

Supporting Statement

Advertisement Consent Application for Signage at the Chicklade EV Hub



August 2026



Contents:

1. Introduction
2. Advertisement Control
3. The Established Signage Context
4. Design and Visual Amenity
5. Illumination and the AONB
6. EV Infrastructure, Visibility and Transport Decarbonisation
7. Public and Highway Safety
8. Cumulative Impact
9. Conclusion

INSTAVOLT
CHICKPEA.



Lone Wolf Planning Ltd.



1. Introduction

- 1.1 Lone Wolf Planning Ltd. submits this Supporting Statement on behalf of InstaVolt Ltd. in support of an application for advertisement consent for a coordinated package of essential signage at the approved Chicklade Electric Vehicle Charging Hub.
- 1.2 The application relates to the signage shown on the submitted Studio Four Architects signage drawing. The proposals comprise two principal 6 metre illuminated roadside totems, together with signage associated with the feeder-pillar/kiosk, building-mounted identification signs and smaller internal wayfinding totems. The submitted drawing establishes a clear signage hierarchy rather than a proliferation of unrelated advertisements.
- 1.3 Specifically, Sign A1 is a 6 metre illuminated totem arranged in a 'V' formation; Sign A2 is a 6 metre illuminated double-sided totem; Sign B comprises signage associated with the feeder-pillar/kiosk; Signs C1 and C2 comprise the InstaVolt and Chickpea building signage respectively; and Signs D and E are modest 2 metre internal directional/identification totems.
- 1.4 The principal signs identify the development for what it is: an Ultra-Rapid EV Charging Hub, together with the associated Chickpea food and refreshment offer. The signage is therefore not gratuitous roadside advertising. It performs the entirely conventional and necessary function of identifying a roadside service facility to motorists and thereafter directing customers safely and efficiently around that facility.
- 1.5 The principle of redevelopment of Chicklade Service Station as a substantial EV charging facility was established by the grant of planning permission in January 2025. The existing site is not an undeveloped field or an isolated intrusion into an otherwise untouched landscape: it is a long-established roadside service site whose history extends back to the 1960s, containing a former filling station, shop, café/restaurant, parking and associated roadside infrastructure.
- 1.6 This distinction is fundamental. The application concerns the appropriate identification and operation of a consented modern roadside service facility on an established roadside service site. It does not concern the introduction of unrelated commercial advertising into open countryside.

2. Advertisement Control

- 2.1 The legal and policy framework is deliberately narrow. Planning Practice Guidance confirms that advertisements are controlled with reference to their effects on amenity and public safety only. Regulation 3 requires those matters to be considered having regard to the development



plan insofar as material and other relevant factors.

- 2.2 The current National Planning Policy Framework is equally clear. Paragraph 141 states that advertisement control should operate in a simple, efficient and effective manner and that advertisements should be controlled only in the interests of amenity and public safety, including cumulative impacts.
- 2.3 Accordingly, the issue is not whether an individual consultee happens to prefer there to be no illuminated signs within the National Landscape. Nor is the test whether the signage is invisible, recessive to the point of failing in its purpose, or incapable of being seen by passing motorists.
- 2.4 The proper questions are whether the advertisements, as designed and in their actual roadside context, would cause unacceptable harm to amenity or public safety.
- 2.5 For the avoidance of doubt, the assessment of “visual amenity” under the advertisement-control regime is not synonymous with a conventional Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, nor does the presence of a National Landscape designation convert an advertisement application into such an exercise. The PPG deliberately frames amenity by reference to the visual and aural amenity of the *immediate neighbourhood* in which residents and passers-by will experience the advertisement. The character and scenic qualities of the locality are plainly relevant context when making that judgement, but they do not expand the statutory test into a general assessment of effects upon landscape character, landscape fabric or the wider purposes of landscape designation. This distinction is important: landscape considerations may inform the judgement on visual amenity, but they are not a separate or freestanding basis upon which advertisement consent falls to be determined. The relevant question is therefore not whether the signs would be visible within the National Landscape, whether they introduce a new feature, or whether some degree of landscape change can be identified; it is whether, having regard to the actual character of this established roadside service site and the manner in which the advertisements would be experienced by people **in its locality**, they would cause an unacceptable effect upon amenity. To substitute a conventional landscape-impact test for that statutory advertisement-control test would materially broaden the scope of the assessment beyond that contemplated by the Regulations and PPG.
- 2.6 Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 is useful insofar as it expressly anticipates the sensitive design of advertisements and signage by reference to their scale, design, lighting and materials. Importantly, the policy does not prohibit illuminated advertisements: lighting is expressly identified as a design consideration to be assessed.



3. The Established Signage Context

- 3.1 Chicklade has been a signed roadside service facility for decades. The previous Chicklade advertisement statement records the variety of substantial roadside signage that has occupied the frontage over the years, including tall freestanding commercial/service-station totems immediately adjoining the A303.
- 3.2 The historic imagery reproduced in that statement is particularly important. It demonstrates that tall roadside signage was a characteristic element of the service station in its Little Chef era and remained so through its later Spar/Murco operation.
- 3.3 The additional historic Street View material supplied with this application also demonstrates that this was not historically an entirely unilluminated commercial frontage. The July 2019 image identifies illuminated roadside service-station signage associated with the former filling station. The earlier imagery similarly records prominent freestanding signage within the same A303 frontage.
- 3.4 That existing baseline matters. The proposed advertisements should not be assessed against an artificial baseline in which Chicklade is treated as an undeveloped, unsigned and unlit rural field. That is simply not the character of this particular site.
- 3.5 The former filling station required conspicuous roadside identification because motorists needed to identify it safely from the A303. The replacement EV charging hub has precisely the same operational requirement. The fuel has changed; the inherent roadside-service function has not; albeit has adapted to modern consumer needs.

4. Design and Visual Amenity

- 4.1 The proposed signs form part of a deliberately coordinated design language across the site. There is a clear distinction between the principal roadside identification signs, building identification and internal wayfinding. The result is an ordered family of signs rather than incremental visual clutter.
- 4.2 The two 6 metre totems perform the primary identification role. Their height reflects the scale and function of an A303 roadside service facility and the need for information to be perceived sufficiently early by motorists travelling on the strategic road network. Their purpose would be defeated if they were reduced to an arbitrary scale at which the information ceased to function effectively.
- 4.3 The remainder of the signage is plainly subordinate. The C1 and C2 signs are incorporated



onto the building elevations rather than introduced as additional freestanding structures, while the 2 metre D and E signs principally assist movement once a motorist has entered the site.

- 4.4 That approach accords with the underlying design principles of Core Policy 57. The policy calls for signage that responds appropriately to its setting through scale, design, lighting and materials. It does not require advertisements to be hidden, nor could such an approach sensibly be applied to a roadside service station.
- 4.5 The site's AONB (National Landscape) location is fully acknowledged. It was equally acknowledged when permission was granted for the EV hub itself. The previous planning assessment recognised the importance of conserving landscape and scenic beauty while also concluding that a high-quality, functional transport-service development could constitute good design within the AONB.
- 4.6 National energy policy also recognises an important principle which is especially pertinent here: good design is not synonymous with visual concealment. Functionality, fitness for purpose and sustainability are integral components of good design alongside appearance. That reasoning was already adopted in the recent Chicklade s73 Planning Statement.

5. Illumination and the National Landscape

- 5.1 It is anticipated that particular attention may be directed towards the illumination of Signs A1 and A2. That issue should be considered carefully, but it must also be considered proportionately and against the correct planning test.
- 5.2 There is no policy prohibition on illuminated signage within the Cranborne Chase National Landscape. Core Policy 57 expressly treats lighting as a matter of design judgement rather than prohibition. The Advertisement Regulations and NPPF likewise require an assessment of the actual effect of an advertisement on amenity and public safety; they do not create a presumption against illumination.
- 5.3 Indeed, Cranborne Chase National Landscape's own published approach is more nuanced than a blanket objection to artificial light. It promotes correctly directed, appropriately designed and responsibly operated lighting and has itself summarised the position succinctly: "the solution to intrusive lighting is not 'no light' but 'good light'."
- 5.4 That principle should be applied here. The proper response to concerns about illumination is good lighting design: static illumination, controlled output, avoidance of flashing or animation, and avoidance of unnecessary upward spill. It is not the wholesale removal of



illumination from functional roadside signs.

- 5.5 Cranborne Chase's own planning material confirms that its concern is with light pollution and upward emission and that properly designed lighting can effectively meet its lighting task while complying with dark-sky requirements.
- 5.6 The significance of the International Dark Sky Reserve is therefore respected, but it cannot reasonably be translated into an assertion that all visible artificial lighting is inherently unacceptable. Were that the test, the National Landscape's own guidance on dark-sky-compliant lighting would have no purpose.
- 5.7 Nor should the historic context be ignored. Illuminated service-station signage has previously existed on this established roadside frontage. It would be artificial to assess the proposal as though illumination were being introduced for the first time into an intrinsically dark and undeveloped landscape.
- 5.8 If the Council identifies a specific technical concern regarding the operation of the illumination, it has the ability to impose a precise and proportionate condition controlling that matter. A blanket objection to illumination, without demonstrating actual unacceptable amenity or safety harm, would not represent a proper application of the advertisement-control regime.

6. EV Infrastructure, Visibility and Transport Decarbonisation

- 6.1 The functional importance of these signs should not be understated.
- 6.2 Chicklade is being transformed from a conventional fossil-fuel filling station into a substantial ultra-rapid EV charging hub. That transition directly supports the decarbonisation of road transport and responds to the rapidly increasing requirement for reliable public charging on strategic routes. The recent Chicklade s73 Planning Statement already identifies the proposal as strategically important low-carbon transport infrastructure and records the strong national policy support for rapid public charging provision.
- 6.3 Government policy has moved further in precisely this direction. In its July 2025 policy for EV charging on the strategic road network, Government stated its ambition for industry to provide visible, reliable and accessible charging infrastructure ahead of need.
- 6.4 The significance of the word visible should not be overlooked in an application concerning signage. In June 2026, Government again stated that a visible charging network ahead of need is essential to successful EV uptake and identified concerns about the ability to charge on long journeys as a continuing barrier to drivers switching to EVs.



