

2.0 Non-Householder

- 2.1 NIPSA's opinion is that Prior Approval provisions, or a similar arrangement, should be a feature of permitted development rights in the new GPDO, as this is a mechanism that would help ensure the protection of mature trees and sensitive landscapes.
- 2.2 We recommend that Permitted Development Rights should be withdrawn from environmentally sensitive areas designated for their landscape character or quality. We disagree with the conclusion that there are inherent differences between what is appropriate in large scale protected areas such as National Parks and AONBs compared to more localised sites such as Conservation Areas and ASSIs. We advise that within an extensive designation such as an AONB there will be areas as sensitive, if not more sensitive, to landscape and visual impacts as more localised designations. By allowing Permitted Development Rights within extensive designations there would be the potential to create detrimental landscape and visual impacts on highly sensitive landscapes over wide areas.
- 2.3 We do not agree that the proposed PD rights for Universities, Hospitals, Schools, Leisure and Community Facilities and other institutions should be permitted in AONBs and National Parks due to the potential detrimental impact on landscapes of the highest landscape and visual amenity value.
- 2.4 We do not agree with the extension of PD rights to allow single user overhead power lines of up to 400m in length within AONBs and National Parks due to potential detrimental impact on landscapes of the highest landscape and visual amenity value.
- 2.5 We have major concerns in relation to the proposal to extend PD rights for development ancillary to mining operations, as this type of development creates some of the most detrimental landscape and visual impacts on the existing environment. We would express particular concern at the intention to permit such PD rights within AONBs and National Parks.