

# Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

6 September 2023

**Response to Government ‘Consultation on additional flexibilities to support housing delivery, the agricultural sector, businesses, high streets and open prisons; and a call for evidence on nature-based solutions, farm efficiency projects and diversification’**

## 1. Contacts

### Report Author

Martin Mew

Telephone: 01243 534734

E-mail: [mmew@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:mmew@chichester.gov.uk)

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Planning Committee consider and agree the attached responses to the consultation questions for submission in response to the government ‘consultation on additional flexibilities to support housing delivery, the agricultural sector, businesses, high streets and open prisons; and a call for evidence on nature-based solutions, farm efficiency projects and diversification’**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The Government is running a public consultation from 24 July 2023 to 25 September 2023 on proposed changes to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, as amended. The consultation seeks views on changes to permitted development rights which allow for works to take place without a planning application.
- 3.2 The consultation can be found here: [Consultation on additional flexibility to support housing delivery, the agricultural sector, businesses, high streets and open prisons; and a call for evidence on nature-based solutions, farm efficiency projects and diversification - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/consultation-on-additional-flexibility-to-support-housing-delivery-the-agricultural-sector-businesses-high-streets-and-open-prisons-and-a-call-for-evidence-on-nature-based-solutions-farm-efficiency-projects-and-diversification)
- 3.3 The consultation covers:
- The application of local design codes to certain permitted development rights.
  - Changes to certain permitted development rights that allow for the change of use to dwellinghouses.
  - Changes to certain permitted development rights that allow agricultural diversification and development on agricultural units.
  - Changes to certain permitted development rights that allow for non-domestic extensions and the erection of new industrial and warehouse buildings.
  - Changes to the permitted development right that allows for the temporary use of land to allow markets to operate for more days.

- Changes to the existing permitted development right that allows for the erection, extension or alteration of schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, and closed prisons to also apply to open prisons.
- A call for evidence led by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs seeking views on nature-based solutions, farm efficiency projects and diversification.

#### **4. Outcomes to be Achieved**

- 4.1 To influence the Government's proposals for changes to permitted development rights.

#### **5. Proposal**

- 5.1 The purpose of this report is to provide a response to the consultation as set out in Appendix 1 of this report. The following highlights the key changes proposed and summarises the responses, using the consultation Chapter headings.

##### Design codes

- 5.2 The July 2021 update to the National Planning Policy Framework sets the policy expectation that, to provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should prepare design codes and guides consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, and which reflect local character and design preferences. The Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill is seeking to introduce a duty for all local councils to produce a design code at the spatial scale of their authority area, either as part of their local plan or as a supplementary plan, both of which will give design codes significant weight when planning applications are determined.
- 5.3 Under the proposed changes to the GPDO it is suggested that prior approvals for design or external appearance in existing permitted development rights should be replaced by consideration of design codes where they are in place locally. It is considered that the prior approval process should still apply to allow for a specific assessment to take place, however design codes should become a consideration in this assessment, but not the determining matter.

##### Commercial Business and Service uses to dwellinghouses (Class MA of Part 3)

- 5.4 Permitted development rights currently allows up to 1,500 square metres of Class E use to change use to residential. It is proposed that this limit is increased to 3,000 square metres or the limit removed. The existing permitted development right requires that the premises be vacant for a continuous period of at least 3 months immediately prior to the date of the application for prior approval. The consultation proposes that this vacancy requirement is removed to provide greater flexibility for owners and enable more premises to change use, with the suggestion this would deliver additional homes.

- 5.5 Officers consider that the floorspace threshold under the permitted development right should not be increased. As it stands there is conflict with national guidance and local policy in allowing businesses to be lost to housing without regard to location or marketing. The draft response also sets out that the vacancy period to benefit from this right should not be deleted, indeed it should be increased to allow the opportunity for alternative commercial uses to come forward.
- 5.6 The Class MA permitted development right applies in conservation areas subject to prior approval (see question 6), but not in other article 2(3) land, which in the Chichester Local Plan area are the areas designated as AONB. The consultation seeks views on broadening the right to enable its use in other types of article 2(3) land. The response objects to this, stating that it would be at odds with the designation of these areas and the advice within the NPPF. To allow such changes would fail to conserve and enhance the natural scenic beauty, tranquil character and the economic characteristics of these areas and prohibit the LPA from being able to consider the suitability of the location.

Hotels, boarding houses and guest houses (Use Class C1) to dwellinghouses

- 5.8 The Consultation proposes allowing the change of use of hotels, boarding houses or guest houses (in the C1 Hotels use class) to dwellinghouses through permitted development rights. This could either be delivered through an expansion to the Commercial, Business and Service rights or through a separate Class. It is suggested that certain elements of the development may require specific safeguards or allow for additional consideration by the local planning authority through the prior approval process. For example, to allow for local consideration of the impacts the change of use could have on the local tourism economy.
- 5.9 The response objects to this proposal. Officers consider that the issues and scrutiny required to assess the acceptability of a change of use from C1 to residential, particularly with regard to marketing exercises and the value of tourism to the local economy, cannot be assessed through a permitted development right and that this should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application.

