

## **Appendix 1: Consultations responses to questions**

Question 1. The government has committed to make it easier to deploy radio equipment housing without the need for prior approval. This is to support the deployment of 5G and incentivise the use of existing sites for site sharing.

1A) To implement this, we would welcome your views on the following proposals:

On Article 2(3) land to:

- permit single developments up to 2.5m<sup>3</sup> without the need for prior approval;
- to permit single developments exceeding 2.5m<sup>3</sup> subject to prior approval.

The above proposals would not apply on land on or within sites of special scientific interest.

**Response - It is considered that the small scale developments that would not have a significant impact, and therefore the proposed changes are not of concern, provided prior approval is required in respect of siting and appearance.**

1B) To implement this, we would welcome your views on the following proposal:

- To permit the installation, alteration or replacement of radio equipment housing within the boundaries of a permitted compound, without the need for prior approval, subject to measures to mitigate visual impact. This proposal would apply on all land except land on or within sites of special scientific interest.

We recognise that conditions would be needed to ensure that new equipment housing does not have an adverse visual impact on the local area. We therefore particularly welcome comments on what measures would be most appropriate to mitigate visual impact.

**Response - It is considered that the intensification of the use of existing compounds would be preferable to the need for additional compounds. It is considered that this permitted development should be limited to ensure the height of any radio equipment housing does not exceed the height of the existing permitted within the compound, or it is no higher than any permitted perimeter fence, whichever is the highest.**

Question 2

2A) The government has committed to make it easier to strengthen existing masts without the need for prior approval to be given by the local planning authority. This is to encourage use and sharing of existing masts and so limit the need for new ones.

To implement this, we would welcome your views on the following proposals:

- To permit the alteration or replacement of existing masts with wider masts, subject to the following limits: on all land, for existing masts less than one metre wide, permit increasing the width by up to two-thirds without the need for prior approval;
- where an existing mast is greater than one metre wide, permit increases in width without the need for prior approval. Subject to consultation responses this would be by either:
  - a) up to one half or two metres (whichever is greater) on all land (including Article 2(3) land and land on a highway); or
  - b) up to one third or one metre (whichever is greater) on Article 2(3) land and land on a highway, and one half or two metres on all other land.
- on all land permit greater increases in width than proposed above subject to prior approval
- that any change in width is calculated by comparing the widest part of an existing mast with the widest part of the new altered or replacement mast.

The above proposals would not apply on land on or within sites of special scientific interest.

**Response – It is considered that the limited increase in width without prior approval would be acceptable, and that prior approval should be required for any greater increase in width in respect of the siting, height, scale and appearance.**

2B) For existing masts greater than one metre wide we have proposed two alternative options:

Permit the alteration or replacement of existing masts with wider masts, subject to the following limits:

- Option A) up to one half or two metres (whichever is greater) on all land (including Article 2(3) land and land on a highway), or
- Option B) up to one third or one metre (whichever is greater) on Article 2(3) land and land on a highway, and one half or two metres on all other land.

Greater increases in width than proposed above would be subject to prior approval. The above proposal would also not apply on land on or within sites of special scientific interest.

Which of these two options do you consider to be most appropriate? If you would make any further comments, please include these in your response to Question 2A (above).

**Response – It is considered that option B would be more appropriate to ensure that the special qualities and character of landscapes and the built environment within areas designated as Art 2(3) land are protected. It is a concern that option A would have a harmful impact on designated Art 2(3) land.**

Question 3. The government has committed to make it easier to strengthen existing masts without the need for prior approval to be given by the local planning authority. This is to encourage use and sharing of existing masts and so limit the need for new ones. To implement this, we would welcome your views on the following proposals:

To permit the alteration or replacement of existing masts up to a new height of 25 metres, without the need for prior approval, outside of Article 2(3) land. The government also proposes to align permitted development height limits for alterations to existing masts with those proposed for new masts. This would permit the alteration or replacement of existing masts subject to the following limits:

- on Article 2(3) land and land on a highway, up to a new height of 25 metres subject to prior approval;
- on all other land, up to a new height of 30 metres, subject to prior approval;

The above proposals would not apply on land on or within sites of special scientific interest.

**Response – In principle there are no concerns with the increased heights given that prior approval would be required.**

Question 4. The government has committed to make it easier to deploy building-based masts nearer to highways, subject to prior approval. This is to support deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage encourage using existing structures.

To implement this, we would welcome your views on the following proposal:

Permitting the installations of masts within 20 metres of the highway on buildings that are less than 15 metres in height. Existing limits to the location and heights of masts and number of antennae that can be deployed on building would remain. This proposal would not apply on article 2(3) land or land on or within sites of special scientific interest.

**Response – It is considered that provided the existing limitations are imposed this amendment would be acceptable in principle.**

Question 5. The government wishes to go further to enable the deployment of building-based masts nearer to highways. This is to support deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage encourage using existing structures.

5A) Do you agree with the government's proposal to permit shorter masts on buildings without the need for prior approval, subject to measures to mitigate visual impact?

**Response – It is considered that provided the limitation requiring that a building based mast is no more than 6 metres higher than the highest part of the building the amendments would be acceptable in principle**

5B) We would welcome your views on this proposal. We particularly welcome comments on the measures proposed to mitigate visual impact:

- limiting the height of masts that can be deployed without the need for prior approval to a height of no more than 6 metres above the highest part of the building, and
- only applying this permitted development right outside of Article 2(3) land and sites of special scientific interest.

**Response – yes it is considered that the proposed limitations are essential to manage the impact on visual amenity and areas designated as Article 2(3) land.**

Question 6. The government has committed to enable higher masts, subject to prior approval. This is to support deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage encourage using, and to support the sharing of masts.

To implement this, we would welcome your views on the following proposals:

- On Article 2(3) land, and land which is on a highway, to permit new ground-based mast up to 25 metres in height, subject to prior approval
- On all other land, to permit new ground-based mast up to 30 metres in height, subject to prior approval

The above proposals would not apply on land on or within sites of special scientific interest.

**Response – this would be consistent with the proposals for replacement masts, and provided prior approval would be required this would not be a concern.**

Question 7. The government has considered whether further measures are needed to support deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage.

We are considering whether permitting monopoles up to 15 metres in height outside of Article 2(3) land and land on or within sites of special scientific interest without the need for prior approval would support the government's ambitions for 5G deployment.

We would welcome your views on this proposal. We particularly welcome comments on the restrictions, limitations and conditions that would be required to ensure this permitted development right would only apply to monopoles, and to mitigate visual impacts.

**Response - It is considered that in principle monopoles no higher than 15m in height are unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the character or amenity of an area. However, this would largely depend on their appearance and colour and therefore it is considered that it would not be appropriate to allow such masts without prior approval. A prior approval process should be required to ensure that the design, appearance and colour of the mast would not be harmful to amenity. It would also be important that the GPDO included a clear definition of a monopole, i.e. a single pole with no additional antennas attached to the**

**structure. In addition, for all masts that are permitted development there should be a condition requiring the masts to be removed within 3 months of the cessation of use should they no longer be operational. There is a concern that cumulatively the masts may have a harmful impact, and therefore the GPDO should include a limit to how many masts can be erected within a specific area.**

Question 8. The government wishes to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to mitigate the impact of development from the proposals on safeguarded areas. To achieve this, we are proposing to amend the General Permitted Development Order for all developments relating to masts within official safeguarded areas related to Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas.

8A) Do you agree with the government's proposal to amend the General Permitted Development Order to include a prior notification procedure relating to safeguarded areas, and to require prior approval for proposed mast developments in proximity to a defence asset?

**Response - Yes**

8B) We would welcome your views on the proposed prior notification procedure and prior approval requirement.

**Response – It will be important that local planning authorities are provided sufficient time to carry out the necessary consultations, and there should be a duty on the consultees to respond within a set period to ensure that the application for prior approval can be fully assessed prior to determination.**

Question 9. The government wishes to update the definition of small cell systems in the General Permitted Development Order. This is to ensure that there is no uncertainty about the types of technology that fall within the definition.

9A) Do you agree with the government's proposal to amend the definition of 'small cell systems' in the General Permitted Development Order?

**Response - Yes**

9B) We would welcome your views on this proposal.

**Response – It is important that the definition is updated to clearly relate to current and emerging technologies.**

Question 10. We welcome comments on what more, if anything, the government should do to ensure successful implementation of the proposed planning reforms to support the deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage.

**Response - No comments to make.**

Question 11. The proposals outlined in this technical consultation build upon the principles that the government has established to enable the deployment of 5G and extending mobile coverage, and have been considered under [section 149 of the Equality Act 2010](#).

Considering the technical detail of the proposals, we would welcome views on the potential impact of the matters raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

**Response - No concerns to raise.**

Question 12. We welcome further any further evidence specifically on the regulatory impacts of the proposed changes to planning regulations set out in this technical consultation.

**Response - No comments to make.**