

2 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (AN306-2002)

(a) 266 HILLTOWN - EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED ADVERTISEMENT HOARDINGS

Reference is made to the decision of the Council on 8th April 2002 under powers delegated to the Director of Planning and Transportation in consultation with the Convener, to refuse Advertisement Consent because the proposal would form an incongruous and visually disruptive element in the streetscape in view of their scale and appearance. If approved a precedent could be set for similar proposals in the area.

The decision was appealed by the applicant under the provisions of Section 182 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 and Regulation 21 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (Scotland) Regulations 1984.

The appeal was determined by written representations and the decision was received by the Council on 22nd October 2002. A copy of the decision letter can be found in the Members' Lounges.

The Reporter considered that the determining issues, as with all advertisement consent appeals, were whether the display would be contrary to the interests of amenity or public safety.

In summary the Reporter concluded that no issues of public safety were relevant. However, he considered the application site to be an "eyesore" in a fairly prominent location and an advertising proposal of smaller scale would be acceptable and would have the advantage of screening the vacant and unkempt site and the scarred tenement elevation adjacent.

Accordingly the appeal was **UPHELD** in respect of a single 48 sheet hoarding only and subject to conditions relating to landscaping, timber fencing and implementation/maintenance.

(b) LAND WEST OF LAWSIDE ROAD AND SOUTH OF LOONS ROAD - ERECTION OF TEMPORARY, EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED ADVERTISING HOARDINGS

Reference is made to the decision of the Council on 29th July 2002, under powers delegated to the Director of Planning and Transportation in consultation with the Convener, to refuse Advertisement Consent because the proposal would represent an unacceptable proliferation of hoardings leading to a detrimental impact on the environment (Dundee Local Plan Proposal HS5).

The decision was appealed by the applicant under the provisions of Section 182 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 and Regulation 21 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (Scotland) Regulations 1984.

The appeal was determined by written representations and the decision was received by the Council on 22nd October 2002. A copy of the decision letter can be found in the Members' Lounges.

The Reporter considered the determining issues, as with all advertisement consent appeals, to be whether the display would be contrary to the interests of amenity or public safety.

In summary the Reporter concluded that no issues of public safety were involved. The proposal would offer no screening benefits and would merely add to the existing 14 hoardings in the neighbourhood, 5 of which already face the appeal site. He concluded that the proposal would add to advertisement clutter and would damage amenity.

Accordingly the appeal was **DISMISSED**.

(c) 35 EAST DOCK STREET - WALL MOUNTED EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED 48 STREET ADVERTISEMENT HOARDINGS

Reference is made to the decision of the Council 19th August 2002 under powers delegated to the Director of Planning and Transportation in consultation with the Convener, to refuse Advertisement Consent because the proposal would be contrary to Dundee Local Plan Policy BE23 (City Gateways); and Policy BE6 (Advertisements and the environment).

The decision was appealed by the applicant under the provisions of Section 182 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 and Regulation 21 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (Scotland) Regulations 1984.

The appeal was determined by written representations and the decision was received by the Council on 22nd October 2002. A copy of the decision letter can be found in the Members' Lounges.

The Reporter considered the determining issues, as with all advertisement consent appeals, to be whether the display would be contrary to the interests of amenity or public safety.

In summary the Reporter concluded that the proposal site is located in an area dominated by commercial/industrial land uses where, in appropriate cases advertisement hoardings can make a positive contribution to screening vacant/derelict land or buildings. However, in this case the proposal was considered to be significantly out of character with the appeal property and would not enhance visual amenity. In addition, it was considered that, with the recent approval on appeal of another hoarding display nearby and other advertisement hoardings in the locality, further consents could not be accommodated without environmental damage.

Accordingly the appeal was **DISMISSED**.