Betting offices and pay day loan shops etc. to dwellinghouses (Class M of Part 3) and arcades etc. to dwellinghouses (Class N of Part 3)

- 5.10 Two permitted development rights (Class M and N of Part 3) allow certain other high street and town centre uses to change use to residential. Class M allows the change of use of hot food takeaways, betting offices, pay day loan shops and launderettes to dwellinghouses. Class N allows the change of use of amusement arcades and centres and casinos to dwellinghouses. The Class M right does not apply to any article 2(3) land, while the Class N right does not apply in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 5.11 Both rights are long standing and are subject to a floorspace limit which allows up to 150 square metres to change use to residential. It is proposed that the floorspace limits are either doubled to 300 square metres or removed. It is also proposed to

remove the right for laundrettes, meaning any change of use would need to be through a planning application. With the exception of the proposed changes to safeguard laundrettes, which is supported, the response recommends no change to these existing rights.

Commercial, Business and Service, betting office or pay day loan shop to mixed use residential (Class G of Part 3)

- 5.12 This permitted development right allows the change of use of the space above a wide range of uses to provide for new homes. The right applies to Commercial, Business and Service (Use Class E) uses as well as betting offices and pay day loan shops. It allows for the change of use to mixed use with up to two flats.
- 5.13 The permitted development right already provides for local consideration of the impact of noise on potential residents through prior approval and it is proposed to maintain this. The government is seeking LPAs views on a proposal to amend the right to support the delivery of homes above other types of high street or town centre premises while retaining the ground floor business use, and a proposal to double the number of flats that may be delivered through this right from two to four.
- 5.14 Allied to Class G, Class H of Part 3 provides for the change of use from a mixed use residential to a Commercial Business and Service use, betting office or pay day loan shop. This enables a mixed Commercial Business and Service (or betting office or pay day loan shop) and residential use (of up to two flats above) to change use to solely a Commercial Business and Service (or betting office or pay day loan shop) use without the need for a planning application.
- 5.15 The proposed changes to these rights are not supported. Cases should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis to allow for a full assessment of the planning merits.

Agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses (Class Q of Part 3)

- 5.16 An existing permitted development right (Class Q of Part 3) allows agricultural buildings to change to residential use. The existing right allows for up to 3 larger homes, to be greater than 100 square metres and within an overall floorspace of 465 square metres; or up to 5 smaller homes each no greater than 100 square metres; or up to 5 homes comprising a mixture of larger and smaller homes, with neither exceeding the thresholds for each type of home.
- 5.17 The permitted development right for the change of use from agricultural buildings to residential does not allow for any increase to the external dimensions of the original building. The consultation proposes an amendment to allow for rear extensions to the original building during the change of use.
- 5.18 The consultation also seeks views on increasing the number of dwellings that can be created from 5 to 10, amending the right so that it would apply in areas of article 2(3) land and also to enable it to apply to buildings on agricultural units that may not have been solely used for agricultural purposes.

- 5.19 Officers raise objections to these changes in the consultation response.
- 5.20 It is considered that to allow extensions as well as conversion under the Class Q process would result in development to the detriment on the character and appearance of the rural area. The changes would be contrary to the NPPF as it would not secure development that would be sympathetic to local character or landscape setting. It would not result in the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings which the NPPF sets out is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
- 5.21 It is the experience of the LPA that many Class Q conversion applications are submitted to secure the principle of a residential unit, and are followed by an application for a rebuild with the 'fall back' of the Class Q cited by the applicants as carrying significant weight. Allowing extensions to Class Q conversions is likely to result in extensions being maximised by applicants with a view to then securing a larger 'replacement' dwellings.
- 5.22 The proposed increase in the number of dwellings which could be created under Class Q is objected to as they would be created in unsustainable locations away from services and facilities, contrary to the NPPF. Additionally, these homes would be built without contributing to affordable housing provision unlike under a planning application where policy allows for this to be captured.
- 5.23 Objections are raised to the proposal to introduce these rights within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. To remove this restriction would be at odds with the designation of these areas and the advice within the NPPF. Allowing such changes would fail to conserve and enhance the natural scenic beauty and tranquil character of these areas. The benefit of a modest contribution to housing supply would not be outweighed by the issues above and by providing residential units without regard to the suitability of the location in terms of access to services and facilities. There would be no contribution towards affordable housing provision or infrastructure which may be otherwise required as part of the planning process.

Agricultural buildings to a flexible commercial use ("agricultural diversification")  
(Class R of Part 3)

- 5.24 There is an existing permitted development right (Class R of Part 3) which allows for the change of use of agricultural buildings to a range of uses. This includes flexible use as storage, distribution, hotels and Commercial, Business and Service uses such as shops and offices. The consultation proposes extending the right so it would apply to a building in forestry, equestrian or another predominantly rural use, and amending the right to allow for outdoor sports, recreation or fitness uses to be undertaken. This would allow for landowners to use buildings and land within its curtilage for outdoor activities, such as paintballing, but not including motor sports.
- 5.25 Officers disagree with applying the permitted development right to other rural buildings. The appropriate economic re-use of buildings is supported by planning policies, however the complexities of this and what may be acceptable in particular

locations mean that it is not possible to have a suitable permitted development right to cover this. Each matter should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application.

- 5.26 The proposed amendment to allow for buildings and land within its curtilage to be used for outdoor sports, recreation or fitness is not considered acceptable. It is considered that each matter should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. An alteration to this right may lead to facilities being located in unsustainable locations. This would be contrary to the NPPF social objective which seeks to provide accessible services, supporting communities' health, social and cultural well-being.

