive period buildings nearby, including the terrace on which the appeal site is located. (No.s 26-46). These dwellings are of stone construction and feature attractive window detailing. To the south is Poplar Terrace (dating from 1891) and Hill View, an attractive villa from the same period. These buildings add historic charm to the character of the area.
6. There is some commercial signage present including signs and banners associated with the car dealership and various signage associated with the Caravan and Camping Centre. There is also a 'D6' internally illuminated Digital sign on land immediately to the front of No. 26. The largest and most prominent sign by far,

however, is the existing 48-sheet hoarding that occupies most of the width of the end elevation of No. 26. Despite now being non illuminated, the existing advertisement appears prominent in this location and detracts, to an extent, from the historic character of the buildings to the south.

7. The proposal is for the replacement of the current display with a modern digital format display (D-Poster) in approximately the same location. The display would have the same dimensions as the current hoarding.
8. The appellant has stated that the quality of the image produced on the D-Poster is intended to mimic that of a traditional poster and paste display with a system of threshold controls, timers and light sensors to control illumination.
9. The appellant has provided details of an earlier application for a similar proposal in the same location. That application was refused and an appeal subsequently dismissed on the grounds of visual amenity and proposed illumination. The appellant has drawn attention to the proposed differences between the two schemes. The changes amount to the removal of the logo box and camera, repositioning of the display centrally, limitations to illumination levels and rate change, and the imposition of a 'nighttime curfew' between midnight and 5am.
10. The extra condition suggested by the appellant over and above the standard conditions set out in the Regulations would control the level of illumination, restrict the display to static advertisements and limit the minimum display time for each advertisement to at least 10 seconds. The sign would be turned off completely between midnight and 5am. I note that the proposed level of illumination would accord with the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance. Nevertheless, I do not consider that these measures would be sufficient to mitigate against the harm I identify below.
11. The current display already appears uncharacteristically prominent in a traditional setting. Although the existing hoarding does detract from the character of the area, the impact is limited by the nature of traditional advertisements.
12. Traditional paper and paste advertisements appear, on the whole, less prominent than modern D-Posters due to the static nature of each advertisement, which often remains in situ for a number of weeks or months. As such, they have more of a tendency to fade into the background, like much of the existing signage present locally. Furthermore, and despite the attempts to mimic traditional advertisements, the images produced by D-Posters do generally appear more vivid and saturated than their paper and paste counterparts. The 'D6' sign immediately in front of the appeal property is undoubtedly brighter, clearer and more eye catching than other signs in the area, but its impact is limited by its relatively small size and position below first floor level.
13. The proposed new D-Poster is also intended to be eye-catching. It is proposed in this case that images could be changed up to every ten seconds. The dynamic nature of the advertisement combined with its large size, conspicuous position above street level and on a street corner, will give the advertisement a harmful degree of prominence, especially when viewed in conjunction with the existing D6 sign at street level. It is considered that this prominence would have an adverse impact on the amenities of the local area.

14. Insofar as they are relevant to consideration of the effect of the proposal on amenity, I have taken into account policies in the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, nothing within them leads me to a different conclusion from the one I have reached above.
15. In considering public safety, I note that the Transport Officer raised no objection to the proposal, subject to the imposition of conditions. There is nothing in the evidence before me or which I saw on my site visit which suggests that I should, or that it would be appropriate for me to, depart from that position, or that there are any other public safety factors, including pedestrian safety which would result in me reaching a different conclusion.
16. As such, I find that the proposed advertisement would not have a harmful effect on highway, and by extension, public safety.

Other Matters

17. I note the appellant has provided examples of other advertisement cases, none of the examples provided appear to be directly comparable to the proposal, therefore I have attributed only moderate weight to these.

Conclusions

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

JJ Packman

INSPECTOR