Broads Authority
Planning Committee
3 March 2017
Agenda Item No 14

Article 4 Directions Report by Planning Officer and Head of Planning

Summary: The planning team have carried out a review of the existing

Article 4 Directions in the Broads. Of the 24 Directions, it is

proposed to retain 14, remove 7 and review 3.

Recommendation: That the approach be agreed.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The planning team has been reviewing several of its planning policies, procedures and provisions as it is appropriate to do periodically. Members will be aware of the outcomes of some of this work, for example the ongoing work on the Local Plan and the Local Enforcement Plan which was adopted last year, whilst other work will have solely internal impacts.
- 1.2 As part of this work we have been looking at the Article 4 Directions which restrict permitted development rights in the Broads and this report covers this topic.

2.0 Background and legislation

- 2.1 Planning permission is required for any development, with development defined in s55(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as:
 - "the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operations in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any buildings or other land".
- 2.2 The definition of development is very broad, so in order to prevent the planning system getting bogged down dealing with large numbers of applications for very minor development, the law introduces the concept of 'permitted development rights' whereby planning permission is automatically granted for certain types of development. The permitted development rights are set out in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), which explains the rights and the limitations and the conditions which apply.
- 2.3 Over the last 10 years permitted development rights have been extended considerably as the Government has sought to streamline and modernise the planning system. Permitted development rights in the Broads remain more limited than outside the Broads, but they too have been extended and certain

- developments which formerly required planning permission, such as roof mounted solar panels, are now permitted development.
- 2.4 While permitted development rights automatically <u>allow</u> development subject to certain restrictions/conditions, there is a contrary provision which can <u>remove</u> permitted development rights. This is known as an Article 4 Direction and enables a Local Planning Authority (LPA) to withdraw permitted development rights by serving a direction under Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The effect of this is that the development specified in the Direction which would usually benefit from permitted development rights would now require express planning permission from the LPA.
- 2.5 Members should also be aware that there is a further provision which allows an LPA to develop and apply its own permitted development rights for its area, so that development which is not normally covered by a permitted development right has that status locally. This is done under a Local Development Order, the procedures for which are set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. This provision is mentioned here purely for completeness.

3.0 The purpose and effect of Article 4 Directions

- 3.1 An Article 4 Direction gives the LPA the ability to manage development which would not otherwise require planning permission and to consider developments in detail, including taking into account the views of the local community and other consultees, before it can proceed. As permitted development rights are set nationally, there may be particular local circumstances which mean some types of development can have a greater impact in some areas than others. National Parks, the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Conservation Areas do benefit from some additional controls and exemptions from permitted development rights. However, Article 4 Directions provide an additional mechanism to respond in the interests of protecting amenities and landscapes.
- 3.2 For a landowner, the withdrawal of permitted development rights means that, where Article 4 Directions are served, planning permission is required for the specified development in the specified area when it would not otherwise be required. This does not mean that planning permission will not be granted, but that it is necessary to submit an application and allow the LPA to consider and consult on the proposal. There is, however, no fee to pay for such applications, or indeed any subsequent appeals following a refusal of planning permission.

4.0 Reviewing the existing Article 4 Directions in the Broads

4.1 There has previously been no comprehensive review of the existing Article 4
Directions. It is good practice to review these periodically and to consider
which should be retained and which should be cancelled. It is also

- appropriate to consider periodically whether any of the existing Directions should be extended and whether any new Directions are necessary.
- 4.2 Together these three reviews would constitute a major piece of work, so it is proposed to take a phased approach. This report considers the existing Directions only, and further reports on the possible extension of the existing Directions and any new Directions will be presented in due course as phases two and three respectively.