#### Agricultural development on units of 5 hectares or more (Class A of Part 6)

- 5.27 The existing right allows up to 1,000 square metres of ground area to be covered by any building or extension (or any works or structure (other than a fence) for accommodating livestock, or any plant or machinery arising from engineering operations). It is proposed to increase the size limit by 500 square metres to allow for any new building or extension erected under the right to cover up to 1,500 square metres of ground area. This revision is supported. It would only be permitted development if used for agricultural purposes and the works are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit.

#### Agricultural development on units of less than 5 hectares (Class B or Part 6)

- 5.28 It is proposed to increase the ground area limit of any extension erected under the right. This would allow for the ground area of any building extended under the right to reach 1,250 square metres. It is also proposed to increase the cubic content limit of any extension erected under the right. This would allow for the cubic content of a building extended under the right to increase by 25% above its original cubic content.

The revisions to increase the size of extensions to buildings that can be erected under this existing permitted development right are supported. It would only be permitted development if used for agricultural purposes and the works are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit.

#### Commercial Business and Service use extensions (Class A of Part 7)

- 5.29 An existing permitted development right, under Class A of Part 7, allows for the extension or alteration to a Commercial, Business and Service establishment. The consultation proposes that the current floorspace limit of extensions or alterations is increased from 50% or 100 square metres of floorspace (whichever is the lesser) to 100% or 200 square metres of floorspace (whichever is the lesser).
- 5.30 Officers object to this amendment and consider that this should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application so that the planning merits can be properly considered.

#### Industrial and warehousing extensions (Class H of Part 7)

- 5.31 An existing permitted development right, under Class H of Part 7, allows for the erection, extension or alteration of an industrial building (Use Class B2) or warehouse (Use Class B8). The consultation proposes that the current floorspace threshold of new buildings permitted under the right in non-protected areas should be increased from 200 square metres to 400 square metres. It does not propose changing the 100 square metres limit for new buildings on article 2(3) land or a site of special scientific interest (SSSI).
- 5.32 The same permitted development right also provides for significant extensions to be made to existing warehouses or industrial buildings. It is proposed that the current floorspace thresholds of extensions erected in non-protected areas should be increased from 1,000 square metres of floorspace or a 50% increase over the original building (whichever is lesser) to 1,500 square metres of floorspace or a 75% increase over the original building (whichever is lesser). This change would not apply to article 2(3) land or a SSSI.
- 5.33 Officers consider that this should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application so that the planning merits can be properly considered.

#### Markets - temporary use of land (Class B of Part 4)

- 5.34 Nationally set permitted development rights allow for the temporary use of land for any purpose for up to 28 days per calendar year, of which up to 14 days can be used for markets. The consultation proposes that the limit on the number of days that the permitted development right can be used for the purposes of holding a market is increased from 14 days. This would not change the right that allows for the holding of a market by or on behalf of a local authority (Class BA or Part 12).
- 5.35 Amendments to this right to increase it to 28 days per calendar year are supported. This would bring it in line with other uses permitted under this right. Markets help to improve the economic viability of an area and provide for an increased sense of community.

#### Ensuring the sufficient capacity of open prisons

- 5.36 There is an existing permitted development right which allows for the erection, extension, or alteration of schools and hospitals. This was amended in 2021 to additionally apply to prisons with a closed perimeter (Category A – C prisons). To support the necessary increase in capacity, it is now proposed to amend further this right (Class M of Part 7) to apply to open prisons (Category D sites)..
- 5.37 No objections are raised to these proposed changes.

## Public Sector Equality Duty

- 5.38 The consultation asks if the changes proposed in this consultation could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic? (Age; Disability; Gender Reassignment; Pregnancy and Maternity; Race; Religion or Belief; Sex; and Sexual Orientation).
- 5.39 The response considers that it would. The proposed changes would result in some dwellings and facilities being provided in inappropriate locations which would be difficult to access and where an aging population or people with disabilities would be isolated and removed from the services and facilities required to support their needs.

## Nature-based solutions, farm efficiency projects and diversification of farm incomes

- 5.40 A separate part of the consultation is a call for evidence for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). It includes questions on nature-based solutions (defined as projects seeking to use, manage, change or restore an area of land to address environmental issues, such as nutrient pollution, flooding, plant pest or disease impacts, climate change or biodiversity loss), farm efficiency projects and diversification of farm incomes.
- 5.41 The response sets out that it is unlikely that nature-based solutions would constitute development and therefore would not need planning permission. It is also suggested that whether a material change of use has occurred should continue to be assessed on a case-by-case basis by local planning authorities.
- 5.42 The scope of nature-based solutions, farm efficiency projects and diversification of farm incomes are considered to be too broad to be satisfactorily defined within the General Permitted Development Order. The size of the unit is not necessarily material to the potential impact and each case must be assessed on its own merits.
- 5.43 The consultation asks if the LPA foresees any unintended negative consequences that may result from these schemes coming forward and asks how they could be avoided. The example negative consequences cited in the questions include impacts to other species, flood risk, wildfire risk, risk to public safety, releasing contaminants from contaminated land and hydrology.
- 5.44 Officers consider that the content and explanation of this question is indicative of the complexity of the matter and therefore each case must be dealt with on its own merits and cannot be covered by a simple permitted development right. The examples of the negative examples cited in the question are not minor matters. These can be avoided through thorough consideration on a case-by-case basis and to mitigate them through the planning process with appropriate controls if they constitute development. This level of scrutiny and control goes beyond the scope of a permitted development right.



