

Response ID ANON-DEZB-M4P6-C

Submitted to Permitted development rights 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.

Submitted on 2023-09-22 14:42:18

Scope of the consultation

Introduction

What is your name?

Name:

Stuart Ashworth

What is your email address?

Email:

stuart.ashworth@west-norfolk.gov.uk

What is the type of organisation that you work for?

Local authority

If applicable, what is the name of your organisation?

Organisation:

King's Lynn & West Norfolk BC

What is your position in the organisation?

Position in the organisation:

Assistant Director - Environment & Planning

Privacy notice

Design codes

Do you want to complete this section?

Yes

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

It is logical to ensure consistency with a local design code if it is in place within the local authority area.

Design codes - impact assessment

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?

No

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.:

- a) Overall it should not be an extra burden on businesses although if local stone is required for example, there could be extra costs
- b) There is no additional impact on LPA's
- c) Positive impact on communities in terms of built form, although there could sometimes be extra costs as outline above in a)

Supporting housing delivery through change of use permitted development rights

Do you want to complete this section?

Yes

Supporting housing delivery through change of use permitted development rights

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

Floorspace limits

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:

No change

Please give your reasons :

The current regulations seem to strike the right balance already.

Vacancy requirement

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

Difficult to assess impact of the short 3 month period now, but we would question whether it could lead to an increased likelihood of businesses being evicted in favour of higher value residential uses?

Article 2(3) land

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

No

Please give your reasons :

Many of these areas are tourist areas, because of the special landscape designation. There will be pressure to convert business premises (& therefore local services) to residential, often for high value holiday uses, leading to the loss of local services for local residents living there permanently. This could actually be harmful to those communities, and do the opposite of the stated aims of this proposal.

Prior approval – conservation areas

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons. If no, please explain why you don't think the prior approval works in practice?:

The character of a conservation area may be due to the mix of uses, especially on the ground floor, so any watering down of this aspect, by removing that protection where that has to be considered by the LPA, is considered to be a backward step.

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

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

Potential to lose guest houses and hotels in tourist towns, for example a seaside resort like Hunstanton, could be very harmful to the tourism trade and therefore the local economy. The best way to consider these impacts is through a planning application.

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

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons. If yes, please specify. :

There would need to be a consideration of impact on the tourism sector but it will be extremely difficult to do in practice. Perhaps room sizes, which may not always be suitable for permanent accommodation needs to be considered as well.

It is difficult to put a size limit on this because of the diverse range of accommodation needs, where small B & B's and guesthouses also play a part in the tourism accommodation sector.

Impact Assessments

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?

Yes

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.:

a) Loss of premises in favour of high value residential facilities would be a negative impact on businesses.

b) No identifiable impact as still have to deal with a form of application (either prior notification or a planning app)

c) Potential loss of businesses/services in favour of residential

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?

Don't know

Please give your reasons :

Difficult to asses, but it could do if it is a lighter touch approach (prior notification), rather than everything needed for 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)

Floorspace limits

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:

Don't know

Please give your reasons :

No real view as hasn't really been an issue at this authority, although doubling the limit to 300 sq m does seem a large jump in thresholds, and given the existing sizes of these premises (usually smaller premises), it is probably not necessary.

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

Yes

Please give your reasons :

Seems sensible given the important role these facilities can play in local areas.

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:

No change

Please give your reasons :

Although in many cases this won't be an issue, need to consider holiday resorts, where these facilities serve that local tourism economy and are part of the tourism offer.

Date the building was in use in order to benefit from the right

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?

Don't know

Please give your reasons :

No real comments on this aspect.

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?

Don't know

Please give your reasons :

No real comments on this aspect.

Article 2(3) land

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

It could lead to further loss of services/facilities in these areas, albeit in practice betting offices, pay day loan shops and launderettes are not prevalent in the AONB covering our local area.

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?

Don't know

Please give your reasons :

In practice, this probably doesn't make much difference, given the character and facilities found in AONB's for example.

Impact Assessments

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?

Yes

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.:

- a) Could lead to a change from business uses so could be a negative impact on some sectors
- b) No real issues
- c) could lead to loss of some types of facilities

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?

Don't know

Please give your reasons :

Difficult to assess but given the niche elements of some of these proposals it is unlikely.

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

Uses the right applies to

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?

Yes

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

Seems a sensible approach.

Number of flats that can be delivered

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

However, there should be minimum size standards, to ensure quality accommodation is being provided.

Consequential changes to the permitted development right that allows the change of use from a mixed use to Commercial Business and Service use or betting office or pay day loan shop right (Class H of Part 3)

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

Seems sensible and consistent

Impact Assessments

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?

No

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.:

These changes seem fairly low key and will have limited 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?

Don't know

Please give your reasons :

Agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses (Class Q of Part 3)

Size limits and maximum numbers of homes delivered

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:

150 square metres per dwellinghouse

Please give your reasons :

There are issues in principle with this right and relationships with adjacent yards, but restricting the maximum floorspace would be sensible.

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)?

No

Please give your reasons :

As above there are in principle issues. It is noted this is up from the current 865 sq m, so it is a relatively modest amount, but increasing the number of houses in often unsustainable locations does not seem sensible, and against the thrust of sustainable development in national policy.

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

The issue is 10 dwellings is essentially a small estate of houses in often unsustainable locations in rural locations. There will be total reliance on the car for services.

Rear extensions

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

Seems to run counter to the ethos of converting existing redundant buildings. If allowed however, the previously developed aspect must be part of the qualifying criteria.

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

This is essential to protect neighbours existing amenities.

Minimum building size

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

Yes

Please give your reasons :

To ensure better quality housing is provided.

Article 2(3) land

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

There could be impacts on these landscape character areas that need to be properly considered through a planning application. For example in dark skies areas, the impact of a conversion could be significant.