5.0 Existing Article 4 Directions in the Broads

5.1 There are 24 existing Directions within (or partly within) the Broads area and these have mostly been inherited from the constituent district and borough councils prior to the Authority being established. The existing Article 4 Directions cover permitted development rights relating to retail sales, householder development, boundary treatments, temporary uses and agricultural and forestry development. The sites covered include large areas of marshes, Conservation Areas, commercial areas and moorings. A summary table is set out below:

	<u>Direction</u>	<u>Area</u>
i	Retail sales from moored vessels	23 moorings
ii	Householder permitted development rights, including	Beccles
	outbuildings and boundary treatments	Bungay
iii	Temporary uses of land	Brundall Riverside
iv	Holding of markets, motor and motorcycle racing and clay pigeon shooting	Haddiscoe Marshes
		Church Road, Hoveton
		Gillingham Swan Motel
٧	Erection of boundary treatments	Crabbetts Marsh, Horning
	-	Boathouse Lane, Oulton
		Anchor Street, Coltishall
		Nobbs Loke, Wayford
		Oulton Marsh
		Riverside Park, St Olaves
		Holly Lodge in Wroxham
		Surlingham and Bramerton
vi	Caravans, camping and temporary uses	Horsey, Winterton and Sea Palling
		Crabbetts Marsh, Horning
		Anchor Street, Coltishall
		Smallburgh

vii	Agricultural development	Limpenhoe
		Gillingham Dam
viii	Works to unadopted streets	Anchor Street, Coltishall
ix	Forestry development	Laundry Cottages, Bramerton
Χ	Travelling shows and camping	Halvergate

- 5.2 Each of the Directions applies to a specific area and none cover the entire Broads. It is noted that Directions can be, and have been, used to respond to a particular threat of development or set of circumstances and these may no longer apply. In considering whether to retain the Directions, it is necessary to look at each in turn and consider the factors which justified its making, the continued relevance of these and any current factors, plus whether any alternative controls are available.
- 5.3 Each of the Directions has been reviewed and an assessment and recommendation is set out as follows.

i. Retail sales from moored vessels

- 5.4 The prohibition of retail sales from moored vessels covers 23 sites across the Broads, which are mainly around bridges, dykes and staithes. The Direction was issued in 1972/3.
- 5.5 The origins of the Direction, issued over 40 years ago, are unknown. There is no current issue with retail sales from moored vessels, however this may be as a result of the Direction as around 5 or 6 enquiries about trading from moorings are received each year and the enquirers are normally discouraged by the need to apply for planning permission. There are no byelaws which specifically cover this matter, although the operators would need to demonstrate how they would trade safely and without impacting on navigation; they would also be bound by the 24 hour restriction at Broads Authority moorings.
- 5.6 The above notwithstanding, there is a risk that managing any such use would have an impact on the ranger service, whilst the mooring of vessels used for trading might reduce the availability of public moorings. These, however, are not strictly planning matters and the PPG is clear that Article 4s should be used only where they are necessary to protect amenity or the wider area and it is arguable whether this is applicable here. On balance, there is no strong planning justification for retaining the Direction. There may be an argument for developing a byelaw to cover these uses.
 - ii. Householder permitted development rights, including outbuildings and boundary treatments
- 5.7 Directions removing permitted development rights for householder alterations, extensions, outbuildings etc, and boundary treatment and exterior painting on land fronting highways, waterways and open spaces, including demolition were issued in 1998 and cover the Conservation Areas in Beccles and Bungay. They were served by Waveney District Council, which is why they

- cover only the Conservation Areas in the towns in that district rather than Conservation Areas widely in the Broads.
- This Direction manages the alterations on the most prominent aspects of dwellings within the Conservation Areas. There is a duty to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas so the rationale for withdrawing permitted development rights in these areas is stronger, and it is noted that despite the various national changes to permitted development rights the protection of Conservation Areas has been retained. There is a strong planning justification for retaining this Direction. Further, it may be a good model to expand to other Conservation Areas and this will be considered in the next phase of this work.

iii. Temporary uses of land

- 5.9 This Direction, which prohibits the temporary use of land and its use by recreational organisations, applies at Brundall Riverside Estate. It was served in 1954 and its origins are unknown.
- 5.10 This area is densely developed with a mix of commercial, recreational and residential uses and is at risk of flooding with a constrained access. There are not known to be any particular pressures or demands for temporary uses here, but the impacts could be significant depending on the use. This notwithstanding, there is limited open space for any such uses to occur and, additionally, the area is not dissimilar to many other areas in the Broads for example the riverside at Hoveton, Beccles and Horning.
- 5.11 It appears unlikely that there would be a sudden (and unacceptable) increase in this activity if the Direction were to be lifted. There is no strong planning justification for retaining the Direction, particularly given the similarity with other areas in the Broads.
 - iv. Holding of markets, motor and motorcycle racing and clay pigeon shooting
- 5.12 This Direction applies at Haddiscoe Marshes and was imposed in 1992 in response to a specific proposal to use the land for a variety of temporary uses which was considered would be alien and visually intrusive to the landscape, affect amenity in the village and give rise to traffic issues.
- 5.13 The area is currently in use for grazing marshes and arable farming. These fields are no different in character and appearance to the surrounding marshes, or indeed much of the marshland across the Broads. There are not known to be any present proposals to use the land in this way, but the impacts would be the same as when the Direction was served and these would be unacceptable. Whilst there is no immediate threat, a planning justification can be made due to the severity of the potential impacts. If it is considered necessary to retain this Direction, it would be a good model to expand to other areas as the impacts of the development covered would be

