

**From:** [Oliver Perrott](#)  
**To:** [Section52CDPA](#)  
**Subject:** reply to repeal of section 52  
**Date:** 15 December 2015 16:59:33

---

- Do you agree that the Government is right not to distinguish between two- and three-dimensional copies?

I think the government is wrong on the above point in question, there should be a distinction. Three dimensional copies of works are a direct transference of design to a non original piece for monetary gain, ripping off the work and stealing a portion of their income stream, I agree this should be stopped with a license. But with regards to a 2D representation and photography, the government needs to think really carefully and give more clarification on how a designer could sue for loss of earnings or infringement.

In my line of work as an interior photographer 3D pieces are always represented in living spaces of lifestyle shoots. 2D represents of 3D pieces are not made with the aim of trying to make money from original designed works, the 3D piece is part of the scene and owned by the individual property owners or clients.

If designers are able to sue photographers for including their works in imagery, photographers will be put under huge financial strain and maybe even put out of business. It is not our aim to copy 3d works, we embrace and publicise them, we are in business to help designers show their work to the greater audience and we shouldn't be punished for this.

Having to identify the design of every 3D piece in my image library and gain a licence would need months and months of work, years maybe and a task I can not afford to take without effecting my businesses way to make money.

I hope the government will take the above concerns seriously.

Best  
Oliver Perrott

**Photography** by Oliver Perrott - [www.oliverperrott.com](http://www.oliverperrott.com)



**Fine art prints available through Lumitrix**  
<http://www.lumitrix.com/photographers/oliver-perrott>