



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 & 3 December 2025

by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/Z/25/3375072

156 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norfolk NR7 0AD

- 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 Aram Adullah of Vape & Variety against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/2408.
The advertisement proposed is described as retention of proposed front fascia and window signage with LED lighting.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The advertisement was in place at the time of the site visit, and appeared to be displayed broadly in accordance with the plans. However, the LED lighting was not operative.
3. Reference is made to various planning policies and guidance, to which I have had regard as relevant considerations. The powers to control advertisements under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations) may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. In my determination of the appeal, the planning policies and guidance have not therefore by themselves been decisive.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on visual amenity.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a mid-terraced property located on a busy main road. The locality is predominantly residential in character, although the appeal property is adjacent to another commercial property and a couple of commercial properties are located a short distance away further along the road.
6. The fascia sign is above the main shop front window and includes white letters displayed on a black background. The letters would be internally illuminated and protrude from the background. The lettering is disproportionately large having regard to the depth and width of the fascia. While the appellant has indicated a willingness to reduce the brightness of the advertisement, it is unclear what level of

illumination would be acceptable. In any event, consent is sought for the advertisement as per the submitted plans.

7. From numerous public vantage points along Yarmouth Road, the fascia sign would appear conspicuous, even in the context of the large shop window below and the presence of existing signs on other properties along Yarmouth Road.
8. Being noticeable reflects the main purposes of the advertisements, which is to attract attention and potential custom. However, an appropriate balance needs to be struck between allowing businesses to engage with and inform prospective customers and safeguarding the visual amenity of the area.
9. I observed several examples of prominent illuminated advertisements in the locality, to which the appellant has also referred. However, limited background details of these advertisements have been provided and so I cannot be certain that their circumstances are the same or like those of the appeal scheme.
10. The appeal sign is visually intrusive to the detriment of the streetscene. Accordingly, the proposal results in material harm to visual amenity. Insofar as they are material to the main issue, the proposal would conflict with Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan, Policy GC4 of the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document and Policy 2 of the Thorpe St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan, which, amongst other things requires a high standard of design.

Other Matters

11. The lack of objection from the Highway Authority is noted. Whilst the proposal may not be detrimental to highway safety, for the reasons stated, I have found harm to visual amenity.
12. Observations from the appellant regarding the nature of advertisements in the locality and the processing of the application are noted. The social and economic benefits of bringing a vacant unit back into use that serves the community is not disputed. However, this has had no bearing on my assessment of the proposed scheme which has focused on the merits of the proposed advertisement insofar as it relates to the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

R. Gee

INSPECTOR