

# Amendments to permitted development rights

## Details

### Q1. Details

Name

[REDACTED]

Organisation

-

Preferred contact details (Email address, phone number or address)

[REDACTED]

### Q2. Type (please select one from the following)

Responding in a private capacity

Q3. Responses to consultations may be made public. To keep your response anonymous (including email addresses) tick the box.

Keep my response anonymous

## Questions

Q4. Q1. 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?

No

#### Comments:

Absolutely not! Even 28 days is too many as it's being abused and for those of us living next to it, our lives are being made unbearable.

Q5. Q2. 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

**Comments:**

There has been absolutely no benefit for those of us who live in a rural area but that have been invaded over the last year, by hordes of campers and caravaners! Noise, traffic, trespassing, anti social behaviour and rubbish left are just a few issues we've had to deal with. We as neighbours have absolutely no come back either via the police or the local authority as it takes place on private land, and quite often the land owners do not reside anywhere near it. Last year our lives were made hell by noise continuing into the early hours by campers in the neighbouring field, but we still have to work. We can no longer can enjoy the peace and privacy of our own home due to, at times around 40 people camping. We live off a 60mph unclassified road and vehicles turning into the fields to camp are causing traffic chaos and its dangerous. Then there's the question of where exactly their waste water and human waste is being disposed of. We have come home several times to find used toilet paper blowing across our garden. There is also a stream which several neighbouring farms use for watering their livestock and this is being polluted by rubbish and human waste. There are more than enough organised, licensed sites across Wales, we do not need to blight the countryside for more days than necessary. How about looking after the people who work and live here permanently instead of just trying to make a quick buck. Permanently extending this to 56 days (in reality last year it was more than double this) would cause untold misery for the likes of us and our neighbours who moved here to enjoy the peace, tranquility and beauty of the countryside. If I wanted to live next door to a campsite, I would have bought a house next to one (and have a much smaller mortgage). If this is introduced permanently we will be forced to sell up. Are we as council tax payers not entitled to enjoy our own home all year?

Q6. Q3. 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

**Comments:**

There should be a restriction that this PDR can only take place for 28 days and on land that is at least 500 meters away from and neighbouring property.

Q7. Q4. 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?

*No Response*

Q8. Q5. Should any additional days over the permitted 14 days be provided for markets operated by or on behalf of a local authority?

*No Response*

Q9. Q6. Do you agree the permitted changes of use within town centres should become permanent? If not, please provide your reasons for disagreeing.

*No Response*

Q10. Q7. 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.

*No Response*

Q11. Q8. If you answered yes to Q7, are any additional conditions required to mitigate potential amenity impacts?

*No Response*

Q12. Q9. 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.

*No Response*

Q13. Q10. Do you have any comments regarding Part 3A?

*No Response*

Q14. Q11. Do you have any comments regarding Part 12A?

*No Response*

Q15. Q12. 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.

*No Response*

Q16. Q13. Do you agree with the proposed alterations to Class F? If not, please suggest alternative approaches, restrictions or thresholds that could be adopted.

*No Response*

Q17. Q14. 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.

*No Response*

Q18. Q15. Do you agree with reintroducing permitted development rights for the protection of poultry and other captive birds?

*No Response*

Q19. Q16. Do you agree with the proposals for amending Article 4 directions?

*No Response*

Q20. Q17. 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?

*No Response*

Q21. 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.

*No Response*

## Submit your response

Q22. If you want to receive a receipt of your response, please provide an email address.

Email address

████████████████████