

**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](mailto:planconsultations-e@gov.wales).

Your name:

Organisation (if applicable):

email / telephone number:

Your address:

<b>Q.1</b>	<b>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?</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> With the advent of Covid 19 and the total restriction of movement outdoors it is necessary to allow temporary uses as outlined in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.8 on a permanent basis. Too many small businesses have closed never to open again and it is necessary to kick start festivals, fairs, markets etc before they are lost for ever. The additional days granted by Class A of part 4A should therefore be made permanent to assist such ventures. With holidays in this Country being more needed these additional campsites on a temporary basis would be most welcome for family holidays.		

<b>Q.2</b>	<b>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.</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> Local public house installed a tepee (wigwam type marquee) for dining due to need to observe social distances, and fund- raising events for a terminally ill child could be organised to raise money for treatment in America. Sadly, she died before the journey could be made but this assisted the raising of money for a very notable cause.		

<b>Q.3</b>	<b>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.</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> Each venture is going to turn on its own set of facts and provided there is no nuisance caused to neighbours this should not need further mitigation of potential impacts.		

<b>Q.4</b>	<b>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?</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> The holding of markets is generally on a temporary basis for a day or two and for car boots sales 1 day per week so that the existing provision seems reasonable. Accordingly, any extension up to 28 days would appear reasonable. Care should be taken to ensure there is no noise pollution or nuisance to adjoining or near- by properties.		

<b>Q.5</b>	<b>Should any additional days over the permitted 14 days be provided for markets operated by or on behalf of a local authority?</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> As for Q4 above an extension to 28 days would appear reasonable and on the same terms as private markets.		

<b>Q.6</b>	<b>Do you agree the permitted changes of use within town centres should become permanent? If not, please provide your reasons for disagreeing.</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> Permanent permitted changes of use would allow the regeneration of town centres subject to the existing restrictions on sale of food for		

consumption off site and industrial use. There is a need to kick start town centre leisure and eating habits and this seems to be a way to assist.

**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:** Yes, but there is a need to consider the safety aspects to the public as well. Little used streets could well be used to try to bring about areas for eating etc but use of streets with a heavy volume of traffic could lead to more accidents. There should be an ability to control the system vested in the local authority, and any permanent approval should be on the existing conditions.

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

**Comments:**

Care must be exercised to ensure that persons with protected characteristics are not obstructed by the pavement overspill. The access provisions required under Inclusive Mobility should be properly ensured.

**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:**

Yes, subject to any conditions already in place affecting the same and set out in clause 2.30 of this consultation. In the next village an awning was put in place projecting towards the highway and allowed more people to eat in the open, under the awning and suitably protected from the elements. The Council planned to take enforcement proceedings but it is still there and providing a useful facility.

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

Yes ☒

No ☐

Other ☐

**Comments:** It is necessary to maintain venues for health provision as has been evidenced by the marquees, adaption of buildings for hospitals as evidenced in the early days of Covid 19. When we were young there was always the threat of nuclear war from Russia and practically every town had a bunker which could

be up and running within hours in case such a threat became reality. Some of the larger bunkers/control rooms which often had provision as hospitals would have saved the initial panic when the pandemic that is Covid 19 struck. Most of them have been abandoned or dismantled now. One wonders with people like the Soviet Leader in power whether such provisions should again become the norm and be moth balled whilst not wanted and could be re-activated when needed quickly. Such structures could have coped with a large number of patients in the pandemic and in the event of another pandemic the make shift hospitals may have to be re-installed again. As with all these good ideas unless there are immediately available adequately trained, resourced and equipped staff the facilities will be of limited value.

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

Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

**Comments:**

The comments at Q10 above apply equally here. There should be some permanent structure that could be immediately activated in the event of another emergency be it a natural disaster, health related like Covid 19, a major chemical plant incident or man- made such as a war.

**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:** HMOs generate much controversy, and should be subject to planning permission, but Planning Officers need to realise that with pandemics like Covid 19 coming along it is necessary to have minimum standards for HMOs equivalent for private premises to those provided to affordable housing. (EG WDQR2021)The suggestion that an HMO is "bijoux" if it provides totally inadequate accommodation and is in private ownership must stop. There appears to have been an increase in mental illness as a result of Covid and tiny and cramped accommodation will not assist or overcome the problem.

**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 ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

**Comments:**

Permeable surfaces should apply throughout the curtilage of a property and when hard surfaces are renewed but provision should be made to ensure that permeable surfaces are actually going to work. In our area no account is taken of underlying clay which can result in flooding on site or increased risk off site. Without ground condition testing to establish where infiltration will work, this could be a waste of effort and resources.

<b>Q.14</b>	<b>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.</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> Yes, provided that the generating plant can keep pace with the increased roll out currently needed for each household. Our concern is that with Government pressure to take up even greater use of Electric Vehicles the Electricity Generating Capacity for this nearly 4- fold increase in domestic demand will outstrip the generating potential.		

<b>Q.15</b>	<b>Do you agree with reintroducing permitted development rights for the protection of poultry and other captive birds?</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> There is a need for the provisions to be implemented within a short time scale. It is unreasonable to expect poultry owners to run the risk of offending the temporary structures planning rules with attendant enforcement action being taken against them or run the risk of not erecting the same and facing prosecution for failing to follow the rules/law relating to avian flu. The provision for removal of temporary structures within 4 months of the pandemic finishing is adequate.		

<b>Q.16</b>	<b>Do you agree with the proposals for amending Article 4 Directions?</b>		
	<b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Comments:</b> The amendments proposed are reasonable, but not likely to affect Wrexham as no notice is taken of existing regulations and our planners are intent on circumventing all the rules to assist developers to provide inappropriate development in our villages; so, they would not be concerned with Article 4 directions to prevent harm to local amenities or to promote proper planning.		

<b>Q.17</b>	<b>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.</b>		
	<b>What effects do you think there would be? How could positive effects be increased, or negative effects be mitigated?</b>		
	<b>Comments:</b> We believe the effects would be Language neutral. The proposals are unlikely to have any effect on the Welsh language as this area is		



predominantly English speaking. Other than for Local authorities to have Welsh speakers on the staff to respond to queries from those people whose first language is Welsh it is difficult to see how positive effects can be increased or negative effects mitigated.

**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:** Nothing further to add.

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: ☐