

RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF GRANGE/PRESTONFIELD COMMUNITY COUNCIL

ANNEX A

HOUSEHOLDER PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS CONSULTATION PAPER

LIST OF QUESTIONS

Q1. Do you agree with this change from floor area to development footprint/ ground area? YES

Q2. Do you agree with the new approach to principal, side and rear elevations? YES IN PRINCIPLE BUT THE CHANGE COULD BE OPEN TO EXPLOITATION AND IT MAY BE BETTER TO LEAVE IT AS AT PRESENT

Q3. Do you believe that issues regarding road safety are sufficiently addressed by the restrictions on PDR set out in Article 3 of the draft Householder Permitted Development Order and the height limit of 1 metre within 5 metres of a road? YES

Q4. Do you agree with the overall limit on development of the curtilage (excluding the original dwelling) of 40%? YES

Q5. Do you agree with the additional limit on the development of rear curtilage of 40%? YES

Q6. Do you agree with an absolute limit of 60 square metres? YES

Q7. Do you agree with the additional conditions and restrictions on householder PDR in conservation areas contained in the draft Householder Permitted Development Order? YES BUT SEE RESPONSE TO Q9

Q8. Do you agree with the additional conditions and restrictions on householder PDR within the curtilage of listed buildings as set out in the draft householder permitted development order? YES BUT THIS CHANGE WILL HAVE LITTLE IMPACT

Q9. Should there simply be no permitted development in relation to conservation areas or the curtilage of listed buildings? YES (SEE BELOW)

Q10. Should additional statutory restrictions be placed on householder PDR within World Heritage Sites? NO VIEW

Q11. If so, what level of control should be applied (e.g. similar to that for conservation areas or a total restriction)? AS CONS. AREAS

Q12. Do you have any comments on the extent of designated areas where restrictions will apply? NO.

Q13. In your experience, do planning authorities treat the addition of ramps and handrails to the exterior of houses to assist the elderly or disabled people as requiring an application for planning permission? NO

QA RESPONSE. NO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT IN CONS. AREAS WOULD BE SIMPLER FOR ALL TO UNDERSTAND AND AVOID ANOMALIES AND CONFUSION WHERE SOME CONS. AREAS MAY HAVE ART. 4 DIRECTIONS AND OTHERS NOT. CONS. AREA PLANNING APP. FEES COULD BE LESS TO COMPENSATE.

Q14. Do respondents believe that replacement and alteration of existing windows in flats, without altering the overall size of the window opening should be permitted development? **YES PROVIDED NOT IN CONSERVATION AREAS**

Q15. Do respondents believe there should be specific PDR to allow flagpoles to be erected within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse? **NO**

Q16. If so, what controls should there be on the height of flagpoles and on their location, with particular regard to designated areas? **N/A**

Questions on Classes – Q17 (Classes 1-12)

- Are the grant of permission and the restrictions and conditions clear? **YES**
- Will these controls release a significant number of proposals (see paragraph 1.3) from the planning application process? **NOT LIKELY IN URBAN AREAS**
- Will these PDR provide adequate controls on amenity? **YES**
- Are there any changes to the controls which might mean significant further reduction in planning applications without undermining amenity? **NO**

Q18. Do respondents agree with the addition of requirements on drainage to PDR for new and replacement hard surfaces over an area of 5 square metres between the principal elevation and the road? **NO. DIFFICULT TO ENFORCE.**

MAYBE ALL IMPERMEABLE SURFACING SHOULD BE ADMITTED FROM PDR

Q19. Do respondents think the changes to permitted development rights as drafted will achieve the Scottish Government's aim of removing a significant amount of householder development from the planning application process?

NO. NOT IN DENSE URBAN OR CITY AREAS

Q20. If not, what particular alterations to the draft Householder Permitted Development Order might significantly reduce the number of householder planning applications? **MAYBE RETAINING STATUS QUO.**

Q21. What effects might any suggested changes have on amenity issues? **NOT SURE**

Q22. Do respondents believe that the provisions of the draft Householder Permitted Development Order pay sufficient regard to the impact on local amenity? **PROBABLY, PROVIDED NO ADDITIONAL IMPACT ON CONSERVATION AREAS**

Q23. If not, what particular alterations to the draft Householder Permitted Development Order might address some or all of these issues? **NO VIEW**

Q24. What particular issues would you like to see addressed in the guidance accompanying the changes to householder permitted development rights?

SIMPLICITY AND CLARITY SO ALL AFFECTED CAN UNDERSTAND.

Q25. Are there any costs or benefits not identified in the draft RIA? **UNDERSTAND.**

NO.

Q26. If so, do you have any information or can you suggest sources of relevant information on these costs and/ or benefits? No

Q27. Are there any potential impacts on particular societal groups that we should be aware of in finalising the order? No