

Appendix B: Response to the Changes to Permitted Development rights consultation

Q.1 Do you agree that the maximum depth permitted for smaller single-storey rear extensions on detached homes should be increased from 4 metres to 5 metres?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

No comment

Q.2 Do you agree that the maximum depth permitted for smaller single-storey rear extensions on all other homes that are not detached should be increased from 3 metres to 4 metres?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.3 Do you agree that the maximum depth permitted for two-storey rear extensions should be increased from 3 metres to 4 metres?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.4 Do you agree that the existing limitation requiring that extensions must be at least 7 metres from the rear boundary of the home should be amended so that it only applies if the adjacent use is residential?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.5 Are there are any circumstances where it would not be appropriate to allow extensions up to the rear boundary where the adjacent use is non-residential?

- Yes
- **No**
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons.

No comment

Q.6 Do you agree that the existing limitation that the permitted development right does not apply if, as a result of the works, the total area of ground covered by buildings within the curtilage of the house (other than the original house) would exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage (excluding the ground area of the original house) should be removed?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.7 Should the permitted development right be amended so that where a two-storey rear extension is not visible from the street, the highest part of the alternation can be as high as the highest part of the existing roof (excluding any chimney)?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.8 Is the existing requirement for the materials used in any exterior work to be of a similar appearance to the existing exterior of the dwellinghouse fit for purpose?

- Yes
- **No**

- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.9 Do you agree that permitted development rights should enable the construction of single-storey wrap around L-shaped extensions to homes?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.10 Are there any limitations that should apply to a permitted development right for wrap around L-shaped extensions to limit potential impacts?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.11 Do you have any views on the other existing limitations which apply to the permitted development right under Class A of Part 1 which could be amended to further support householders to undertake extensions and alterations?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.12 Do you agree that the existing limitation that any additional roof space created cannot exceed 40 cubic metres (in the case of a terrace house) and 50 cubic metres (in all other cases) should be removed?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.13 Do you agree that the existing limitation requiring that any enlargement must be set back at least 20 centimetres from the original eaves is amended to only apply where visible from the street, so that enlargements that are not visible from the street can extend up to the original eaves?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.14 Should the limitation that the highest part of the alteration cannot be higher than the highest part of the original roof be replaced by a limitation that allows the ridge height of the roof to increase by up to 30 centimetres?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.15 Do you agree that the permitted development right, Class B of Part 1, should apply to flats?

- Yes
- **No**
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. **There are likely to be other freeholder or covenant restrictions to development within a flatted development. These matters would therefore be best dealt with via a planning application.**

Q.16 Should the permitted development right be amended so that where an alteration takes place on a roof slope that does not front a highway, it should be able to extend more than 0.15 metres beyond the plane of the roof and if so, what would be a suitable size limit?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide your alternative suggestion and any supporting evidence. **No comment**

Q.17 Should the limitation that the highest part of the alteration cannot be higher than the highest part of the original roof be amended so that alterations can be as high as the highest part of the original roof (excluding any chimney)?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.18 Do you agree that bin and bike stores should be permitted in front gardens?

- **Yes**
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.19 Do you agree that bin and bike stores should be permitted in front gardens in article 2(3) land (which includes conservation areas, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the Broads, National Parks and World Heritage Sites)?

- Yes
- **No**
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. **The siting of bin and bike stores could have some negative impacts on the streetscene for very sensitive locations, eg World Heritage Sites, therefore should be subject to planning applications.**

Q.20 Do you agree that bin and bike stores in front gardens can be no more than 2 metres in width, 1 metre in depth and up to 1.5 metres in height?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.21 Are there any other planning matters that should be considered if bin and bike stores were permitted in front gardens?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. **No comment**

Q.22 Should the existing limitation that in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the Broads, National Parks and World Heritage Sites development situated more than 20 metres from any wall of the dwellinghouse is not permitted if the total area of ground covered by development would exceed 10 square metres be removed?

- Yes
- **No**
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. **Need to ensure no negative impacts on very sensitive locations, eg World Heritage Sites.**

Q.23 Should the permitted development right be amended so that it does not apply where the dwellinghouse or land within its curtilage is designated as a scheduled monument?

- **Yes**
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons.

Q.24 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class A, B C and E of Part 1 permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. It would be helpful if you could specify whether your comments relate to a) business, b) local planning authorities, or c) communities, or a combination and which right or rights your comments relate to.

Q.25 Do you agree that the limitation restricting upwards extensions on buildings built before 1 July 1948 should be removed entirely or amended to an alternative date (e.g. 1930)?

- Yes – removed entirely
- Yes – amended to an alternative date
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. If you have chosen an alternative date, please specify. **It is unclear from the consultation material why an alternative date is being proposed.**

Q.26 Do you think that the prior approvals for the building upwards permitted development rights could be streamlined or simplified?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. If you have responded yes, please provide your suggestion and justification, and specify which right(s) you are referring to.

