



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/Z/25/3365850

38 Church Street, Ruddington, Nottinghamshire NG11 6HD

- 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 Mr Chris Edge on behalf of Co-Operative Group against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00040/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'digital display screen located inside the store advertising deals, produce etc.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant's name is stated as 'Mr Chris Edge' on the appeal form. However, the application form stated that the applicant is 'Ms Abbie Bannerman'. The company name on the appeal form is stated as 'Co-Operative Group', whereas the application form referred to 'COOP'. The latter is clearly a shorted version of the same company and this has been confirmed by the appellant. As the planning application and appeal have both been made by representatives of the Co-Operative Group, the banner heading above reflects this.
4. The proposal is described as 'retrospective' on the Council's decision notice. However, when I undertook my site visit, the advertisement was not in situ. The recommendation and decision are therefore based upon the submitted drawings and supporting documents that accompany this appeal.
5. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) set out that powers under those Regulations shall be exercised in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material, and any other relevant factors. The main issue in this case relates to amenity having regard to the reason for refusal on the Council's decision notice. Whilst the development plan policies referred to on the decision notice cannot by themselves be decisive, where relevant I have taken them into account as a material consideration.

Main Issue

6. The effect of the proposed advertisement on the amenity of the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruddington Conservation Area (RCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The significance of the RCA largely derives from its origins as a Saxon settlement and its rapid growth during the Industrial Revolution to become the largest frame knitters' village in Nottinghamshire south of the River Trent. The village core is compact with a number of narrow streets and roads and includes many buildings of architectural and historic interest including former framework knitters' accommodation and workshops. The Grade II Listed buildings at Ruddington Village Museum, lies opposite the appeal site, and St Peters Church and its associated grounds are also situated close by. There are also 'Key Unlisted buildings', as identified in the Council's 'Townscape Appraisal', opposite the site. These aspects are part of the RCA's high quality vernacular and add to its significance.
8. The area surrounding the appeal site comprises a diverse range of residential, commercial and community uses. Whilst there are a range of fascia signs in the village, some of which are illuminated, in the main, shopfronts are traditional in design and scale and have a discreet presence in the street scene. There is a brightly coloured, fascia sign to a Chinese Takeaway which is situated opposite the site and this and other advertisements in the area are often externally lit. However, digital displays are not a common feature in the RCA. Advertisements in the area more often of a static, subdued design and where this occurs this positively reflects the traditional visual qualities of the area and thus helps to preserve the significance of the RCA.
9. The appeal site comprises a modern supermarket building with its form and materials respectful of the local vernacular. The existing fascia signage despite being internally illuminated, is uncluttered and is understated in design including a restrained colour palette. In these respects, the existing premises acceptably assimilate with the visual amenity of the area.
10. Even though the digital display screen would be located inside the building, its position next to a window and towards the front of the side elevation would be appreciable when approaching the site from the south along Church Street. I acknowledge that the display would only operate during store opening hours, that there would be no moving imagery or flashing lights and that the levels of luminance could be controlled. Even so, I understand that the supermarket is permitted to open late into the evenings meaning it would operate both in daylight and during hours of darkness.
11. Moreover, the advertisement would be seen to unnecessarily clutter the building's façade. Together with the frequently changing digital imagery, and potential for vivid colours, it would draw the eye and jar with the prevailing traditional vernacular. The digital display screen would therefore be an incongruous addition to the supermarket that would poorly respond to the visual amenity of the area, failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the RCA.

12. A static paper and paste advertisement would need to be considered on its own merits in respect of its relationship with the RCA. In any case, the frequently changing digital images would differentiate it from a static advertisement, and would accentuate the screen's visual prominence. Therefore, this comparison is not persuasive. The suggestion the proposal would declutter the appeal site is unfounded as there were no advertisements in the respective window at the time of my visit. Furthermore, the display would contrast with the more cohesive approach to the existing fascia signage and it is unclear whether there would be anything to prevent the display of the 'poor quality paper displays' referred to by the appellant in tandem with the proposal.
13. The appellant has referred to other digital advertisements that have been granted consent in Conservation Areas within other districts around the United Kingdom. However, I am unaware of the precise circumstances in those cases and they do not provide a reason to allow the site specific harm identified.
14. For the reasons set out, the proposed advertisement would have a harmful effect on the amenity of the area, and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the RCA.
15. Although not on their own determinative, my conclusion indicates that there would also be conflict with Policies 10 and 11 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014), Policies 1 and 28 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019) and Design Code H1 of the Ruddington Design Guide (2021), which collectively seek to ensure proposals are sympathetic to the character of the area and conserve and enhance heritage assets. My conclusion also takes into account the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which sets out that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

Other Matters

16. I concur with the main parties that there would be no harm to the significance of the nearest listed buildings including their more intimate settings. The proposal may also result in a number of benefits, including being more durable, efficient and easy to move than a traditional paper and paste advertisement, as well as being easy to maintain, potentially reducing waste and providing greater flexibility. However, the heritage balance in the Framework relates to development, not advertisements. In any case, the benefits put forward do not justify the harm to the amenity of the area and the special attention that must be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the RCA.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above, the scheme would cause harm to the visual amenity of the area, contrary to the Regulations. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR