

Coronavirus (COVID-19) (/coronavirus)

Latest updates and guidance

1. Home (<https://www.gov.uk/>)
 2. Housing, local and community (<https://www.gov.uk/housing-local-and-community>)
 3. Planning and building (<https://www.gov.uk/housing-local-and-community/planning-and-building>)
 4. Planning system (<https://www.gov.uk/housing-local-and-community/planning-system>)
 5. Technical consultation on consequential changes to permitted development rights (<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/technical-consultation-on-consequential-changes-to-permitted-development-rights>)
- Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-levelling-up-housing-and-communities>)
 - Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-housing-communities-and-local-government>)

Consultation outcome

Technical consultation on consequential changes to permitted development rights: consultation outcome

Updated 20 January 2022

Contents

[Foreword](#)

[Summary of responses](#)

[Minor technical changes](#)

[Part 3 changes of use](#)

[Part 4 Temporary buildings and uses](#)

Part 7 Non-domestic extensions, operations etc

Further comments

Public Sector Equality Duty Assessment and impact assessment

Government response



© Crown copyright 2022

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/technical-consultation-on-consequential-changes-to-permitted-development-rights/outcome/technical-consultation-on-consequential-changes-to-permitted-development-rights-consultation-outcome>

Foreword

1. The government is committed to reforming the planning system to make it more streamlined and accessible in support of key government agendas and broader economic growth. A key part of this saw the reform from 1 September 2020 of the planning use classes, in particular the creation of the Commercial, Business and Service (E), Learning and non-residential institutions (F1), and Local Community (F2) use classes. As a result of these changes it was necessary to review and update national permitted development rights, as set out in the [Town and Country Planning \(General Permitted Development\) \(England\) Order 2015, as amended, \(the General Permitted Development Order\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/596/contents) (<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/596/contents>), where they reference uses or the former use classes. The opportunity was taken to simplify and rationalise those existing national permitted development rights where possible.

2. To take this forward, views were sought on the broad approach through the ‘[Supporting housing delivery and public service infrastructure](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-and-public-service-infrastructure)’ (<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-and-public-service-infrastructure>)’ consultation. We published a further ‘[Technical consultation on consequential changes to permitted development rights](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/technical-consultation-on-consequential-changes-to-permitted-development-rights)’ (<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/technical-consultation-on-consequential-changes-to-permitted-development-rights>) which ran from 13 May 2021 to 3 June 2021. This consultation set out the approach in relation to: minor technical changes; changes related to the Commercial, Business and Service use class; the treatment of the former D2 assembly and leisure use class; state funded schools and nurseries; and other changes and sought views on proposed amendments to individual rights within specific Parts of the General Permitted Development Order.

3. We are grateful for the quality and breadth of the responses received to the consultation. They have been carefully considered and our responses to the individual proposals are set out below. These changes have been taken forward in legislation from 1 August 2021.

Summary of responses

4. There was a total of 71 responses to the consultation from a range of interested parties from across the public and private sectors, as well as from the general public. This was a detailed, technical, consultation and as a result not all respondents answered every question, a high number responded ‘don’t know’, and not all that responded left comment. The analysis below is based on those who responded that they either were, or were not, supportive of individual proposals.

5. The table below provides a breakdown of responses to the consultation survey by type of respondent:

Type of organisation	Number of responses
Developer	9
Planning consultant	7
Construction company or builder	0
Local authority	17
Statutory consultees	6
Professional organisations	5

Type of organisation	Number of responses
Lawyer	0
Charity or voluntary	6
Town council	2
Parish council	0
Community groups	1
Private individuals	6
Other	12

6. We have carefully reviewed and analysed the responses and comment is provided below along with the government response.

Minor technical changes

7. The consultation document set out a number of proposed minor technical changes and invited views. These minor technical changes mainly related to updates from former to current use classes without any change to the scope or impact of the right.

Question 1 Do you have any comments on the proposed minor technical changes?

8. 53 responded to this question, with more than half saying they had no comments on the proposed minor technical changes. Of the 21 comments made, some recognised the need to align permitted development rights with the amendments to the Use Classes Order while others took the opportunity to make broader points about use classes and permitted development rights.

9. **Government response to question 1:** The minor technical changes have been introduced as proposed, except in relation to Class ZA of Part 20 where it was decided that no change was necessary, and Classes AA and AB of Part 20 where the rights were instead amended to refer to the Use Classes Order as it applied on 5 March 2018. This has the same effect as the consultation proposal.

Part 3 changes of use

10. The subsets of question 2 considered the proposal that there should be a single right for the change of use from a casino, betting office, pay day loan shop or hot food takeaway to Commercial, Business and Service use, and the scope of that right.

Question 2 (a) Do you agree that there should be single Part 3 right to allow the change of use from:

- (m) casino (Classes C, K (part),
- (n) betting office (Classes C, E, F J (part), JA)
- (o) pay day loan shop (Classes C, E, F, J (part), JA)
- (r) hot food takeaway

to the Commercial, Business and Service use class (E)

11. Of the 43 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. Much of the support came from the flexibility it would create for converting to a wider range of other uses, which will better help towns adapt to changing consumer demands. Although not part of the proposal, there was comment that the right should not allow the change of use to a betting office or hot food takeaway etc.

12. Comment was made on potential impacts, such as noise and traffic, on local residents from conversion to different uses, and on the suitability of the location of such uses. There were suggestions that casinos may be of a substantial size, and therefore there should be a size limit to limit any potential impacts of a sizable new Commercial, Business or Service use. There was also support for some prior approvals in respect of the change of use to restaurants, or to a creche or nursery which are more vulnerable uses in respect of flood risk.

Question 2(b) If there is to be a single right, do you agree that this single right should not be subject to any limitations, such as a size limit, or exclusions for listed buildings etc?

13. Of the 52 responses that either did or did not agree, less than half supported the proposal that the right should not be subject to limitations or exclusions. It was noted that limitations would reduce the potential flexibility of the proposed change. Other comments suggested that there should be a maximum floor area size limit to minimise the impact of the change of use in respect of noise, health, and traffic, especially in relation to conversion to restaurants. It was also suggested that listed buildings and protected areas should be excluded from the right.

Question 2(c) If there is agreed to be a single right, do you agree that this single right should not be subject to conditions, such as matters for prior approval in respect of restaurants or other uses?

14. Of the 53 responses that either did or did not agree, less than half supported the proposal that the right should not be subject to conditions. Those who supported the right not including conditions felt that to do so would limit flexibility. Others considered that their inclusion would allow for potential impacts to be considered and mitigated, such as where premises changing use to a restaurant, especially in residential areas, could have impacts in respect of noise, odours, and waste. It was also suggested that there should also be conditions to understand the potential health and flood risks of changes of use.

Question 2(d) Given the flexibility to move within the use Commercial, Business and Service use class, do you agree that any single consolidated right should not provide an exclusion in respect of offices in article 2 (3) land?

15. Of the 36 responses that either did or did not agree, about half supported the proposal. Comments in support of the proposal included that it would give these areas greater flexibility to repurpose buildings for new uses that would benefit local economies. Comment against suggested that change of use could affect the character and amenity of protected areas, and that excluding the right from Article 2 (3) land would allow for local consideration of a planning application.

16. **Government response to questions 2 (a) to 2 (d).** The amendments have been taken forward as proposed. Class A of Part 3 of the General Permitted Development Order has been amended to provide for the change of use from a casino, betting office, pay day loan shop or hot food takeaway to Commercial, Business and Service use. This change provides greater flexibility to support change of use, including on high streets. Recognising the scope for movement within the Commercial, Business and Service use class, the right is not subject to any limitations, such as a size limit, or conditions such as matters for prior approval. Businesses, such as nurseries, and property owners will consider the location etc before changing to a Commercial, Business and Service use. The developer is required to notify the local planning authority before a change of use. Classes B, C, E, F, and JA of Part 3 are therefore no longer necessary and have been revoked.

Question 3. Do you agree that the existing Class G right of Part 3 should be broadened to allow for up to 2 flats above (mixed use) any premises in the Commercial, Business and Service use class?

17. Of the 47 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. Some commented that the proposed broadening of the right would help make effective use of unused space and contribute to housing supply, particularly on high streets.

18. Others commented that this could lead to inappropriate dwellings that would be poorly located being next to noisy businesses, lacking amenities, and access to services, and that the right should be subject to prior approval. The Environment Agency noted issues such as the risk of flooding, and location near to waste sites.

19. There was comment also that the new dwellings would be too small and lack light and ventilation. There was also a suggestion that it should not be possible to use both the Class G and Class MA permitted development rights in the same building.