Q.27 Do you have any views on the operation of the permitted development right that allows for the construction of new dwellinghouses on a freestanding block of flats (Class A of Part 20)?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.28 Do you agree that the existing limitations associated with the permitted development right for building upwards on a freestanding block of flats (Class A of Part 20) incorporates sufficient mitigation to limit impacts on leaseholders?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons

Q.29 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class AA of Part 1 and Class A, AA, AB, AC and AD of Part 20 permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. It would be helpful if you could specify whether your comments relate to a) business, b) local planning authorities, or c) communities, or a combination and which right or rights your comments relate to.

Q.30 Do you agree that the limitation restricting the permitted development right to buildings built on or before 31 December 1989 should be removed?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.31 If the permitted development right is amended to allow newer buildings to be demolished, are there are any other matters that should be considered?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.32 Do you agree that the permitted development right should be amended to introduce a limit on the maximum age of the original building that can be demolished?

- Yes – it should not apply to buildings built before 1930
- Yes – it should not apply to buildings built before an alternative date
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. If you have chosen an alternative date, please specify.

Q.33 Do you agree that the Class ZA rebuild footprint for buildings that were originally in use as offices, research and development and industrial processes should be allowed to benefit from the Class A, Part 7 permitted development right at the time of redevelopment only?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons.

Q.34 Do you think that prior approvals for the demolition and rebuild permitted development right could be streamlined or simplified?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons and examples where possible.

Q.35 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class ZA of Part 20 permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. It would be helpful if you could specify whether your comments relate to a) business, b) local planning authorities, or c) communities, or a combination.

Q.36 Do you agree that the limitation that wall-mounted outlets for EV charging cannot face onto and be within 2 metres of a highway should be removed?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.37 Do you agree that the limitation that electrical upstands for EV charging cannot be within 2 metres of a highway should be removed?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.38 Do you agree that the maximum height of electric upstands for EV recharging should be increased from 2.3 metres to 2.7 metres where they would be installed in cases not within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse or a block of flats?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.39 Do you agree that permitted development rights should allow for the installation of a unit for equipment housing or storage cabinets needed to support non-domestic upstands for EV recharging?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.40 Do you agree that the permitted development right should allow one unit of equipment housing in a non-domestic car park?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. If you think that the permitted development right should allow for more than one unit of equipment housing or storage cabinet, please specify a suitable alternative limit and provide any supporting evidence.

Q.41 Do you agree with the other proposed limitations set out at paragraph 60 for units for equipment housing or storage cabinets, including the size limit of up to 29 cubic metres?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.42 Do you have any feedback on how permitted development rights can further support the installation of EV charging infrastructure?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.43 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class D and E of Part 2 permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

- Yes
- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons. It would be helpful if you could specify whether your comments relate to a) business, b) local planning authorities, or c) communities, or a combination and which right or rights your comments relate to.

Q.44 Do you agree that the limitation that an air source heat pump must be at least 1 metre from the property boundary should be removed?

- **Yes**
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons.- Kerstin

The removal of the 1m limitation is considered beneficial to encourage the uptake of air source heat pumps. However, this should be subject to appropriate noise attenuation and integration into the design, including potential screening.

Q.45 Do you agree that the current volume limit of 0.6 cubic metres for an air source heat pump should be increased?

- **Yes**
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide examples of a suitable size threshold, for example, in cubic meters or a height limit, including any supporting evidence. **Subject to appropriate siting, context of the location and ensuring it is well integrated to the design and not contrary to visual amenity.**

Q.46 Are there any other matters that should be considered if the size threshold is increased?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons.

Q.47 Do you agree that detached dwellinghouses should be permitted to install a maximum of two air source heat pumps?

- Yes

- No
- **Don't know**

Please provide your reasons.

Q.48 Do you agree that stand-alone blocks of flats should be permitted to install more than one air source heat pump?

- **Yes**
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. In the context of changing technologies the aim should be for the best and most efficient working solution for each site. This should also be subject to appropriate siting and noise attenuation.

Q.49 Do you agree that the permitted development right should be amended so that, where the development would result in more than one air source heat pump on or within the curtilage of a block flats, it is subject to a prior approval with regard to siting?

- **Yes**
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. **Yes, subject to visual amenity and noise attenuation.**

Q.50 Are there any safeguards or specific matters that should be considered if the installation of more than one air source heat pump on or within the curtilage of a block of flats was supported through permitted development rights?

- **Yes**
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. **Yes, subject to visual amenity and noise attenuation.**

Q.51 Do you have any views on the other existing limitations which apply to this permitted development right that could be amended to further support the deployment of air source heat pumps?

- Yes
- **No**
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons.

Q.52 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class G of Part 14 permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please provide your reasons. It would be helpful if you could specify whether your comments relate to a) business, b) local planning authorities, or c) communities, or a combination.