



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 September 2026

by R Cahalane BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th October 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6012932

Pavement o/s Ramparts, Devizes Road, Salisbury SP2 7EE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Safia Rana-Jaswal (BT Telecommunications PLC) against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2026/02555.
 - The development proposed was described as “the installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.”
-

Appeal B Ref: 6012933

Pavement o/s Ramparts, Devizes Road, Salisbury SP2 7EE

- 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 Safia Rana-Jaswal (BT Telecommunications PLC) against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2026/02790.
The advertisement proposed is 2no. digital 75" LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. Appeal A concerns a planning appeal following refusal of planning permission to erect a BT street hub. Appeal B concerns an advertisement appeal following refusal of express consent to display advertisements on the Appeal A street hub. Whilst I have considered each on its individual merits, as they are interrelated and raise similar issues within the same location, I have combined both decisions into a single decision letter.
4. In the above banner heading, the Appeal A development description is taken from the combined application form for planning permission and advertisement consent. However, whilst that description refers to “payphones”, the site location maps¹ and other evidence before me indicate removal of only one payphone. For appeal B, I have taken the description from the “Type of Proposed Advertisement(s)” section of the application form, and this accurately describes the advertisement consent proposal. I have determined the appeals accordingly. For ease of reference, I refer to the proposals collectively as a “street hub” from hereon in.

¹ Drawing No 001 Rev B

5. On 17 August 2026, the Government issued a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). As these revisions could affect the issues in this case, the Council and the appellant were invited to make further comments. My decisions reflect this latest Framework and any responses received.

Main Issue

6. For both appeals, the main issue is the effect of the proposed street hub on the character and appearance/visual amenity of the area, including surrounding heritage assets.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is located at the edge of Salisbury city centre, alongside the junction of Wilton Road (A36) with St Pauls roundabout. During my site visit, I observed this to be a busy area in terms of both traffic and pedestrian movements. The A36 is clearly a well-used arterial route and nearby, there is also a signed underpass to the city centre and cathedral.
8. The street hub would sit forward of a Premier convenience store that has extensive shopfront glazing, and a modern and externally illuminated fascia. There are also some other variously illuminated commercial premises in the vicinity. The street hub would sit within a sizeable paved area between the Premier store and the roundabout junction that is mainly free of clutter. Such a location would give prominence to the structure, given its proposed height.
9. Moreover, the proposed illuminance of the street hub's digital screens would be static and at a level of 5,000 candelas per square metre (cd/m²), as set out in the application form. The above is also indicated in the street hub product statement, which further advises that maximum night-time brightness would be lower at 600 cd/m². One of the appellant's suggested conditions² would impose such a limit between dusk and dawn. This limit is also as set out in Chapter 9 and Table 9.1 of Professional Lighting Guide 05/23³ (PLG 05/23).
10. It is suggested that the lighting levels are within the levels set for this type and size of screen as set out in PLG 05/23. However, its further guidance contained within Chapter 10 accounts for ambient lighting levels. Based on the street hub's display size and location, its recommended maximum night-time sign luminance under Table 10.4 is therefore 300 cd/m².
11. Additionally, Table 10.5 recommends a range of daytime values of sign luminance of between 400 cd/m² and 5,000 cd/m², to account for variable ambient light conditions dependent on the time of day, time of year, and weather. Whilst PLG 05/23 does not form planning policy, it is as an important material consideration. The evidence before me does not indicate that the display luminance would be limited to 300 cd/m² at night-time, nor adjusted during daytime in response to variable ambient light conditions.
12. Given the limited amount of internal and external advertisement illumination in the vicinity, the proposed illumination levels and location of the street hub displays would not be appropriate, despite its dynamic urban context that also includes some nearby large trees. As the nearby roundabout traffic lights, road signs,

² Within its Planning, Design and Access Statement

³ The Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements Including Digital Displays (Institution of Lighting Professionals, 2023)

streetlights and headlamps form essential highway features, they do not justify the proposed street hub and its extent of illumination.

