



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/Z/25/3373527

48 Moorgate, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 6RN

- 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 Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00451/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the Installation of Single Sided Digital Advertising Display.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent is granted for the Installation of Single Sided Digital Advertising Display at 48 Moorgate, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 6RN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00451/ADV, dated 11 April 2025. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations and the following additional conditions:
 - 1) There shall be no moving images, animation, video or full motion images displayed unless otherwise permitted by this consent.
 - 2) In the hours of darkness, the advertisement display luminance shall be no greater than 300cd/m² in accordance with the recommended maximum night time luminance value set out for Environmental Zone 4 in Table 10.4 within the Institution of Lighting Professionals - Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m².
 - 3) In daylight hours, the advertisement display luminance shall be controlled in order to reflect ambient light conditions (to ensure it is neither too bright or too dull), and shall at all times be no greater than the recommended maximum daytime luminance values set out in Table 10.5 within the Institution of Lighting Professionals – Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) 'Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements including Digital Displays' (or its equivalent in a replacement guide) in cd/m².
 - 4) Unless otherwise permitted, the minimum display time for each advertisement shall be 10 seconds and the advertisement shall not include any features which would result in interactive messages/advertisements being displayed.
 - 5) The interval between successive advertisements shall be no greater than 1 second and the complete display shall change without effect. The display to include a mechanism to default to a blank or black screen in the event of malfunction, or if the advertisement is not in use.

- 6) No images displayed shall resemble official road traffic signs, traffic lights or traffic matrix signs.

Preliminary Matters

2. The decision notice refers to Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended). However, Section 66 refers only to instances when the consideration is whether to grant planning permission and Section 72 applies only with respect to buildings or other land in a conservation area. Neither statutory duty is therefore applicable as this is an application for advertisement consent on a site located outside of a conservation area.
3. The Council does not raise concern with regard to the impact that the proposed advertisement would have on public safety, and the Highway Authority has no objection. I find no reason to disagree in that respect.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on amenity.

Reasons

5. The appeal site occupies a prominent location on Moorgate, a main arterial route into and out of Retford. The surrounding area is mixed in use, including residential properties, a restaurant and two petrol filling stations (PFS), one of on whose forecourt the proposed advertisement would be positioned. There is a considerable amount of existing signage associated with the commercial uses in the area, which varies in its size and its visual impact. Overall, the character and appearance of the surrounding area is that of a mixed-use area which lacks one primary type of usage. It is solely the impact upon the nearby heritage assets which is raised in the reason for refusal, as opposed to a concern about the impact of the proposed advertisement on amenity in wider terms.
6. The proposal would be positioned near to a number of listed buildings and what the Council identifies as non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs). Of those listed buildings, the grade II listed 53 and 55 Moorgate are referred to specifically in the reason for refusal. I concur that it is only those two listed buildings that might reasonably be considered to be affected by the proposal. There would be a very limited visual impact on the NDHAs to the north-east, because of the presence of a brick boundary wall which would provide a degree of physical separation between the proposal and those dwellings, because those buildings do not have a comparable visual standing to the listed buildings and because of the presence of the existing PFS already immediately adjacent to them.
7. The buildings at Nos 53 and 55 are attractive period properties which engage strongly with the street scene given their scale, design and because of their positioning immediately on the back edge of the pavement. It is likely that along with other older properties, a number of which remain, they created a somewhat grand entrance to the town along this main road. However, the street scene has been considerably fractured by modern buildings which are less visually sympathetic and by the presence of the two PFS, one of which is immediately adjacent to the listed buildings, with the appeal site being diagonally opposite. Each of those PFS has signage which dominates the street scene, and they are sites which are well illuminated as a result of their uses. There is a further NDHA

located adjacent to these listed buildings and opposite the appeal PFS and this appears in the same views.

8. The proposed advertisement is relatively small in size. It would be contained within the forecourt of the PFS, sitting next to the brick wall and being viewed against that wall and the gable end of the adjacent dwelling. It would have no visual impact on views taken from the north-east in the context that it would sit. From views from the south-west the large totem sign of the appeal PFS and its canopy would be seen in the foreground. Against those existing features the proposed advertisement would not be a dominant feature at all. It would be adequately separated from the two listed buildings and their adjacent NDHA by the width of the road and in views of those buildings it would be seen with both the appeal PFS in the foreground and the equally visually dominant totem sign of the other PFS in the background. As a whole, the proposed advertisement would not cause harm to the visual amenity of the area, even accounting for the presence of the listed buildings and the NDHAs.
9. There would be no adverse impact upon the Retford conservation area, as in views taken towards the designated area the proposed advertisement would be mostly screened by the aforementioned brick wall, any view of its structure would be viewed against the PFS and its display would not be visible from that location. In views looking out of the conservation area, the appeal PFS would be in the foreground, and the view would be taken towards an area which it was not deemed appropriate to include within the formal conservation area designation.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to amenity. I have taken into account Policies ST33, ST40 and ST41 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 (LP) insofar as they seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case, together with chapters 4, 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity, it does not conflict with the aims of these policies in that specific respect. The reason for refusal also refers to Policy ST34 of the LP, the Successful Places Supplementary Planning Document 2013 and to the Shopfront Design and Signage Supplementary Planning Document 2014, however none appear to be relevant to the type of signage proposed.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard advertisement consent conditions it is necessary to impose conditions relating to the prevention of moving images, animation, video or full motion images, levels of illumination in darkness and daylight, the minimum advert display time, the crossover time and a mechanism in case of malfunction and the prevention of displays resembling road signs, traffic lights or traffic matrix signs. These conditions are needed in the interests of amenity and/or public safety.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR