
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G2625/Z/25/3369576

24 St Stephens Road, Norwich NR1 3QU

- 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 David Galbraith, Inschool Media against the decision of Norwich City Council.
 - The application Ref 25/00396/A, dated 31 March 2015, was refused on 27 May 2025.
 - The proposed advertisement is the display of 1 no. non-illuminated fascia sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the advertisement on the visual amenity of the area; and
 - the effect of the advertisement on highway safety.

Reasons

Visual amenity

3. The proposal is the display of a static, non-illuminated rectangular advertisement about 4.267 m tall by 2.133 m wide on the flank wall of No 24 St Stephens Road. The display has already been erected and faces northeast towards pedestrian and vehicular traffic leaving Norwich City Centre on the busy A11 radial route. Due to the wide undeveloped gap between No 24 and the adjacent property along the road, Nedeham House, the advertisement is visually prominent in the street scene.
4. Whilst there are a number of commercial premises with related advertisements on St Stephens Road southwest of the A147/A11 roundabout, some brightly coloured and intrusive, these are concentrated on the opposite side of the road to No 24 and directly relate to the premises concerned. There are no examples of unrelated advertisement displays as proposed here, and the proposal would conflict with the character of the street scene in this respect. Beyond No 24 the road is generally residential in nature with no advertisements.
5. No 24 itself is an attractive three storey Grade II listed building dating from the mid/late 19th Century with quoins, rusticated ground floor, yellow brickwork above and classic window detailing on the roadside elevation. Whilst the main features of the building, a first-floor verandah with trellis above, face southwest down the road and the

advertisement is mounted on its featureless flank (back) wall, passers-by do see the display in conjunction with the attractive roadside elevation where it clearly detracts from the significance and appreciation of the listed building.

6. For these reasons the advertisement causes significant harm to the visual amenity of the area. The advertisement conflicts with Policies DM3 and DM9 of the Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 (the NDMLP) and paragraphs 141 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF). These seek to ensure respect for the character and local distinctiveness of the area, resist poorly sited advertisements, aim to preserve and enhance designated heritage assets and seek to avoid harm to heritage assets unless outweighed by public benefits.

Highway safety

7. The gap between No 24 and Nedeham House provides access to a large area of temporary car parking which is due to be the subject of a major redevelopment scheme shortly. This will generate substantial traffic flows and thus turning movements adjacent to the advertisement. The Highway Authority is concerned that the display could jeopardise highway safety by distracting drivers in an area with significant pedestrian flows. Whilst a digital, intermittent or moving display in this location would be likely to distract drivers, a traditional static and non-illuminated display, albeit quite large, is unlikely to do so as there is no element of surprise.

8. For these reasons the advertisement as erected does not raise significant highway safety concerns and is consistent with NDMLP Policy DM30 and NPPF paragraph 116 which seek to promote a safe highway network.

Conclusion

9. Whilst there are no significant implications for highway safety, the advertisement causes significant harm to the visual amenity of the area. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR