

Date:

0 9 NOV 1998

Dear Sir

BS9 2DA

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (CONTROL OF ADVERTISEMENTS) REGULATIONS 1992

APPEAL: Express Dairy Depot, Two Waters Way, Hemel Hempstead **APPLICATION NO:** 4/01389/98/ADV

- 1. I have been appointed to decide the appeal of your clients, More Group UK Ltd, against Dacorum Borough Council's refusal to permit the display, at the above-mentioned site, of two non illuminated 96 sheet poster panels and two non illuminated 64 sheet poster panels. My decision is based on the submitted documents and an inspection of the site.
- 2. I agree with the brief, general description of the appeal site and its surroundings included in the Council's statement, enclosed with their letter dated 18 September 1998.
- 3. The Council have drawn attention to Policies 28 and 103 of the adopted Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1995. The Council have also drawn attention to policies, in the emerging Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011, for enhancing the immediate environment of Two Waters Way. However, as the Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and, where applicable, public safety, the Council's policies alone cannot be decisive. But I have taken them into account as a material consideration.
- 4. The appeal premises are a utilitarian building in brick with a corrugated sheeting roof, which backs onto Two Waters Way near to its junction with London Road. The building is set partly below the level of Two Waters Way giving it a lower profile, when seen from Two Waters Way, than its size alone would suggest. This section of Two Waters Way, between London Road and the railway line to the south west, is steeply inclined and is lined on both sides by a variety of commercial and industrial premises. To the north, on the other side of London Road, is a largely undeveloped area of green open space, some of which is in agricultural uses.
- 5. The proposed panels, and associated fencing, would be sited almost immediately behind the grass verge of Two Waters Way and some five metres or more from the appeal premises. When seen from directly opposite, the panels would, for the most part, be visually contained by the profile of the appeal premises. But I consider that, in these forward positions, from most viewpoints and particularly those of motorists using Two Waters Way,

the panels would be seen as isolated structures. In these circumstances, and given their overall height of some five to six metres, I consider that the roughly 27 and 36 square metre displays would appear as excessively conspicuous and obtrusive features in this setting. And despite the commercial nature and uses of the panels' immediate surroundings, because of the mixed and partly undeveloped character of the wider setting – in which context the panels would be seen when approached from the south west, I consider that the impact of the combined, roughly 125 square metre display, would be one of unduly intrusive and assertive roadside advertising.

- 6. For the reasons given above, and in consideration of all the material factors, I conclude that the display of the poster panels would be detrimental to the interests of amenity. Although I agree that the appeal premises are not particularly attractive, I consider that they are not so unattractive that their screening by the proposed panels and fencing would improve the amenity of this locality. And in these circumstances I take the view that the landscaping treatment proposed would be insufficient to overcome the amenity objections set out above.
- 7. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Yours faithfully

D G WATERMAN

Advertisement Control Officer



PLANNING

Civic Centre Marlowes Hemel Hempstead Herts HP1 1HH

MORE GROUP UK LTD 440 SPRINGFIELD ROAD HAYES MIDDX UB4 OJS

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

APPLICATION - 4/01389/98/ADV

mornand

ADJ. EXPRESS DAIRY DEPOT, TWO WATERS WAY, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HERTS
FOUR ADVERTISEMENT HOARDINGS

Your application for advertisement consent dated 05 August 1998 and received on 06 August 1998 has been **REFUSED**, for the reasons set out overleaf.

Director of Planning

Date of Decision: 20 August 1998

REASONS FOR REFUSAL APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION: 4/01389/98/ADV

Date of Decision: 20 August 1998

The proposed advertisements would appear incongrous, intrusive and would be detrimental to the interests of amenity.