- 6.5 There is therefore a direct functional relationship between the infrastructure itself and motorists being able to identify, locate and confidently use it.
- 6.6 It would be perverse to support, consent and encourage major investment in ultra-rapid charging infrastructure on one of England's principal strategic roads, but then require that infrastructure to be inadequately identified to the very road users it exists to serve.
- 6.7 Visibility is not an unfortunate by-product of these principal signs. Visibility is their function.
- 6.8 This does not mean that EV infrastructure enjoys immunity from normal amenity and safety controls. What it does mean is that the signs must be assessed as functional components of a modern roadside charging facility rather than as unnecessary decorative advertising.
- 6.9 That distinction is particularly important when considering illumination. EV charging infrastructure operates beyond daylight hours. The ability of motorists to recognise a charging facility after dark is an obvious part of providing a usable, reliable and confidence-inspiring national charging network.
- 6.10 The planning system should not simultaneously demand the rapid deployment of visible and dependable low-carbon transport infrastructure and then frustrate its effective operation by treating ordinary, controlled identification signage as inherently objectionable.

7. Public and Highway Safety

- 7.1 The second statutory consideration is public safety.
- 7.2 The signage is static. There are no moving displays, flashing images or animated messages. The principal wording is short and readily comprehensible: InstaVolt, Ultra-Rapid EV Charging Hub and associated service information. The signs do not require prolonged study by a passing motorist.
- 7.3 Their legibility is a safety benefit. A motorist who can recognise the service station and understand its offer in good time has less reason to brake abruptly, search for an entrance at the last moment or divert attention from the carriageway.
- 7.4 Planning Practice Guidance expressly recognises that advertisements can be permitted within service areas adjoining trunk roads; the relevant concern is whether a particular advertisement adversely affects amenity or creates danger to traffic.
- 7.5 The previous Chicklade advertisement submission also recorded that the site's long-established signed frontage had operated safely and relied upon CrashMap information in support of that conclusion.



- 7.6 There is no reason in principle why a professionally designed modern EV-service-station totem should be regarded as more distracting than the petrol filling-station and retail totems that motorists have encountered at this location for decades.

8. Cumulative Impact

- 8.1 The NPPF requires cumulative effects to be considered. That requirement supports rather than undermines the present proposal.
- 8.2 The signage has been designed as a coordinated package at the outset of the redevelopment. It avoids the far less satisfactory outcome of incremental signage being added piecemeal as operational requirements emerge.
- 8.3 Two principal totems undertake the roadside identification function. Building-mounted signs identify the individual uses. Smaller signs then provide internal information and direction. That hierarchy is rational, legible and disciplined.
- 8.4 The cumulative effect is therefore one of coherence, not clutter.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1 Chicklade is a long-established roadside service site on the A303 which has contained prominent commercial and service-station signage for decades. The redevelopment changes the means by which vehicles are fuelled; it does not remove the basic operational requirement for motorists to identify a roadside service facility.
- 9.2 The proposed signage is appropriately related to that function. It is coordinated in design, hierarchical in scale and restricted to what is necessary to identify the hub, associated customer facilities and internal circulation.
- 9.3 The site's National Landscape and International Dark Sky Reserve status have been fully recognised. Those designations properly demand responsible lighting; they do not impose a prohibition on illuminated signage. Cranborne Chase National Landscape's own published position recognises precisely that distinction.
- 9.4 Signs A1 and A2 should therefore be judged on their actual effects, not refused because they carry the label "illuminated". There is no legitimate planning basis for treating illumination itself as synonymous with unacceptable harm.
- 9.5 The historic presence of prominent and illuminated service-station signage is a highly relevant



part of the baseline. The proposal is not introducing illumination into an untouched location but modernising the identification of an established transport use for the zero-emission era.

- 9.6 Furthermore, the Government's current policy position could scarcely be clearer: visible, reliable and accessible EV charging infrastructure on strategic routes is required ahead of need to support EV uptake and transport decarbonisation.
- 9.7 The planning system should facilitate that transition rather than erect artificial barriers to it. A consented ultra-rapid charging hub that motorists cannot readily identify, particularly after dark, would plainly fail to perform its intended roadside function as effectively as it should.
- 9.8 The statutory matters of amenity and public safety are satisfactorily addressed. If any detailed issue concerning illumination requires further control, that can be secured through a suitably precise condition rather than the removal of illumination or refusal of consent.
- 9.9 There is no sound planning reason to withhold advertisement consent. The application should be approved.