Agricultural buildings not solely in agricultural use

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

This could lead to many more unsuitable buildings coming forward.

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

No

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

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

Don't know

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

Former agricultural buildings no longer on an agricultural unit

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

No

Please give your reasons :

Will extend further unsuitable buildings coming forward. Likely to be often remote sites, away from services and facilities, and therefore unsustainable.

Highways access

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

Definition of suitable will be needed. Must be a safe access.

Works permitted

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

Yes

Please give your reasons. If yes, please provide details. :

There is no requirement to show that structurally buildings are capable of conversion, as often they are not, and amount to little more than a frame that actually can be used.

The current rebuilding rules effectively allow for almost a complete rebuild, and are used in fall-back arguments to justify a completely new dwelling.

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?

Don't know

Please give your reasons. If yes, please provide details of suggested changes. :

Seems pretty comprehensive, including reference to case law

Enabling the change of use of other rural buildings to residential

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

No

Please give your reasons. If yes, please specify which uses.:

This could lead to some unsuitable buildings in unsuitable locations coming forward. For example stables would very often not appropriate to convert. Forestry buildings will often be in remote locations, again in areas not usually suitable for a residential use.

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?

Don't know

Please give your reasons If yes, please specify. :

Impact Assessments

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?

Yes

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.:

- a) Would benefit the owners of these buildings, including businesses
- b) Would create poor planning decisions, and make it more difficult to argue against applications given the fall-back position
- c) could lead to resentment that unsuitable buildings i.e. stables, are being converted to residential.

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

Although many will potentially be wholly unsuitable.

Supporting the agricultural sector through additional flexibilities

Do you want to complete this section?

Yes

Supporting the agricultural sector through additional flexibilities

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

Types of uses to which the right applies

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons. If yes, please specify which uses. :

In principle yes, although they would need to be in sustainable locations.

What flexible uses can buildings be used for

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

Some uses such as paintballing are better located in rural locations, but a large gym in regular use may be less appropriate for example.

What flexible uses can buildings be used for

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

Seems sensible to process what is grown/produced on site.

What flexible uses can buildings be used for

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

No

Please give your reasons. If yes, please specify which uses. :

Other commercial uses may not be appropriate so should continue to be assessed through a planning application

Allowing mixed uses

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

Yes

Please give your reasons :

It would however entirely depend if the mix of uses was appropriate or complimentary.

Amount of floorspace that can change use

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

Doubling the floorspace seems excessive

Prior notification/approval triggers

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

Yes

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

Impact Assessments

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?

Yes

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.:

- a) would be positive for businesses potentially, through enhanced flexibility
- b) could go against sustainable development and the thrust of the NPPF and local planning policy
- c) unknown impacts

Agricultural development

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

1000 sq m is seemingly generous already and a more than doubling of the previous figure in 465 sq m.

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?

Yes

Please give your reasons :

This is a current anomaly & the proposal will safeguard SAM's.

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

Already seems generous and a previous doubling (in 2018) of the former thresholds before assessment was needed.

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

Already seems generous and a previous doubling (in 2018) of the former thresholds before assessment was needed.

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

Yes

Please give your reasons :

Sensible to deal with the current anomaly here.

Impact Assessments

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?

Yes

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.:

- a) will potentially help farmers in not having to apply for planning permission
- b) Little impact
- c) need to be safeguards otherwise could impact on nearby neighbours

Supporting businesses and high streets through greater flexibilities

Do you want to complete this section?

Yes

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 non-protected land is increased to either 200 square metres or a 100% increase over the original building, whichever is lesser?

No

Please give your reasons :

It is already generous, and further alterations ought to be considered through a planning application, as a doubling of the size could have impacts on for example neighbouring residential uses.

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?

No

Please give your reasons :

It is already generous, and further alterations ought to be considered through a planning application, as a doubling of the size could have impacts on for example neighbouring residential uses.

Industrial and warehousing extensions (Class H of Part 7)

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.

No

Please give your reasons :

It is already generous, and further alterations ought to be considered through a planning application, as a doubling of the size could have impacts on for example neighbouring residential uses.

Impact Assessments

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?

Yes

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.:

- a) Positively as it would allow businesses more flexibility
- b) No significant impact, as an application would still need to be dealt with (planning application or prior notification). Fees would likely decrease though for this type of application.
- c) potentially negatively, unless safeguards are in place, including covering impact on neighbours.

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:

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

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?:

Seems a sensible approach

Impact Assessments

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?

Yes

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.:

- a) more markets can be held in the year before permission is needed, thereby reducing that administrative burden
- b) No real impact
- c) Will allow more markets to take place, which could benefit communities

Ensuring the sufficient capacity of open prisons

Do you want to complete this section?

No

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).

No

Please give your reasons :

Call for evidence - nature-based solutions, farm efficiency projects, and diversification.

Do you want to complete this section?

Yes

Call for evidence - nature-based solutions, farm efficiency projects, and diversification.

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?

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

Unknown

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.

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. :

Unknown

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

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

Potentially yes. This may make it easier and quicker to bring forward nutrient mitigation schemes.

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.

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.:

N/A

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

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

N/A

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

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

N/A

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

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

Yes. Perhaps more care would be needed on smaller agricultural units, which may not have the amount of land required for such schemes.

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?

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?:

There shouldn't be with suitable safeguards, and nature-based solutions should be the way forward.

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?

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

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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.

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. :

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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 small-scale reservoirs.

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 small-scale reservoirs.:

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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

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

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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

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

Not aware of any.

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

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

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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?

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?:

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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?

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

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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.

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. :

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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.

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.:

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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

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

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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

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

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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

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

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers

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

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

N/A as aimed at farmers and land managers