## 6. Alternatives Considered

6.1 The alternatives are not to respond to this consultation, or to provide different consultation responses.

## 7. Resource and Legal Implications

7.1 There are no resource or legal implications connected with responding to this consultation for this Council.

## 8. Consultation

8.1 This is a public consultation being run by the government.

## 9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1 There are no community impacts or risks to this council of responding to this consultation.

## 10. Other Implications

	Yes	No
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>		✓
<b>Climate Change and Biodiversity</b>	✓	
<b>Human Rights and Equality Impact</b> the consultation seeks views on the potential impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty	✓	
<b>Safeguarding and Early Help</b>		✓
<b>General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)</b>		✓
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b> The proposed changes could impact upon wellbeing	✓	

## 11. Appendices

Appendix 1: Consultation questions and draft answers for consideration

## **Appendix 1: Proposed consultation responses**

### **Design codes**

**Q.1 Do you agree that prior approvals for design or external appearance in existing permitted development rights should be replaced by consideration of design codes where they are in place locally?**

- a) Yes**
- b) No**
- c) Don't know**

**Please give your reasons.**

No. The prior approval process should still apply to allow for a specific assessment to take place. The LPA recognise that design codes could become a helpful consideration in this assessment, but not the determining matter.

**Q.2 Do you think that any of the proposed changes to permitted development rights in relation to design codes could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes**
- b) No**
- c) Don't know**

**Please give 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.**

Yes.

- a) Design codes as a material consideration could provide some certainty to businesses
- b) Increased workloads for the LPA providing design codes at a sufficient detail and scale to cover all Permitted Development possibilities
- c) Risk of inappropriate development

### **Commercial Business and Service uses to dwellinghouses (Class MA of Part 3)**

**Q.3 Do you agree that the permitted development right for the change of use from the Commercial, Business and Service use class (Use Class E) to residential (Class MA of Part 3), should be amended to either:**

- a) Double the floorspace that can change use to 3,000 square metres**
- b) Remove the limit on the amount of floorspace that can change use**
- c) No change**
- d) Don't know**

**Please give your reasons.**

No change. The permitted development right as it stands conflicts with the NPPF in allowing businesses to be lost to create housing, and without adequate regard to its

location to ensure that housing is being delivered in sustainable locations or with the necessary infrastructure. Increasing the amount of floorspace would only exacerbate this problem. Therefore this right should not be increased.

**Q.4 Do you agree that the permitted development right (Class MA of Part 3) should be amended to remove the requirement that the premises must be vacant for at least three continuous months immediately prior to the date of the application for prior approval?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. It is considered that if anything this should be strengthened to allow for the opportunity for alternative commercial uses to come forward as three months is far too short as it is and is open to manipulation.

**Q.5 Do you think that the permitted development right (Class MA of Part 3) should apply in other excluded article 2(3) land?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. To remove this restriction would be at odds with the designation of these areas and the advice within the NPPF. To allow such changes would fail to conserve and enhance the natural scenic beauty, tranquil character and the economic characteristics of these areas. The loss of the Class E uses in this area would deliver a modest contribution to housing supply without regard to the suitability of the location in terms of access to services and facilities. The loss of the Class E use would impact upon the rural economy and may also lead to pressure for further development in these sensitive locations.

**Q.6 Do you think the prior approval that allows for the local consideration of the impacts of the change of use of the ground floor in conservation areas on the character or sustainability of the conservation is working well in practice?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If no, please explain why you don't think the prior approval works in practice?**

Don't know. The Local Planning Authority has only had one application where this was a relevant consideration so an informed judgement about how that works in practice cannot be made.

**Q.7 Do you agree that permitted development rights should support the change of use of hotels, boarding houses or guest houses (Use Class C1) to dwellinghouses?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. It is important that the proposed change of use is robustly tested and assessed through the established planning application process. The tourism industry is significant to the local economy and it is important to scrutinise whether the tourism use is no longer required through a marketing exercise, which can be best assessed through Local Plan Policies to reflect the characteristics of the Local Area. Once lost to residential the use is highly unlikely to return and so the additional potential and scrutiny of a planning application is vital.

**Q.8 Are there any safeguards or specific matters that should be considered if the change of use of hotels, boarding houses or guest houses (Use Class C1) to dwellinghouses was supported through permitted development rights?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If yes, please specify.**

This should be assessed through a planning application. The issues and scrutiny required to assess whether the change of use from C1 to residential, particularly with regard to marketing exercises and the value of tourism to the local economy cannot be assessed through a permitted development right. That this question is asking about safeguards is in itself indicative that the issues go beyond what can be covered through a permitted development right that aims to simplify the process.

**Q.9 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class MA permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give 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.**

Yes.

- a) Loss of available business premises
- b) Increased workloads for the LPA and loss of application fee income

c) Loss of Class E facilities which serve the community, and dealing with the long-term consequences of dwellings in inappropriate locations.

**Q.10 Do you think that changes to Class MA will lead to the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**If so, please give your reasons.**

No. The prior approval process is overly complex meaning that applicants/agents do not use it often. There have only been two applications received in the last 12 months (both for the same site).

**Betting offices and pay day loan shops etc. to dwellinghouses (Class M of Part 3) and arcades etc. to dwellinghouses (Class N of Part 3)**

**Q. 11 Do you agree that the right for the change of use from hot food takeaways, betting offices, pay day loan shops and launderettes (Class M of Part 3) is amended to:**

- a) Double the floorspace that can change use to 300 square metres
- b) Remove the limit on the amount of floorspace that can change use
- c) No change
- d) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. The existing limits are more than sufficient for most of these commercial uses.