- equally severe elsewhere. This will be considered in the next phase of this work.
- 5.14 A further Direction preventing the holding of markets was served on a site off Church Road, Hoveton in 1973. The reasons for the Direction are now lost, so it is assumed this was served in response to a particular proposal or to end an ongoing activity. The site has now been partly developed and a small, occasional market on the remainder would be unlikely to cause any significant adverse impacts in this busy, commercial area. There is therefore no planning justification for the retention of this Direction.
- 5.15 A similar Direction was issued at the Gillingham Swan Motel in 1991 in order to bring an existing use into planning control. As a consequence of the Direction, a series of temporary permissions were granted, replaced in 1997 by a permanent planning permission (1997/0069 as amended by 1999/0835). It is understood this market continues to operate, although not in full compliance with the permission. The use of land limited by the Direction is no longer necessary, but the Direction maintains control over the erection of temporary structures. It would be appropriate, therefore, to modify this Direction if it is considered necessary to retain it.

v. Erection of boundary treatments;

- 5.16 Directions prohibiting the erection of gates, walls, fences or other means of enclosure have been widely issued across the Broads at various points in time at Crabbetts Marsh in Horning in 1972, Boathouse Lane in Oulton in 1981, Anchor Street, Coltishall in 1982, Nobbs Loke at Wayford, Oulton Marsh and Riverside Park, St Olaves in 1990, Holly Lodge in Wroxham in 1992 and Surlingham and Bramerton in 1993.
- 5.17 The purpose of these Directions has been to protect the openness of land at and around leisure and mooring plots due to the important contribution this makes to the character and appearance of the landscape. Some were served in response to a particular threat (Nobbs Loke, Oulton Marsh, St Olaves, Wroxham and Surlingham/Bramerton), whilst others were precautionary.
- 5.18 The Direction served at Holly Lodge, Wroxham was unusual, being prompted by enforcement action action and the need to retain control over any replacement boundary treatment once an unauthorised and unsympathetic structure had been removed. The site forms the residential curtilage of a dwelling and extends to the river, being the only form of built development at the riverside and is also visible from the adjacent public open space of Caen Meadow. It is unusual for individual properties to be managed in this way and the site is now better screened by surrounding vegetation. Since the Direction was served, the Wroxham Conservation Area has been designated which further justifies any additional level of control over development, however, the case for retaining this Direction is finely balanced particularly as it is unusual for a Direction to apply to a single property. On balance, there is no strong planning justification for retaining the Direction, particularly given the similarity with other properties in the Broads.

- 5.19 The Direction at Boathouse Lane, Oulton has not been complied with nor enforced and the result is a series of enclosed mooring plots and views of the water from the PROW are blocked. Many of the existing boundary treatments may now be immune from enforcement action. It is considered necessary to retain this Direction and enforce its provisions in order to raise awareness and bring any future changes under control
- 5.20 The Direction at Oulton Marsh sought to prevent a subdivision of the marshes, which was a particular threat due to the popularity of the area for horse grazing. The Direction controlled the spread of this to a degree, but was not consistently enforced. Much of the land has now been purchased by Suffolk Wildlife Trust so it would be appropriate to review the Direction and its boundaries.
- 5.21 The Direction at Riverside Park in St Olaves has not been enforced and there is a prevalence of boundary treatment, the majority of which is likely to be immune from enforcement action. It would be appropriate to review this Direction.
- 5.22 In the main, the Directions have been effective in protecting the areas from the excessive enclosure of land and the visual effect of this. There remains a strong justification to retain many of these Directions and review some others, with the exception of at Holly Lodge above which can be removed.
- 5.23 There are a number of other areas where an Article 4 Direction might be justified to protect the characteristic openness of the area. These include upstream of Beccles, Brundall Riverside, Dilham, the north shore of Oulton Broad, Potter Heigham and Repps with Bastwick and downstream of the bridge at St Olaves. It would be necessary to undertake a survey of these areas prior to a decision being made on this. This will be considered in the next phase of this work.

vi. Caravans, camping and temporary uses

- 5.24 A number of Directions have been served covering camping and caravanning and associated uses. The Direction preventing camping, caravans and temporary uses at Horsey, Winterton and Sea Palling was served in 1964 and whilst it is not known why this was originally served, the entire site is within the AONB and the majority is within SAC and SSSI designations.
- 5.25 This sensitivity of this site, in terms of both ecological and landscape interest, is such that there remains a strong planning justification for retaining the protection offered by the Direction. On a purely practical level, the Direction also extends outside the Broads area and cancelling or amending it would require collaboration with Great Yarmouth Borough Council and North Norfolk District Council, neither of which have approached us about this.
- 5.26 A Direction relating to temporary uses and buildings and caravan sites on land to the north west of Crabbetts Marsh at Horning was issued in 1972. Access

- is very constrained here and the area is at risk of flooding, so uses such as a caravan site would be inappropriate and there is a strong planning justification for retaining the Direction.
- 5.27 A similar Direction was served on land at Anchor Street, Coltishall in 1982, where the constraints are similar. It covers a relatively small and discrete area of riverside meadow land which is currently used for grazing on the edge of the settlement of Coltishall and within the Conservation Area. Access is via an unsurfaced public footpath. It is understood that the Direction was served in response to a particular threat. Whilst the site is inappropriate for a caravan site use, the severely constrained access reduces the probability of this happening and there is not a strong justification for retaining the Direction.
- 5.28 A Direction was served on land to the west of the A149 in Smallburgh in 1989. This parcel of land is no different in character or appearance to those surrounding it so it is assumed this Direction arose from a particular threat of development. It is an area of grazing marsh where use for a caravan site is likely to be inappropriate due to adverse landscape impacts, high flood risk and inadequate access. The Direction is considered on balance to be worth retaining, although there is not known to be any current threat of development, and if it is retained it may be worth expanding to adjacent parcels of land. This can be considered in the next phase of this work.

vii. Agricultural development

- 5.29 The Secretary of State served a Direction in 1984 at Limpenhoe when a management agreement to stop this area of grazing marsh being drained could not be agreed upon. The intention of the Direction was to introduce a requirement for planning permission for any drainage work constituting development that was undertaken by the farmer, but the Direction covers all agricultural development. Although circumstances may have changed, agricultural permitted development rights allow for quite substantial buildings which would have an adverse landscape impact.
- 5.30 A Direction removing agricultural permitted development rights was served at Gillingham Dam in 1988. This was in response to an intention to erect a large cattle building on the site as the area was considered to be part of a grazing marsh of considerable landscape importance, vulnerable to damage by intrusive development and the prior approval provisions were not considered to give sufficient control.
- 5.31 The principles and objectives surrounding both of these Directions are the same to control agricultural development which would have an adverse impact on the local landscape. Although there are not known to be any current proposals on either site, these considerations remain valid and the impacts of any development would be the same as when the Direction was served. On this basis, there is a strong planning justification to retain both Directions.

5.32 Given, however, that the marshes at both Gillingham and Limpenhoe are typical of many marsh areas across the Broads, if it is considered necessary to retain these Direction, there is likely to be a planning justification to use these as a model to expand to other areas as the impacts of this type of development would be equally severe elsewhere. This can be considered in the next phase of this work.

viii. Works to unadopted streets

5.33 The Direction served at Anchor Street, Coltishall covered at 5.27 above, also included a provision to prevent works to the unadopted street or private way. The reason for the Direction is not known, and the only access is via an unsurfaced public footpath. There does not seem to be a strong justification for the retention of this part of this Direction.