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that in respect of Appeal A, the street hub would adversely harm the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted 2015) (WCS) and Saved Policy PS7 of the Salisbury District Local Plan 2011 (SDLP). Collectively, these policies require, amongst other things, development to respond positively to the existing townscape in terms of built form, height and scale, and to minimise the environmental impact in terms of siting and design.
14. Policy 6 of the Salisbury Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020–2038 (adopted 2025) (SNDP) requires all developments in Salisbury to have regard to the Salisbury Design and Advertising Guide (SDAG) when addressing Core Policies CPs 57 and 58 of the WCS. Whilst the signs and advertising section of the SDAG does not specifically refer to the type of advertisement proposed, this guidance seeks to limit illumination and for the above reasons, the proposed street hub lighting luminance levels and location cannot reasonably be described as modest or discreet. The street hub thus also conflicts with SNDP Policy 6 in this respect.
15. Even if the existing kiosk proposed for removal is within a conservation area, it is at some distance from the appeal site, within an entirely different setting. I observed its location to be tucked away in a walled corner near to the pedestrian ramp up to the Sainsburys supermarket and the pedestrian entrance to the covered car park. Thus, I did not find this kiosk to be a conspicuous structure, or amounting to visual harm, clutter or obstruction. Its removal therefore does not justify the street hub as proposed, despite its slimmer profile and more contemporary design.
16. Whilst the Framework is silent in respect of advertisements, policy CO1 sets out under its paragraph 1 that in considering proposals for the expansion or upgrading of electronic telecommunications networks, substantial weight should be given to the benefits of maintaining or improving network coverage, capacity, reliability and resilience. This includes providing for next generation wireless technologies.
17. Framework policy CO1 however also requires such infrastructure to be sited and designed so as to minimise visual impacts, so far as practical taking into account its operational requirements. Indeed, the objective of policy CO1 is to support the expansion and upgrading of telecommunications infrastructure, but in ways which respect important environmental safeguards. I see no reason why this would not include the character and appearance of the affected area.
18. Moreover, one of the key principles of Framework policy DP3 seeks proposals to respond to their context, including the character and features of their site and its setting, so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings. In the above respects, the street hub fails to comply with Framework policies CO1 and DP3 given its scale, location and illumination levels. The abovementioned development plan policies are not materially inconsistent with these Framework national decision-making policies.
19. In the case of the advertisement appeal (Appeal B), the above development plan policies are only a material consideration and do not carry the same weight as in the case of the planning appeal (Appeal A). However, for the above reasons, the proposed street hub would harm the area's visual amenity. This harm is contrary to

the provisions of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which seek to control advertisements in the interests of amenity.

20. The street hub would also not meet the guidance of Section 5.4.1 of the Wiltshire Design Guide (2024). This seeks designs to carefully consider the size, form and placing of street furniture and signage.
21. The reasons for refusal state, amongst other things, that the proposal does not result in direct harm to designated heritage assets. The Council's delegated reports indicate that the proposal would not give rise to direct harm to the setting of nearby conservation areas and a number of nearby listed buildings⁴ by reason of separation and intervening context. Following my site visit, I have no reason to disagree. I have thus found no conflict with WCS CP58 insofar as it requires development to conserve heritage assets and their settings. Lack of harm in this respect however neither weighs in favour nor against allowing these appeals.

Other Matters

22. Both decision notice reasons for refusal also cite conflict with the Creating Places Design Guide (adopted 2006) and the Salisbury Shopfronts and Advertisements Design Guide. Both of these advice documents were however produced by Salisbury District Council, which is now subsumed by Wiltshire Council as a unitary authority, and the subsequent WCS and SNDP make no specific reference to them. Such guidance thus does not appear to be linked to subsequent adopted development plan policies. On that basis, those guidance documents are not afforded sufficient weight to make any material bearing on my decisions.

Planning Balance

23. The extent of conflict with WCS CP 57, SDLP Saved Policy PS7 and SNDP Policy 6 that I have identified amounts to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework sets out the government's decision making policies for development proposals in England, making it a material consideration of critical importance, and it should be read alongside the policies in the development plan.
24. Framework Chapter 4 sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means Framework policy S4 should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements. Policy S4 states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.
25. The potential services that the street hub could offer would clearly assist with modern life and could be of substantially greater range than the kiosk to be removed. I do not question that there is a need in this respect, and the Framework supports the building of a strong, competitive economy.
26. However, there is little evidence before me to demonstrate that at the appeal site location, there is a specific shortage or deficiency of appropriate 4G/5G and Wi-Fi services for local residents, visitors and businesses; or that the appellant is

⁴ As shown on the maps provided on page 4 of both delegated reports

currently not meeting the requirements of the Universal Service Obligation agreement with Ofcom. Therefore, I cannot quantify the precise benefits arising from the proposed ultra-fast Wi-Fi services.

27. In many instances, the above users would have alternative means to access local information, navigation, or to charge personal digital devices. The kiosk proposed for removal could also serve an important public function for many as an emergency contact point when necessary. In this albeit more limited context, it can continue to serve a purpose. In the absence of a precise legal mechanism, the evidence before me also gives me little assurance that the street hub's potential publicly beneficial uses to count pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle movements, and to monitor air, sound and light conditions, would be adequately secured.
28. For the above reasons, the public benefits of the street hub are only afforded limited weight. The Framework sets out that in applying policy S4, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include situations where the development proposal would fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances. In this respect, the street hub would conflict with a key principle of Framework policy DP3, as already set out in my reasons, with no clear justification.
29. In such circumstances, policy DP3 indicates that development proposals should be refused. Furthermore, the above benefits of the proposal would be substantially outweighed by the adverse effects that I have identified in respect of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

30. Appeal A would not be in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole and material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Appeal B would harm the visual amenity and public safety of the area. Therefore, for the reasons given above, both appeals are dismissed.

R Cahalane

INSPECTOR