**Q.12 Do you agree that the existing right (Class M of Part 3) is amended to no longer apply to launderettes?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons**

Yes. The retention of these is important.

**Q. 13 Do you agree that the right for the change of use from amusement arcades and centres, and casinos (Class N of Part 3) is amended to:**

- a) Double the floorspace that can change use to 300 square metres
- b) Remove the limit on the amount of floorspace that can change use
- c) No change
- d) Don't know

**Please give your reasons**

No change. The existing limits are more than sufficient for most of these commercial uses.

**Q.14 Do you agree that the right (Class M of Part 3) should be amended to replace the existing date on which the building must have been in use as a hot food takeaway, betting office, pay day loan shop or launderette instead to a two-year rolling requirement?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. The two-year rolling requirement does not help demonstrate that the current use is no longer required. Other commercial uses should be explored, prior to residential development.

**Q.15 Do you agree that the right (Class N of Part 3) should be amended to replace the existing date on which the building must have been in use as an amusement arcade or centre, or casino instead to two-year rolling requirement?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. The two-year rolling requirement does not help demonstrate that the current use is no longer required. Other commercial uses should be explored, prior to residential development.

**Q.16 Do you think that the permitted development right for the change of use from hot food takeaways, betting offices, pay day loan shops and launderette (Class M of Part 3) should apply in other article 2(3) land?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. This should be assessed through a planning application to safeguard viable economic uses and to ensure that housing is delivered in appropriate locations.

**Q.17 Do you think that the permitted development right for the change of use of amusement arcade or centre, or casino (Class N of Part 3) should apply in other excluded article 2(3) land?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. This should be assessed through a planning application to safeguard viable economic uses and to ensure that housing is delivered in appropriate locations.

**Q.18 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class M and N permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give 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.**

Yes.

- a) May not need to engage with the planning application process
- b) Increased workloads for the LPA and loss of application fee income
- c) Benefits of retaining laundrettes, but potential long term harmful impacts from loss of commercial floorspace and inappropriately located residential uses.

**Q.19 Do you think that changes to Class M and N will lead to the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**If so, please give your reasons.**

No. The existing permitted development rights are very rarely utilised.

**Commercial, Business and Service, betting office or pay day loan shop to mixed use residential (Class G of Part 3)**

**Q.20 Do you agree that the right (Class G of Part 3) is expanded to allow for mixed use residential above other existing uses?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If yes, please say which uses the right might apply to and give your reasons.**

No. It is not clear what uses would be appropriate with compromising either party. This should be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

**Q.21 Do you agree that the number of flats that may be delivered under the right (Class G of Part 3) is doubled from two to four?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. This is likely to lead to pressure for smaller units, and not delivering good quality homes.

**Q.22 Do you agree that the permitted development right (Class H of Part 3) is amended to align with any changes made to the uses to which Class G of Part 3 applies?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. For the reasons given in answer to the Class G proposals.

**Q.23 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class G and H permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give 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.**

Yes.

- a) Minimal impact
- b) Increased workloads for the LPA and loss of application fee income
- c) Minimal impact

**Q.24 Do you think that changes to Class G will lead to the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**If so, please give your reasons.**

No. The existing permitted development rights are very rarely utilised.



### **Agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses (Class Q of Part 3)**

**Q.25 Do you agree that the smaller and larger home size limits within the agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses right (Class Q of Part 3) should be replaced with a single maximum floorspace limit of either:**

- a) 100 square metres per dwellinghouse**
- b) 150 square metres per dwellinghouse**
- c) No change**
- d) Don't know**

Don't know. It is not clear how this limit would work in conjunction with the overall floorspace/home number limit.

**Q.26 Do you agree that an overall limit on the amount of floorspace that can change use, set at 1,000 square metres, should be introduced for the agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses right (Class Q of Part 3)?**

- a) Yes**
- b) No**
- c) Don't know**

**Please give your reasons.**

No. This would increase the number of dwellings which could be created in unsustainable locations and without contributing to affordable housing where policies would have required this.

**Q.27 Do you agree that the 5 home limit within the agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses right (Class Q of Part 3) should be increased to allow up to a total of 10 homes to be delivered within an agricultural unit?**

- a) Yes**
- b) No**
- c) Don't know**

**Please give your reasons.**

No. This would increase the number of dwellings which could be created in unsustainable locations away from services and facilities, contrary to the NPPF. Housing delivered this way would also not contribute to affordable housing provision or provide the necessary infrastructure whereas a planning application would secure this.

**Q.28 Do you agree that the permitted development right for the change of use from agricultural buildings to residential use (Class Q of Part 3) should be amended to allow for an extension to be erected as part of the change of use on previously developed land?**

- a) Yes**
- b) No**
- c) Don't know**

**Please give your reasons.**

No. To do so would result in development to the detriment on the character and appearance of the rural area. It would be contrary to the paragraph 130 of the NPPF as it would not secure development that would be sympathetic to local character or landscape setting. The proposal would be contrary to what is emphasised as being fundamental by the latest revision of the NPPF, that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

It is the LPAs experience that many Class Q conversion applications are submitted to secure the principle of a residential unit, and are followed by an application for a rebuild with the 'fall back' of the Class Q cited by the applicants as carrying significant weight. Allowing extensions to Class Q conversions is likely to result in extensions being maximised by applicants with a view to securing a larger "replacement" dwellings undermining the LPA's ability to ensure development meets the requirements of the NPPF with regards to sympathetic, high quality design.

**Q.29 Do you agree that a prior approval be introduced, allowing for the consideration of the impacts of an extension on the amenity of neighbouring premises, including overlooking, privacy and light?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

Yes. If the rights are going to change to allow for extensions, it is essential these impacts are considered.

**Q.30 Do you agree that buildings should have an existing floorspace of at least 37 square metres to benefit from the right?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons**

Yes. It is sensible to at least meet the national minimum space standards.

**Q.31 Do you think that the permitted development right for the change of use from agricultural buildings to residential use (Part 3 Class Q) should be amended to apply in other article 2(3) land?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. To remove this restriction would be at odds with the designation of these areas and the advice within the NPPF. To allow such changes would fail to conserve and enhance the natural scenic beauty and tranquil character of these areas. This would deliver a modest contribution to housing supply without regard to the suitability of the location in

terms of access to services and facilities. There would be no contribution towards affordable housing provision or infrastructure which may be otherwise required as part of the planning process.

**Q.32 Do you agree that the right be amended to apply to other buildings on agricultural units that may not have been solely used for agricultural purposes?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. It is important that the proposed change of use is tested on a case-by-case basis and assessed through the established planning application process so that all matters can be considered, mitigated and controlled where necessary. This would ensure housing is delivered in appropriate locations and that relevant infrastructure contributions and affordable housing provision can be secured.

**Q.33 Are there any specific uses that you think should benefit from the right?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**If yes, please give examples of the types of uses that the right should apply to.**

No

**Q.34 Are there any specific uses that you think should not benefit from the right?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**If yes, please give examples of the types of uses that the right should not apply to.**

See above answers that the right should not apply.

**Q.35 Do you agree that the right be amended to apply to agricultural buildings that are no longer part of an agricultural unit?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. It is important that the proposed change of use is tested on a case-by-case basis and assessed through the established planning application process so that all matters can be considered, mitigated and controlled where necessary. This would ensure housing is delivered in appropriate locations and that relevant infrastructure contributions and affordable housing provision can be secured.

**Q.36 Do you agree that any existing building must already have an existing suitable access to a public highway to benefit from the right?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

Yes – this is sensible and prevents landscape harm from any associated access provision.

**Q.37 Do you have a view on whether any changes are required to the scope of the building operations permitted by the right?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If yes, please provide details.**

No. There is established case law on this topic which the Planning Practice Guidance refers to.

**Q.38 Do you have a view on whether the current planning practice guidance in respect of the change of use of agricultural buildings to residential use should be amended?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If yes, please provide details of suggested changes.**

No. The Planning Practice Guidance refers to relevant case law.

**Q.39 Do you agree that permitted development rights should support the change of use of buildings in other predominantly rural uses to residential?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If yes, please specify which uses.**

No. It is important that the proposed change of use is tested on a case-by-case basis and assessed through the established planning application process so that all matters can be considered, mitigated and controlled where necessary. This would ensure housing is delivered in appropriate locations and that relevant infrastructure contributions and affordable housing provision can be secured.

**Q.40 Are there any safeguards or specific matters that should be considered if the right is extended to apply to buildings in other predominantly rural uses?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons**

**If yes, please specify.**

Yes. In the event the right is extended there should be restrictions with regard to the proximity to neighbouring uses which may impact on the amenities of future occupiers of the dwelling, or impact on the operation of neighbouring uses, for example in terms of noise or odour.

**Q.41 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class Q permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give 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.**

Yes.

a) Minimal impact

b) Increased workloads for the LPA and loss of application fee income. Loss of infrastructure contributions and delivery. Potential loss of affordable housing provision.

c) Greater pressure on facilities and services in rural areas from an increase of homes in inappropriate locations.. Impact on the rural character of the area and protected landscapes.

**Q.42 Do you think that changes to Class Q will lead to the delivery of new homes that would not have been brought forward under a planning application?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

A modest contribution to housing supply. However, these would be in an area away from services and facilities.

**Agricultural buildings to a flexible commercial use (“agricultural diversification”)**  
**(Class R of Part 3)**

**Q.43 Do you agree that permitted development rights should support the change of use of other buildings in a predominantly rural land use to a flexible commercial use?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If yes, please specify which uses.**

No. The appropriate economic re-use of buildings is supported by planning policies, however the complexities of this and what may be acceptable in particular locations mean that it is not possible to have a suitable permitted development right to cover this, and each matter should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application.

**Q.44 Do you agree that the right be amended to allow for buildings and land within its curtilage to be used for outdoor sports, recreation or fitness?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. The complexities of this and what may be acceptable in particular locations mean that it is not possible to have a suitable permitted development right to cover this, and each matter should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application. An alteration to this right may lead to facilities being located in unsustainable locations. This would be contrary to the NPPF social objective which seeks to provide accessible services, supporting communities' health, social and cultural well-being.

**Q.45 Do you agree that the right be amended to allow buildings to change use to general industrial, limited to only allow the processing of raw goods produced on the site and which are to be sold on the site, excluding livestock?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

Don't know. It is considered that the scope of this to be satisfactorily controlled through a permitted development right.

**Q.46 Should the right allow for the change of uses to any other flexible commercial uses?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If yes, please specify which uses.**

No. The appropriate economic re-use of buildings is supported by planning policies, however the complexities of this and what may be acceptable in particular locations mean that it is not possible to have a suitable permitted development right to cover this, and each matter should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application.

**Q.47 Do you agree that the right be amended to allow for a mix of the permitted uses?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. The appropriate economic re-use of buildings is supported by planning policies, and this could include a mixed use. The scope of this amendment is too broad to ensure that the mix of uses would be compatible and suitable for each location. Each matter should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application.

**Q.48 Do you agree that the right be amended to increase the total amount of floorspace that can change use to 1,000 square metres?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. The appropriate economic re-use of buildings is supported by planning policies, however the complexities of this and what may be acceptable in particular locations mean that it is not possible to have a suitable permitted development right to cover this, and each matter should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application. Therefore the right should not be increased.

**Q.49 Is the trigger as to whether prior approval is for required set at the right level (150 square metres)?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

**If not, please say what it should be, and give your reasons.**

No. This should be required for all changes in order that they can be assessed, not just those above 150 square metres. This seems like an arbitrary figure.

**Q.50 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Class R permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

**a) Yes**

**b) No**

**c) Don't know**

**Please give 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.**

Yes.

a) Would provide additional flexibility, but would encourage development in inappropriate locations. Impact on the viability of existing commercial areas.

b) Increased workloads for the LPA and loss of application fee income.

c) Detrimental impact from services and facilities being located in unsustainable locations.

**Agricultural development on units of 5 hectares or more (Class A of Part 6)**

**Q.51 Do you agree that the ground area limit of new buildings or extensions erected under the right be increased from 1,000 to 1,500 square metres?**

**a) Yes**

**b) No**

**c) Don't know**

**Please give your reasons.**

Yes. In accordance with the existing permitted development right it would need to be concluded that the works are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit to benefit from that right.

**Q.52 Do you agree that we remove the flexibility for extensions and the erection of new buildings where there is a designated scheduled monument?**

**a) Yes**

**b) No**

**c) Don't know**

**Please give your reasons.**

Yes. It is sensible that this flexibility is removed in these locations.



**Agricultural development on units of less than 5 hectares (Class B or Part 6)**

**Q.53 Do you agree that the right be amended to allow extensions of up to 25% above the original building cubic content?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

Yes. In accordance with the existing permitted development right it would need to be concluded that the works are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit to benefit from that right.

**Q.54 Do you agree that the right be amended to allow the ground area of any building extended to reach 1,250 square metres?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

Yes. In accordance with the existing permitted development right it would need to be concluded that the works are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit to benefit from that right.

**Q.55 Do you agree that we remove the flexibility for extensions where there is a designated scheduled monument?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

Yes. It is sensible that this flexibility is removed in these locations.

**Q.56 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Part 6 permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give 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.**

Yes.

- a) Flexibility for agricultural businesses
- b) Some loss of application fee income
- c) Minimal impact

### **Commercial Business and Service use extensions (Class A of Part 7)**

**Q.57 Do you agree that the maximum floorspace limit for the extension or alteration to a Commercial, Business and Service establishment on nonprotected land is increased to either 200 square metres or a 100% increase over the original building, whichever is lesser?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. This should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application so that the planning merits can be properly considered.

### **Industrial and warehousing extensions (Class H of Part 7)**

**Q.58 Do you agree that the maximum floorspace of a new industrial and/or warehousing building on non-protected land permitted under the Part 7 Class H permitted development right be amended to 400 square metres?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. This should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application so that the planning merits can be properly considered.

**Q.59 Do you agree that the maximum floorspace of a new industrial and/or warehousing extension on non-protected land be increased to either 1,500 square metres or a 75% increase over the original building, whichever is lesser.**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons.**

No. This should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through a planning application so that the planning merits can be properly considered.

**Q.60 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Part 7 permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give 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**

Yes.

- a) May avoid the need for a planning application
- b) Increased workloads for the LPA and loss of application fee income
- c) Loss of scrutiny and possibility for public participation in the planning process.

#### **Markets - temporary use of land (Class B of Part 4)**

**Q.61 Do you agree that the permitted development right for the temporary use of land should be amended so that markets can operate either:**

- a) 28 days per calendar year (in line with other uses permitted under the right)
- b) A different number of days per calendar year
- c) No change
- d) Don't know

**Please give your reasons. If you have chosen a different number of days per calendar year, please specify what number of days the right should provide for?**

Yes. 28 days per calendar year (in line with other uses permitted under the right).

**Q.62 Do you think that any of the proposed changes in relation to the Part 4 permitted development rights could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give 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.**

Yes.

- a) It provides business opportunities for those taking part in the market
- b) None
- c) Providing an increased sense of community

#### **Ensuring the sufficient capacity of open prisons**

**Q.63 Do you agree that the existing Class M of Part 7 permitted development right is amended to additionally apply to open prisons?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons**

Yes. It would be sensible to amend the right as proposed.

**Q.64 Do you agree that there should be a prior notification process where the development under the Class M of Part 7 right is being used for open prisons?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons**

Yes. It would be sensible to include a prior notification process if the right is amended as proposed.

**Q.65 Do you think that the proposed changes to the Class M of Part 7 permitted development right in relation to open prisons could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give 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**

No. There would be no impact on businesses, local planning authorities or communities. The consultation sets out that it would not result in changes to the category of prisoners occupying the site.

### **Public Sector Equality Duty**

**Q.66 Do you think that the changes proposed in this consultation could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic? (Age; Disability; Gender Reassignment; Pregnancy and Maternity; Race; Religion or Belief; Sex; and Sexual Orientation).**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**Please give your reasons**

Yes. The proposed changes would result in some dwellings and facilities being provided in inappropriate locations which would be difficult to access and where an aging population or people with disabilities would be isolated and removed from the services and facilities required to support their needs.