ix. Forestry development

5.34 A Direction was served on land adjacent to Laundry Cottages, Bramerton in 1987 in response to a proposal to erect a building for forestry purposes under permitted development rights on the land, which includes broadleaved woodland and riverside marsh. This area was considered to be of exceptional landscape significance, providing visual amenity when viewed from the land, water and adjacent footpaths. Although the intention to erect a building here may have passed, the Direction is considered worthy of retention due to the sensitivity of the site to built development.

x. Travelling shows and camping

- 5.35 In 1959 a Direction was issued covering Halvergate Marshes, preventing travelling shows and camping. There is no surviving documentation covering the reasons for the Direction, nor is the full extent and effect of it known, although the area can be identified as within the Conservation Area.
- 5.36 Whilst this landscape is very sensitive to change as well as being constrained by access and flood risk, it is not atypical of many marshland landscapes across the Broads. In the absence of any specific threat, and mindful that the threat of travelling shows in particular is very different now to what it might have been in 1959, there is a rationale for removing it. Alternatively, if the Members consider that the Direction should be retained, given that the landscape and constraints on Halvergate are typical of those across much of the Broads it would be appropriate to consider the purpose and contents of the Direction here, as well as whether it should rolled out across a wider area. This can be considered in the next phase of this work.

Summary

5.37 In summary, the following is therefore recommended with regard to the existing Article 4 Directions:

	<u>Direction</u>	Area	Action
i	Retail sales from moored vessels	23 moorings	Remove
ii	Householder permitted development rights,	Beccles	Retain
	including outbuildings and boundary treatments	Bungay	Retain
iii	Temporary uses of land	Brundall Riverside	Remove
iv	Holding of markets, motor and motorcycle racing and	Haddiscoe Marshes	Retain
	clay pigeon shooting	Church Road, Hoveton	Remove
		Gillingham Swan Motel	Review and possibly modify
V	Erection of boundary	Crabbetts Marsh, Horning	Retain
	treatments	Boathouse Lane, Oulton	Retain
		Anchor Street, Coltishall	Retain
		Nobbs Loke, Wayford	Retain
		Oulton Marsh	Retain
		Riverside Park, St Olaves	Review
		Holly Lodge in Wroxham	Remove
		Surlingham and Bramerton	Retain
vii	Caravans, camping and temporary uses	Horsey, Winterton and Sea Palling	Retain
		Crabbetts Marsh, Horning	Retain
		Anchor Street, Coltishall	Remove
		Smallburgh	Retain
vii	Agricultural development	Limpenhoe	Retain
	-	Gillingham Dam	Retain
viii	Works to unadopted streets	Anchor Street, Coltishall	Remove
ix	Forestry development	Laundry Cottages,	Retain
Х	Travelling shows and camping	Bramerton Halvergate	Remove

6.0 The processes associated with Article 4 Directions

6.1 There is a statutory process covering the creation of new Article 4 Directions. There are two type of Direction - immediate and non-immediate - and whilst they both include a statutory consultation, each has a slightly different

process. An immediate Direction will come into effect as soon as it is made, whilst a non-immediate Direction will come into effect on the date specified in the Direction, which will be within a period of between 28 days after the start of the consultation and two years. The processes are set out at Appendix 1.

- 6.2 Existing Directions can be cancelled or modified in the same way as serving a new Direction.
- 6.3 As detailed above, it is proposed to retain 14 of the 24 existing Article 4
 Directions in the Broads. There is no statutory requirement for any action (for
 example consultation) to be taken in respect of a proposal to retain Directions,
 but it would be useful to advise the relevant Parish Councils and District
 Councils that the Authority has reviewed them and decided to make no
 changes. It is noted that the National Planning Practice Guidance advises
 that the LPAs should review their Article 4 Directions regularly.
- 6.4 As detailed above, it is proposed to remove seven of the 24 existing Article 4 Directions in the Broads and to review three. These 10 Directions will need to be subject to the statutory processes. It is proposed to deal with them as non-immediate Directions as there appears to be no justification to use the urgent powers provided for under the immediate Direction procedures.
- 6.5 The 10 Directions which will be subject to this are as follows:

	Direction	<u>Area</u>	Action
i	Retail sales from moored vessels	23 moorings	Remove
iii	Temporary uses of land	Brundall Riverside	Remove
iv	Holding of markets, motor and motorcycle racing and	Church Road, Hoveton	Remove
	clay pigeon shooting	Gillingham Swan Motel	Review and possibly modify
٧	Erection of boundary	Oulton Marsh	Review
	treatments	Riverside Park, St Olaves	Review
		Holly Lodge in Wroxham	Remove
Vii	Caravans, camping and temporary uses	Anchor Street, Coltishall	Remove
viii	Works to unadopted streets	Anchor Street, Coltishall	Remove
Х	Travelling shows and camping	Halvergate	Remove

6.6 With regard to the Directions which it is proposed to remove, it is anticipated that the formal process will commence in April 2017, with confirmation later in 2017.