20. Government response to Question 3: Class G has been amended to apply as proposed to any use within the Commercial, Business or Service use class, and to update references to the position of betting offices and pay day loan shops in article 3 (6) of the Use Classes Order. However, the right has also been amended to now be subject to prior approval including in respect of flooding, noise and adequate natural light, and arrangements for the storage and collection of domestic waste. Applications for prior approval are required from 1 August 2021. The homes created must meet the Nationally Described Space Standards and comply with building regulations.

Question 4: Do you agree that the Class H right of Part 3 be amended to allow change of use from 2 flats mixed use with Commercial, Business Service use to Commercial, Business and Service use?

21. Of the 41 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. It was suggested that the proposed amendment would provide greater flexibility to adjust properties to the needs of the areas and help to revitalise town centres.

22. It was felt that existing mixed-use properties should not be able to change use to a betting office. It was unclear to some why this right was being amended if it could result in a loss of homes on high streets.

23. Government response to Question 4: Class H has been amended to allow change of use from such mixed use to Commercial, Business or Service use. Premises may not change use from such mixed use to a betting office or pay day loan shop unless they were so originally.

Question 5. Do you agree that the Class I right of Part 3 for the change of use from industrial, or storage and distribution, to light industrial use is withdrawn?

24. Of the 40 responses that either did or did not agree, more than half supported the proposal. There was support for the amendment as it was seen as potentially reducing the risk of general industry premises changing to light industrial in order to benefit from the right to change use to residential, thereby creating housing in unsuitable locations.

25. Those who disagreed with the proposal suggested that the reduced flexibility would impact businesses. It was noted that light industrial uses may already be found in general industrial areas.

26. Government response to question 5: The Class I right has been amended to no longer provide for the change of use to light industrial. However, the right has been retained and amended to continue to allow for the change of use from general industrial (B2) to storage and distribution (B8).

Question 6(a) Do you agree that permitted development rights are amended to no longer allow the change of use to uses from the former D2 Assembly and leisure use class?

27. Of the 39 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposed approach. Some recognised that it would avoid potential complexity now previous D2 assembly and leisure uses are found in different part of the Use Classes Order. Others found the proposal confusing, given that some former D2 uses are now within the Commercial, Business and Service use class.

Question 6(b) Do you agree that the Class J Part 3 right that provides for the change of use of retail uses, betting office or pay day loan shop to the former D2 assembly and leisure use class is withdrawn?

28. Of the 34 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposal. In line with the above, and the introduction of the Commercial, Business and Service use class, there was support for the withdrawal of the right. It was noted that it would enable local planning authorities to assess the impacts of changes to leisure uses that could have traffic, noise and amenity implications which would especially affect neighbouring residents.

Question 7. Do you agree that the Class K Part 3 right that provides for the change of use of casinos to the former D2 assembly and leisure use class is withdrawn?

29. Of the 35 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. One comment questioned why the government was requiring a planning application for such change of use. It was separately noted that it would allow local planning authorities to consider the impacts of the change of use through a planning application.

30. Government response to questions 6 (a)-(b) and 7: The amendments have been taken forward as proposed. The Class J and Class K permitted development rights have been revoked, and Class R amended (see paragraph 37). Shops and financial and professional services may move to become used as places for indoor sport, recreation, or fitness within the Commercial, Business and Service use class. Betting offices, pay day loan shops and casinos may change to such uses under the amended Class A of Part 3. All other changes of use to former D2 assembly and leisure uses now require a planning application, allowing for local consideration.

Question 8(a) Do you agree that the Class M right of Part 3 be amended to continue to allow the change of use from a hot food takeaway, betting office, pay day loan shop, or launderette to residential C3 use?

31. Of the 48 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal that the amended right should continue, noting that it could provide additional housing. This proposal reflected the need to update an existing right to take account of the introduction of the Commercial, Business and Service use class. Although it was not proposing any increase in scope, some comment suggested that the right could lead to poor quality homes and negatively impact the amenity and character of town centres with the creation of 'dead' frontages. There was support for continuation of the existing size limit, noting that the right is used by small builders, and for other limitations and exclusions.

Question 8(b) Do you agree that the Class M right of Part 3 should allow for prior approval on the adequate provision of local services as a launderette?

32. Of the 40 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposal that the right continue to provide for local consideration in respect of launderettes. Several responses noted that launderettes can provide essential local services and that their loss could have a particular impact on vulnerable groups and the elderly, as well as people on lower incomes and students. For these reasons some respondents supported retaining the existing prior approval, whilst others stated that a planning application should instead be required.

