### QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS

### Answers may be submitted online at <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/3LBZ5ZH>

### or via email to [Mobileplanningconsultation@communities.gov.uk](mailto:Mobileplanningconsultation@communities.gov.uk)

### Question 1.1: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what impact would they have on meeting the Government’s ambitions in relation to mobile coverage including addressing ‘total not-spots’ and ‘partial not-spots’?

### THIS IS A LEADING QUESTION WHICH ASSUMES AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE ROLL OUT. I DO NOT CONSENT TO THE ROLL OUT OF AN UNTESTED TECHNOLOGY. ESPECIALLY WHEN PULSED MICROWAVE RADIATION HAS PROVEN TO BE BIOLOGICAL HARMFUL BY 1000’s of STUDIES.

### Phiremedical.org, bioinitiave,org, Dr Martin Pall

### Question 1.2: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what impact would they have on planned deployment of 5G technology ?

### I object to a leading question inviting practices which diminishes peoples rights to their own property and allows the enforcement of housing dangerous equipment on their property.

### Question 1.3: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what further measures could industry offer to reduce visual impacts of new electronic communications infrastructure and how would these be delivered? Please provide supporting comment

### I do not consent to hiding damaging technology

### Question 1.4: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what further measures could industry offer to ensure that equipment at redundant sites is removed and the land is restored, and how would these be delivered?

### Why is a question about the need to be responsible for disposing of old equipment needed?

### Question 1.5: If these in principle proposals (set out in Questions 2 to 5) were taken forward, what further measures could industry offer to ensure that the use of existing sites and infrastructure were maximised before new sites are identified, for example through increased sharing?

### How safe is it to add 5g equipment to existing masts? This question needs to be asked.

### Question 2.1:

### Do you agree with the principle of amending permitted development rights for equipment housing to remove the requirement for prior approval for development within Article 2(3) protected land and on unprotected land which exceeds 2.5 cubic metres,to support deployment of 5G?

### Yes / No / Not Sure NO

### Question 2.2: What impact could this proposal have on the surrounding area and how could this be addressed?

### I DO NOT CONSENT TO FACILITATING ROLL OUT OF UNTESTED TECHNOLOGY

### I do not consent to facilitating the roll out of untested technology.

### Question 3.1: Do you agree with the principle of amending permitted development rights to allow an increase in the width of existing ground-based masts by more than one third, to support 5G deployment and encourage greater utilisation of existing sites?

### Yes/ No / Not Sure NO

### Question 3.2: If yes to question 3.1, what increase in width should be granted through permitted development rights, without prior approval, to ensure that the visual impact on the surrounding area is minimised?

### Question 3.3: To further incentivise operators to maximise the use of existing sites, should permitted development rights be amended to increase the height of existing masts to the relevant permitted height without prior approval?

### No

### Please provide supporting comments Question 3.4: Are there any other amendments to permitted development rights that would further incentivise operators to maximise the use of existing sites? If yes, what are these and what restrictions would be appropriate to ensure that the visual impact on the surrounding area is minimised

### I do not consent to relaxing rights to roll out an untested technology

### Do you agree in principle with creating a permitted development right to grant permission for masts to be located within 20 metres of a highway on buildings less than 15 metres in height, in all areas?

### NO

### IT has not been proven to safe to residents of the buildings.

### Question 4.3: If yes to question 4.1, do you agree that this permitted development right should be subject to the prior approval process.

### Question 5.1: Do you agree in principle with amending permitted development rights to increase the height of new masts, subject to prior approval?

### No I do not agree.

### Question 5.2: If yes to question 5.1, what permitted height should masts be increased to and why?

### High masts loaded with pulsed microwave radiation are unsafe

### Question 5.3:

### If yes to question 5.1, should a lower height limit be permitted for masts located in Article 2(3) land or on land on a highway and why?

### If yes to question 5.1, what restrictions (if any) should be put in place to control development of permitted higher masts?

### Question 6

### Do you have any 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?

### Higher levels of EMR from 5G base stations will disproportionately affect babies and young children who absorb more radiation than adults and are more likely to suffer biological effects from exposure. Other vulnerable groups include pregnant women and foetuses and electrosensitive individuals. According to the charity ES-UK there are now around 435,000 people in the UK who are so sensitised to EMR that they are unable to work.'