6.7 With regard to the three Directions which are to be reviewed, the approach will depend on the outcome of the assessment. If they are proposed to be retained, the Parish Council will be informed as it will be for the others to be retained (as at 6.3 above). If they are proposed to be removed, this will be the subject of consultation in exactly the same way as for the others proposed for removal (as at 6.6 above). If it is proposed to modify them following assessment, they will be rolled forward and dealt with in the second phase of the work along with any proposals to extend other Directions.

7.0 Financial implications

7.1 There will be financial implications, resulting from the cost of consultation and advertising. This will be met from within the existing planning budget.

8.0 Conclusion and recommendation

- 8.1 A review of the Article 4 Direction in the Broads area is to be undertaken, in accordance with the advice and guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance. It is to be separated into three phases, with the first phase looking at existing Article 4s.
- 8.2 Of the 24 existing Article 4 Directions it is proposed to retain 14, remove 7 and review 3. Those which are to be removed will be the subject of consultation, expected to start in spring 2017.
- 8.3 It is recommended that Members agree the above approach.

Background papers: Existing Article 4 Directions

Appendices: Appendix 1: Processes associated with Article 4 Directions

Author: Maria Hammond/Cally Smith

Date of report: 21 February 2017

	Immediate directions*	Non-immediate directions
Contents of	A description of the	A description of the
notice	development and area to which	development and area to which
	the direction relates;	the direction relates;
	A statement of the effect	A statement of the effect of
	of the direction;	the direction;
	 Specification that the 	Specification that the
	direction is made under article	direction is made under article 1(4)
	1(4) of the GPDO;	of the GPDO;
	 The name of a place 	The name of a place where
	where a copy of the direction	a copy of the direction and map
	and map can be viewed; and	can be viewed;
	 A period of at least 21 	A period of at least 21 days
	days within which	within which representations can
	representations can be made.	be made; and,
		The date on which it is
		proposed the direction will come
		into force, at least 28 days from
		the start of the consultation period,
		but no more than two years.
Consultation	 Local advertisement; 	Local advertisement;
	 Site notices at no fewer 	Site notices at no fewer
	than two locations within the	than two locations within the area
	area to which the direction	to which the direction relates; and
	relates; and	Serve notice on the owner
	Serve notice on the	and occupier of every part of land
	owner and occupier of every	within the area to which the
	part of land within the area to	direction relates (unless it is
	which the direction relates	considered that individual notice is
	(unless it is considered that	impracticable because not all owners can be identified or
	individual notice is impracticable because not all owners can be	
	identified or located, or it is	located, or it is impracticable due to the number of owners of
	impracticable due to the number	occupiers).
	of owners of occupiers).	occupicis).
Notification	Secretary of State	Secretary of State
	•	• Sociotary of State
Confirmation	Take into account any	Take into account any
	representations received.	representations received.
	 No sooner than 28 days 	No sooner than 28 days
	after latest date notice served,	after latest date notice served, or
	or such longer period specified	such longer period specified by
	by SoS.	SoS.
	Within six months of	Give notice of confirmation
	serving, otherwise it expires.	and the date it will come into effect
	Give notice of	in the same manner as the
	confirmation in the same	consultation, including to SoS in
	manner as the consultation,	most circumstances.
	including to SoS in most	

	circumstances.	
Effect	Immediate.	On the specified date when
		confirmed.

^{*.} Immediate directions can only be used to withdraw permitted development rights for Parts 1 to 4 and Classes B and C of Part 11 of the GPDO (dwellinghouses, minor operations, changes of use, temporary buildings and uses and demolition of buildings) where such development is considered to be prejudicial to the proper planning of their area or constitute a threat to the amenities of the area and to certain rights in parts of, or whole, Conservation Areas.