33. Government response to questions 8 (a)-(b): The Class M right has been amended as proposed to update the references to use classes and to no longer refer to retail uses. (Shops and financial and professional service uses benefit instead from the Class MA permitted development right.) As proposed, the right continues to allow for local consideration of the impact of the loss of a launderette on the adequate provision of such services. However reflecting the removal of retail uses from the right, consideration of the impact of the change of use on the adequate provision of such services or the sustainability of the key shopping areas have been removed.

Question 9(a) Do you agree that the Class R right of Part 3 should be amended to expand the flexible use of agricultural buildings to include the Commercial, Business and Service use class?

34. Of the 42 responses that either did or did not agree, half supported the proposal. Those that supported the proposal provided few comments but saw it as an opportunity to support rural areas with flexible rules that would help rural economies and communities.

35. Other comments however suggested it would lead to unsustainable development in inappropriate locations, and that the buildings may be prone to flooding. It was suggested that the right should not enable the building to eventually convert into residential use under other permitted development rights.

Question 9(b) Do you agree that the Class R right of Part 3 should be amended to no longer allow the flexible use of agricultural buildings for those uses within the former D2 assembly and leisure use class?

36. Of the 37 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. Many were of the view that in future a planning application should be required for the change of use of agricultural buildings to such former D2 assembly and leisure uses in order to consider the impact on rural roads, whether the building is appropriate for other uses, and the impact on the amenity of the countryside. Some opposed the proposed change, noting that rural communities and economies would no longer be able to benefit from such flexibility.

37. Government response to questions 9 (a)-(b): The changes have been taken forward as proposed. Class R has been amended to provide for the change of use from an agricultural building only to a hotel, storage or distribution, or Commercial, Business and Service use. A planning application is now required for the change of use of an agricultural building to a use in the former D2 use class. All other details remain unchanged. (See also paragraph 30 in respect of assembly and leisure uses.)

Question 10. Do you agree that the Class S right of Part 3 is amended to allow only for the change of use of an agricultural building to a state funded school?

38. Of the 39 that either did or did not agree, about half supported the proposal. While the consultation sought views on amending an existing right to no longer allow the change of use to a registered nursery, much of the comment disagreed with the principle of the right, suggesting that a planning application should be required for the change of use to a school. It was acknowledged that agricultural building can change use to a nursery within the Commercial, Business and Service use class under the Class R right.

39. Government response to question 10. The amendment has been taken forward as proposed, and Class S now provides only for the change of use of an agricultural building to a state funded school.

Question 11(a) Do you agree that the Class T right of Part 3 is amended to allow the change of use to a state funded school, and no longer allow the change of use to a registered nursery?

40. Of the 34 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. It was recognised that nurseries are now in a different use class than schools: the Commercial, Business and Service use class. Some supporting the proposal felt that the change of use to a nursery should be considered through a planning application in order to consider the impacts of noise, traffic, and parking, and ensure it is in suitable location.

Question 11(b) Do you agree that the Class T right of Part 3 be amended to additionally allow for the change of use from the Commercial, Business and Service use class to a state funded school?

41. Of the 39 responses that either did or did not agree, more than half supported the proposal. There was recognition that the proposed change reflected the amendment to use classes, and support that the right continues to not apply to listed buildings. Those providing comment who disagreed with the proposal felt that the change of use to a school should always be brought forward via a planning application to ensure that the suitability of the site and the impacts of the development are properly considered.

Question 11(c) Do you agree that the Class T right of Part 3 be amended to no longer allow for the change of use from in the former D2 assembly and leisure use classes, such as cinemas and live music venues, and from the F2 use class?

42. Of the 36 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposal. It was recognised that the proposed changes would better align with the revised use classes. There was support for the protection of community and cultural uses from permitted development rights as they play an important role in the social, economic, and historic fabric of local communities.

43. **Government response to questions 11 (a)-(c):** The amendments have been taken forward as proposed. The amended right now provides for the change of use from hotels, residential and secure residential institutions and Commercial, Business and Service uses to a state funded school.

Part 4 Temporary buildings and uses

Question 12(a) Do you agree that the Class C right of Part 4 be amended to no longer allow for the change of use from uses now within the Local Community (F2) use class?

44. Of the 38 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposal. Comments in support of the proposal saw it as providing protection for community and cultural facilities important to local communities. It was felt that any change of use from such uses should be considered through a planning application so that all the impacts could be considered.

