

Permitted Development Amendments to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995

Consultation Response Form

Respondents are encouraged to submit their responses online:

<https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/5RJZZK/>.

Alternatively, please complete the consultation response form and email to
planconsultations-e@gov.wales.

Your name:

Organisation (if applicable): Pembrokeshire County Council

email / telephone number:

Your address: County Hall, Freemans Way, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire,
SA61 1TP

Q.1 Should the additional days granted by Class A of Part 4A be retained permanently, permitting temporary uses to take place for up to 56 days (28 days for specified uses) in a calendar year?

Yes ☐

No ☒

Other ☐

Comments:

The additional 28 days allowed by Part 4A has resulted in the establishment of a number of sites in unsustainable locations impacting on landscape character, local amenity and highways. The Council's Local Development Plan includes criteria based policies to ensure that tourism uses take place in sustainable locations. Continuation of the additional 28 day period would have the potential to impact on existing tourism sites in more sustainable locations, would potentially increase landscape and amenity impacts and would undermine the aim of ensuring that development is sustainable.

Q.2 Do you have any evidence as to any benefits and impacts as a result of introducing the additional number of days for temporary uses to take place since April? If yes, please specify.

Yes ☒

No ☐

Other ☐

Comments:

The Council has evidence in the form of a number of enforcement investigations in relation to the adverse impacts that temporary uses have caused to residential and visual amenity. Whilst powers exist in relation to

statutory nuisance, the impacts caused by temporary uses appear to be sufficient to have an adverse impact but not sufficient to be actionable in terms of statutory nuisance. The 56 day period has increased the need for monitoring activity and this has resource implications. The 56 day period also appears to have encouraged more 'permanent' changes of use with such sites opening at Easter and then potentially seeking to be available to the end of the Summer. Distinguishing between such uses and 28 day sites is more straightforward than with 56 day sites.

Q.3 Do you have views on whether there should be additional restrictions on the use of this PDR to mitigate against potential impacts of making this permanent? If yes, please specify.

Yes ☐

No ☒

Other ☒

Comments:

Additional restrictions would not address the concerns raised.

Q.4 Should the number of days for holding a market generally be extended? If Yes, what is an acceptable number of days for holding a market? What conditions should apply to manage the planning impacts?

Yes ☐

No ☒

Other ☐

Comments:

The current limit of 14 days is considered to be an appropriate amount as it allows monthly events. Increasing to 28 days would allow fortnightly markets or if seasonal, weekly markets. The frequency of such markets could have adverse impacts on sustainability, amenity and highway safety.

Q.5 Should any additional days over the permitted 14 days be provided for markets operated by or on behalf of a local authority?

Yes ☒

No ☐

Other ☐

Comments:

Local Authority markets can play a role in supporting the vitality and viability of town centres and as such an allowance to hold weekly markets would be appropriate.

Q.6 Do you agree the permitted changes of use within town centres should become permanent? If not, please provide your reasons for disagreeing.

Yes ☐

No ☒

Other ☐

Comments:

The vitality and viability of town centres depends in part on primary and secondary retail frontages where concentrations of retail premises can be found. Adopted local planning policies seek to retain concentrations of retail premises and to prevent significant breaks in primary retail frontages. As such it is important that the planning process is used to

assess the impact of non-retail uses on concentrations of retail premises in primary frontages in order to support vitality and viability.

Q.7 Do you agree the permitted development right for the use of the highway adjacent to a hospitality use for that purpose should be made permanent? If not, please provide your reasons for disagreeing.

Yes ☒

No ☐

Other ☐

Comments:

Q.8 If you answered yes to Q7, are any additional conditions required to mitigate potential amenity impacts?

Comments:

No

Q.9 Do you agree the permitted development right for the installation of awnings at hospitality uses should be made permanent? If not, please provide your reasons for disagreeing.

Yes ☒

No ☐

Other ☐

Comments:

Q.10 Do you have any comments regarding Part 3A?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Other ☐

Comments:

Q.11 Do you have any comments regarding Part 12A?

Yes ☐

No ☒

Other ☐

Comments:

Q.12 Do you agree that HMOs should not benefit from permitted development rights for alterations and extensions to a dwellinghouse granted by Part 1 of the GPDO? If not, please provide your reasons for disagreeing.

Yes ☒

No ☐

Other ☐

	Comments:
--	-----------

Q.13	Do you agree with the proposed alterations to Class F? If not, please suggest alternative approaches, restrictions or thresholds that could be adopted.	
	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments:	

Q.14	Do you agree greater flexibility should be provided through permitted development rights to accelerate the rollout of electric vehicle charging infrastructure? If not, please provide your reasons for disagreeing.	
	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments:	

Q.15	Do you agree with reintroducing permitted development rights for the protection of poultry and other captive birds?	
	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments:	

Q.16	Do you agree with the proposals for amending Article 4 Directions?	
	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments:	

Q.17	We would like to know your views on the effects of the proposals would have on the Welsh language, specifically on opportunities for people to use Welsh and on treating the Welsh language no less favourably than English.	
	What effects do you think there would be? How could positive effects be increased, or negative effects be mitigated?	
	Comments: No comments	

Q.18	We have asked a number of specific consultation questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use the space below to raise them.
	Comments: No comments

Responses to consultations are likely to be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here: ☐