### **Nature-based solutions**

**Q.67 What guidance, policy, or legislative changes could help to provide a more supportive framework for planning authorities to determine planning applications within?**

This question is not clear. Nature-based solution is too broad a term to be defined in the GDPO, and is not necessarily development. It is unlikely to require planning permission as

they would not be a material change of use. It is correct that Local Planning Authorities should determine on a case-by-case basis whether a material change of use has occurred.

**Q.68 What new permitted development rights, or amendments to existing permitted development rights, would streamline and simplify the process? If referring to an existing permitted development right, please be as specific as possible.**

This question is not clear. As above, nature-based solutions are unlikely to require planning permission as they would not be a material change of use, and therefore permitted development rights are not relevant. Local Planning Authorities should determine on a case-by-case basis whether a material change of use has occurred.

**Q.69 Would a specific and focused permitted development right expedite or resolve a specific delivery challenge for nutrient mitigation schemes?**

No. As the mitigation schemes do not constitute a material change of use of land and therefore do not constitute development, permitted development rights are irrelevant.

**Q.70 Please provide specific case studies (including planning reference numbers where available) which can help us understand what issues farmers and land managers are facing in relation to nature-based solutions.**

It would not be appropriate to share specific details without the consent of landowners and applicants.

**Q.71 Would these issues be resolved by amending planning practice guidance or permitted development rights, or any other solutions?**

Too broad a question. Not applicable given the answer to question 70.

**Q.72 Are there any success stories that we can learn from on individual cases, or in certain local planning authorities?**

It would not be appropriate to share specific details without the consent of landowners and applicants.

**Q.73 Would you propose different solutions for different sized agricultural units?**

The size of the unit isn't necessarily relevant with location and surrounding context being more of a determining factor. Each situation should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

**Q.74 Do you foresee any unintended negative consequences that may result from more nature-based solutions coming forward (e.g., impacts to other species, flood risk, wildfire risk, risk to public safety, releasing contaminants from contaminated land or hydrology etc.)? How could these be avoided?**

Yes. This question (and the long list of possible consequences) is indicative of the complexity of the matter. This therefore requires each case to be dealt with on its own merits and that it cannot be dealt with by a simple permitted development right.

The examples of the negative examples cited in the question are not minor matters. These can be avoided through thorough consideration on a case-by-case basis and to mitigate them through the planning process with appropriate controls if they constitute development. This level of scrutiny and control goes beyond the scope of a permitted development right.

### **Farm efficiency projects**

**Q.75 What guidance, policy, or legislative changes could help to provide a more supportive framework for planning authorities to determine planning applications within?**

This question is not clear and is too broad.

**Q.76 What new permitted development rights, or amendments to existing permitted development rights, would streamline and simplify the process? If referring to an existing permitted development right, please be as specific as possible.**

This question is too broad and the issues too complex.

**Q.77 Please provide specific case studies (including planning reference numbers where available) which can help us understand what issues farmers and land managers are facing in relation to slurry stores or lagoons and smallscale reservoirs.**

It would not be appropriate to share specific details without the consent of landowners and applicants.

**Q.78 Would these issues be resolved by amending planning practice guidance or permitted development rights, or any other solutions?**

Not applicable

**Q.79 Are there any success stories that we can learn from on individual cases, or in certain local planning authorities?**

Not applicable.

**Q.80 Would you propose different solutions for different sized agricultural units?**

The size of the unit isn't necessarily relevant with location and surrounding context being more of a determining factor. Each situation would need to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

**Q.81 Do you foresee any unintended negative consequences that may result from more farm efficiency projects coming forward (e.g., impacts on nutrient pollution, protected sites or hydrology)? How can these be mitigated?**

Yes, through thorough consideration on a case-by-case basis and to mitigate them through the planning process with appropriate controls if they constitute development. This level of scrutiny and control goes beyond the scope of a permitted development right.

**Diversification of farm incomes**

**Q.82 What guidance, policy, or legislative changes could help to provide a more supportive framework for planning authorities to determine planning applications within?**

Given the broad nature of this matter, one-size-fits-all guidance is not appropriate. Applications should be assessed on a case-by-case basis against national guidance and development plan policies.

**Q.83 What new permitted development rights, or amendments to existing permitted development rights, would streamline and simplify the process? If referring to an existing permitted development right, please be as specific as possible.**

The complexity and need for case-by-case assessment means that it is not possible to acceptably streamline and simplify the process without risk.

**Q.84 Are there any other diversification projects which have not been covered in this call for evidence or the wider consultation, that you wish to provide evidence for? If so, please provide specific case studies (including planning reference numbers where available) which can help us understand what issues farmers and land managers are facing.**

No

**Q.85 Would these issues be resolved by amending existing permitted development rights, or any other solutions?**

Not applicable.

**Q.86 Are there any success stories that we can learn from on individual cases, or in certain local planning authorities?**

Not applicable.

**Q.87 Would you propose different solutions for different sized agricultural units?**

Not through permitted development rights. Different solutions should be assessed on a case-by-case basis through the planning system.

**Q.88 Do you foresee any unintended negative consequences that may result from more farm diversification projects coming forward? How can these be mitigated?**

Yes, through thorough consideration on a case-by-case basis and to mitigate them through the planning process with appropriate controls if they constitute development. This level of scrutiny and control goes beyond the scope of a permitted development right.