Question 12(b) Do you agree that the permitted development right is amended to no longer allow the change of use from uses within the former D2 Assembly and leisure use class?

45. Again, of the 38 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposal. There was support for preventing the change of use of community facilities. It was noted that local consideration of a planning application can assess the benefits and impacts of the change of use and also the impacts of the loss of the existing use on the area. There was support for amendments that aligned with the changes to the use classes.

46. **Government response to questions 12 (a)-(b):** The Class C right has been amended as proposed to no longer allow the temporary change of use of uses now within the F2 Local Community use class, and former D2 uses such as cinemas, live music venues, and concert halls etc to a state funded school now in F1 (a). The protections in respect of drinking establishments remain.

Question 13(a) Do you agree that the Class CA right of Part 4 be amended to additionally allow for the change of use from vacant land within the Commercial, Business and Service use class?

47. Of the 41 responses that either did or did not agree, about half supported the proposal. Those that agreed with the proposal felt that it would enable additional vacant commercial land to quickly be put to use as a temporary state funded school, and that it is consistent with the revised Use Classes Order.

48. It was noted that land may be left vacant for reasons such as contamination or flood risk. It was suggested that in such cases a planning application is the best way to assess the appropriateness of sites for development.

Question 13(b) Do you agree that the Class CA right of Part 4 be amended to no longer allow for the change of use from vacant land uses in the former D2 assembly and leisure use classes, such as cinemas and live music venues, and in the Local Community F2 use class?

49. Of the 35 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposal. Some respondents similarly noted that a planning application should be provided. It was also noted that the proposed amendment would protect cultural and community land which are important for local communities.

50. Government response to questions 13 (a)-(b): The amendments have been taken forward as proposed. The amended right applies to land last used as hotel, residential or secure residential institutions, or Commercial, Business and Service use.

Question 14. Do you agree that the Class D right of Part 4 is amended to allow the temporary change of use?

- From: the Commercial, Business and Service use class (E), and specified article 3 (6) uses: hot food takeaway (r), betting office (n) and pay day loan shop (o)
- To: another Commercial, Business and Service use class (E) use, or specified F1 Learning and non-residential institutions uses: display of art (b), museum (c), public library (d), public hall or exhibition hall (e)

51. Of the 39 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. Among those leaving comment, some recognised the flexibility this would provide to town centres to adapt to other uses to follow demand. Several stated that this would have additional benefits of diversifying the high street which would increase footfall and therefore increase the number of customers to other shops. It was suggested that it would help the high street adapt and create active frontages for disused buildings.

52. Some added that there must be provisions to ensure that these changes are only temporary and do not become permanent, with one adding that it should only be for one year rather than two. Some respondents suggested that the right should be subject to prior approval. Others opposed the proposal, suggesting that there should be a planning application to assess the impacts of the change of use to ensure sustainable development that will not harm the high street as a result of the loss of commercial space and put strains on local infrastructure.

53. Government response to question 14: The amendments have been taken forward as proposed, updating the Class D right to align with the revised use classes, and broadening the scope to apply to all Commercial, Business and Service uses. The right no longer provides for the temporary change of use from former assembly and leisure uses (D2) now in the F2 Local Community use class or listed in article 3(6) of the Use classes Order such as cinemas and live music venues.

Part 7 Non-domestic extensions, operations etc

Question 15(a) Do you agree that a single Part 7 right, merging Classes A and F, allow for the extension or alteration of buildings in the Commercial, Business and Service use class?

54. Of the 42 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. Those who supported the change recognised it created simplicity and provided consistency, given the creation of Class E. Respondents also approved of the restrictions on article 2(3) land and within the curtilage of listed buildings.

55. Those who disagreed noted that the expansion of this right would impact parking, odour and noise disturbances for surrounding residents negatively impacting their amenity. It was suggested that such development should be brought forward via a planning application.

Question 15(b) Where a single right is introduced, do you further agree that the Part 7 right allow for ground floor extensions only: no higher than 4 metres, or within 2 metres of boundary?

56. Of the 33 responses that either did or did not agree, there was considerable support for the proposal. There was some support for the right mirroring that for the change of use of shops: ground floor extensions only. Some respondents suggested that distance of two metres to the boundary would protect the amenity of buildings and neighbouring properties and prevent inappropriate scale that could cause disruption to existing commercial units. Others suggested that that 2 metres was sufficient, and one suggested 10 metres.

