

Planning Development Management
Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities
Planning Directorate
3rd Floor, North East
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Delivered by email only to : PDRconsultation2024@levellingup.gov.uk

9th April 2024

Dear Sir / Madam

Re : ‘Changes to various permitted development rights’ consultation

Thank you for consulting the Land, Planning and Development Federation (LPDF) on the ‘Changes to various permitted development rights’ consultation.

The LPDF was set up in April 2018 and seeks to represent the UK’s leading land promoters, home builders and commercial developers.

LPDF members support the housebuilding and commercial development sectors by promoting sites through the planning system, providing “shovel ready” land with a planning permission which can facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and serviced land parcels.

The LPDF seeks to actively engage with government on planning, housing and commercial development policy and to educate the wider public on the social, environmental and economic benefits of development through an evidenced based approach.

The LPDF encourages its members to deliver well designed, high quality, sustainable places which deliver a mix of housing types and tenures, commercial spaces and community uses that have a positive social, environmental, and economic impact.

Our key values include:

- Working in a positive and cooperative way with central and local government and key stakeholders, to deliver a planning system capable of supplying the homes and employment space we need.
- Promoting research and an evidence-led approach to policy development.
- Increasing the supply of new homes to meet demand and make home ownership a realistic possibility for all those who aspire to it.

- Ensuring that we build the affordable homes of all types and tenures that this country so desperately needs.
- Delivering new employment space to meet demand from businesses and support economic growth.
- Championing the impact of increased housing delivery on reducing intergenerational unfairness.
- Creating well designed, high quality and sustainable places to live and work.
- Educating and informing about the social, environmental and economic benefits of development.
- Supporting diversity of delivery in the market and championing SME developers.
- Promoting diversity and inclusivity within the sector.

Questions

Q1 – Yes. Single story extensions can have limited impact on neighbours and currently the restriction in depth is "worked around" by leaving a small gap between new and existing building. Detached houses more often have the space for this without detriment to neighbours.

Q2 – Yes. On balance, the additional depth will not impact on neighbours but will afford better accommodation within the extension.

Q3 - No. Unless this is only applied to detached dwellings. Extensions to the depth of 4m on semi-detached or terraced properties can reduce light and overshadow neighbouring properties which is best considered by a full planning application.

Q4 – Yes. Subject to the 50% protection of garden space.

Q5 – Yes. It is important that houses have some private garden space (as we all learned in Covid) and therefore a 50% protection of garden space should remain.

Q6 - No. See above.

Q9 – Yes. This is sensible.

Q10 - This should be limited to single story only and no clear glass windows in side elevations.

Q11 – No. The existing provisions seem to work well.

Q12 – Yes. There needs to be more flexibility for loft extensions for two reasons; one, to create better internal space with improved headroom; two, to allow for better retro-fitting of existing stock to reduce the carbon footprint.

Q13 – Yes. However, as before, the criteria should be facing or fronting a street not visible from street as the visibility criteria is too limiting.

Q14 – Yes. However, the increase should be 40 cm not 30cm to allow for better headroom and retro fitting.

Q15 – Yes. Where a flat has a loft that is included in their lease.

Q16 – Yes. An option is to have no measurement set out but to make this a matter for prior approval.

Q17 – See response to Q14.

Q19 – Yes. They have the same issues as non Article 2(3) residents.

Q20 – Yes. This seems reasonable.

Q22 - Yes. This is unduly restrictive.

Q23 – Agree.

Q24 – Yes. Some communities will see a change and previous controls relaxed which may give rise to objections and feelings of unfairness. They may feel the planning system is failing to protect nationally designated areas.

Q26 - No. The prior approval process was well designed originally and serves a purpose.

Q28 – No. This PDR does not really work but the initiative has value (i.e. using airspace and allowing building up). It might be better to use the NPPF to give this type of development more support then use the application process to control impacts on existing residents.

Q29 – Yes. This may have a greater impact on those living in social housing where the freeholder develops despite concerns from residents.

Q30 - No. You need to guard against developers building commercial building with a view to future redevelopment . However there may be merit in having a moving date line i.e. 30 years old.

Q31 – No. The most sustainable building is the existing one and overall, demolition should be discouraged in favour of repurposing.

Q32 - No. All buildings should be able to benefit from this PDR if you decide to keep it. If buildings are of special merit, they should be listed.

Q33 – No. The PDR right exists for a different purpose; to allow the commercial use to expand. Allowing larger than existing rebuilds needs to be considered through a planning application to allow the impacts on neighbours to be considered and proper planning of amenity and servicing space.

Q34 - No. There are many aspects to this PDr which need proper scrutiny.

Q35 to Q53 – The LPDF do not wish to comment on these questions.

I hope that you find these comments to be helpful and if you require any further information, then please do not hesitate to contact the LPDF at the email address shown below. The LPDF would be happy to discuss the issues raised in this representation in depth with the Land Transparency team at DLUHC, if they feel that this would be of assistance.

Yours sincerely



Phill Bamford
Policy Director
phillb@LPDF.co.uk