57. **Government response to questions 15 (a)-(b):** The Class A right has been amended as proposed to apply to uses within the Commercial, Business and Service use class, including offices. The single right allows for ground floor single storey extensions for all Commercial, Business and Service uses of up to 4 metres in height, and no closer than 2 metres to the boundary where it adjoins residential use. The Class F right has therefore been revoked.

Question 16(a) Do you agree that a single Part 7 right merges Classes E and G, and which is broadened to allow for hard surfaces for premises in the Commercial, Business and Service use class?

58. Of the 39 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposal. Supportive responses stated it made sense to broaden the right to apply to all uses within the new Class E, noting that it would simplify the planning requirements. It would also provide economic benefits to businesses.

59. While the right already includes a requirement for permeable surfaces and a size limit, some responses noted that any increase in hard surfaces through expanding the scope of the right to apply to additional premises could create flood risk and surface water issues. It was suggested that such matters should be considered through a planning application. It was noted that increasing the amount of hard surface ground could be counter to government climate change and biodiversity objectives. .

Question 16(b) Do you agree that the single Part 7 right also allow for hard surfaces for a public house, wine bar or other drinking establishments, drinking establishment with expanded food provision, and hot food takeaways listed in article 3 (6)?

60. Of the 37 responses that either did or did not agree, there was strong support for the proposal. It was noted that this development is already provided for and that aligning it with the new use classes will not lead to any changes in premises that can use the right or increased impacts. However, several responses reiterated comments in responses to part a), including in relation to raised flooding risks and the need for permeable surface requirements. It was again suggested that such matters should be considered through a planning application.

61. **Government response to questions 16 (a)-(b):** The amendments have been taken forward as proposed. Class E now applies to the Commercial, Business and Service use class and specified catering uses, such as drinking establishments. The existing size limit of 50 square metres and requirement for permeable surfaces that remain within the amended right will help to limit any impacts. Class G has therefore been revoked.

Further comments

Question 17. Do you have any further comments you wish to make?

62. 36 additional comments were noted. Some suggested that existing rights should include additional prior approvals and provide greater protections and exclusions. Others took the opportunity to make broader comments on permitted development rights such as the recognition of the role of permitted development rights in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, the loss of local decision taking and undermining local plans.

63. **Government response to question 17:** No further changes have been made to the rights subject to the proposals consulted on, or to other permitted development rights, as a result of these comments.

Public Sector Equality Duty Assessment and impact assessment

64. Comments were sought in relation to any impacts the proposals might have.

Question 18. Do you think that any of the proposed changes could impact on:

a) businesses

b) local planning authorities

c) communities

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 and which right or rights they particularly relate to.

65. Of those that responded there was similar view that the changes could impact on business (37) and communities (36), and slightly less on local planning authorities (30). Within the 41 comments received, some considered the proposals would have largely positive impacts and others that they would be largely negative. Some points were framed as both positive from one respondent and negative from others. It was suggested that businesses would benefit the most. Again much of the comment related to broader issues related to permitted development rights, rather than the specific changes proposed in the consultation.

Question 19. Do you think that any of the proposed changes 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).

If so, please give details and specify which right/s any comment relates to.

66. Of the 31 responses to this question, about half (16) considered that the proposed changes to permitted development rights could lead to impacts on those with a protected characteristic. Many of the 19 who commented noted wider issues around permitted development rights and use classes. These include that planning changes may disproportionately impact vulnerable people, including those who share protected characteristics, who are least vocal in planning matters. It was noted that

there could be access and suitability issues where business premises change use to residential. All homes are required to meet building regulations, whether delivered under a planning application or prior approval. The comments received were considered in finalising the amendments taken forward.

Government response

67. The [Town and Country Planning \(General Permitted Development etc.\) \(England\) \(Amendment\) \(No. 2\) Order 2021](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2021/814/contents/made) (<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2021/814/contents/made>) was laid 9 July 2021 to introduce changes to individual permitted development rights from 1 August 2021. The amendments address the need to update the General Permitted Development Order following the reform of use classes from 1 September 2020. At the same time they simplify existing rights, and recognise the greater flexibilities afforded by the Commercial, Business and Service use class. While some are minor technical changes, others will increase flexibility and reduce planning bureaucracy in more cases, including to support high streets. Where rights have been revoked or amended to add limitations or conditions, transitional and saving provisions have been provided in respect of applications for prior approval.

OGI

All content is available under the [Open Government Licence v3.0](#), except where otherwise stated

[© Crown copyright](#)