



**PERMITTED
DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS
FOR MICROGENERATION
DEVELOPMENT
CONSULTATION PAPER
RESPONSE FORM**

Once you have completed this form please
return to

Policy and Legislation Branch
3rd Floor
Millennium House
Great Victoria STREET
Belfast
BT2 7BN

by fax (marked 'Planning Microgeneration PD
Consultation Response') to:
028 9041 6960

Or by e-mail to:
Planning.microgenpd@doeni.gov.uk

All responses should be submitted to the
Department no later than 22nd January 2010



Department of the
Environment

www.doeni.gov.uk



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

Please Note that this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately.

In keeping with our policy on openness, the Department will make responses to this consultation paper publically available. When publishing responses received on behalf of organisations the Department will also publish the organisation's name and address. When publishing responses received on behalf of individuals the Department will not publish details of the individual's name and address.

1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name

DPP

Title

Mr Ms Mrs Miss Dr Please tick as appropriate

Surname

[Redacted]

Forename

[Redacted]

2. Postal Address

[Redacted]

Postcode:

[Redacted]

Phone:

[Redacted]

Email:

[Redacted]

3. Are you responding:

As an individual

On behalf of a group / organisation

4. Which of the following best describes the capacity in which you are responding:

Developer

Agent/Architect

Business

Member of Public

Environment Group

Council / Councillor

MLA, MP, MEP

Other Please state:

--

5. Acknowledgment

Individual responses will not be acknowledged unless specifically requested

NON DOMESTIC MICROGENERATION

Introduction

Question 1

Do you agree that the GDO should be amended to provide permitted development rights for microgeneration equipment in non-domestic land uses?

Yes No

It is essential that permitted development rights are brought in asap if we are to hit the target required by the Strategic Energy Framework of generating 12% of energy from renewable sources by 2012 and the aspirational target set out in the NI Sustainable Development Strategy of 40% by 2025.

Question 2

Should permitted development rights for non-domestic microgeneration be greater than those proposed for dwellinghouses where this can be achieved without increasing the risk of adverse impacts?

Yes No

To take account of the greater energy requirements of non-domestic land uses, many of which will be located in non-residential areas where any adverse impacts will be minimal.

Question 3

Should permitted development rights for microgeneration associated with non-domestic land uses be provided for in a separate part within Schedule 1 of the GDO from the existing permitted development rights for those land uses?

Yes No

Given the increasing necessity and popularity of renewables, there must be a separate and specific section dealing with renewables.

General limits and conditions to permitted development

Question 4

Do you agree that permitted development in non-domestic land uses should be for microgeneration development that primarily provides heat or energy for use within the curtilage of the non-domestic building or on the agricultural unit?

Yes No

This is appropriate for permitted development, as larger commercial developments should require a planning application.

Question 5

Do you agree that, subject to the maximum height and area restrictions set out in the Review, permitted development for solar panels or wind turbines erected by undertakers referred to in Part 13 of the GDO or by the Roads Service to meet the energy needs of a range of equipment, systems and other uses permitted under Part 13 of the GDO or by the Roads Service should be allowed, provided it is only to meet the needs of the equipment, systems and other uses with which it is associated?

Yes No

The guidelines as set out in the review are unduly restrictive and inconsistent with current technologies for example 15m in height is too small, with a resulting downgrading of output by 40%. As well as the short masts failing to meet turbine efficiencies, the swept area is too small, all the machines on the market exceed this size and a machine would have to be specially manufactured as these sizes are not feasible in the marketplace.

The renewable energy industry is moving at a faster pace than that suggested as appropriate in the document and on this basis some format for updating the document in line with the most up to date technologies should be built in.

Question 6

Do you agree that a condition of all permitted development for microgeneration devices in non-domestic land uses should be that they be removed as soon as reasonably practicable after they are no longer in use and the land or building restored to its condition before the development took place?

Yes No

Given the wind turbine machines in particular have a limited timeframe this is a sensible approach providing flexibility is built into the process.

However there should be an allowance for replacing equipment which is at the end of its lifespan.

Solar Panels

Question 7

Do you agree that permitted development for solar panels fitted to a pitched roof should be limited to the existing roof area?

Yes No

Question 8

Do you agree that permitted development for solar panels fitted to a pitched roof should be limited to the maximum height of the existing roof?

Yes No

Question 9

Do you agree that permitted development for solar panels on a pitched roof plane that faces onto and is visible from a road should not extend more than 20cm above the plane of the existing roof slope?

Yes No

Question 10

Do you agree that permitted development for solar panels on a flat roof should not exceed a height of 2m from the roof plane on which they are mounted?

Yes No

2m should be sufficient to ensure optimal pitch for the scale of permitted development.

Question 11

Do you agree that solar panels permitted on a flat roof should be located at least 2m from the edge of the roof of the building on which they are mounted?

Yes No

2m from all edges decreases the usable roof space by too great an extent. We would possibly suggest 2m from side facing a road if applicable.

Question 12

Should permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels be removed in AONBs and National Parks where the roof slope faces onto and is visible from that road?; or

Yes No

The impact of roof mounted solar panels on the local visual resource will, in the majority of instances, be negligible. In that regard, to restrict throughout AONB's etc. is unnecessary. It is sensible not to exclude these large areas from permitted development.

Question 13

Should permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels be removed in special countryside policy areas where the roof slope faces onto and is visible from that road?; or

Yes No

As above

Question 14

Should permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels in AONBs and National Parks (including special countryside policy areas) be subject to the same limits that apply outside these areas?

Yes No

Question 15

Should permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels in Conservation Areas be removed where the roof slope to which they are fitted faces onto and is visible from that road?; or

Yes No

Features of merit within a Conservation Area can often be associated with the roof line and on this basis the impact on the streetscape should be protected.

Question 16

Should permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels in Conservation Areas be subject to the same limits that apply outside these areas?

Yes No

Question 17

Should permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels in a World Heritage Site be removed where the roof slope to which they are fitted faces onto and is visible from that road?; or

Yes No

Question 18

Should permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels in a World Heritage Site be subject to the same limits that apply outside that area?

Yes No

Question 19

Should there be any additional restrictions to permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

Given the reasons behind the designations are not to protect amenity this is unnecessary.

Question 20

Should permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels within the curtilage of a Listed Building only be removed where Listed Building Consent has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Question 21

Should permitted development rights for solar panels fitted to a wall limit them to the boundaries of the existing wall area?; or

Yes No

Question 22

If you do not agree that permitted development rights for solar panels fitted to a wall should be limited by the existing wall area do you think that there should be an area limit to wall mounted panels and, if so, what area should this be?

N/A

Question 23

Should permitted development rights for solar panels fitted to a wall within 3 metres of the boundary of the curtilage and extending above 4 metres in height be restricted to protrude no more than 20cm from the plane of the wall?

Yes No

Question 24

Should permitted development rights for wall mounted solar panels be removed in AONBs, National Parks, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites where they face onto and are visible from a road?

Yes No

Given wall mounted views are localised and the thresholds will permit only small panels this is considered unnecessary.

Question 25

Do you agree that permitted development rights for wall mounted solar panels in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest should not be subject to additional restrictions?

Yes No

Given they are not designated to protect the landscape it is unnecessary.

Question 26

Should permitted development rights for wall mounted solar panels within the curtilage of a Listed Building only be removed where Listed Building Consent has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Question 27

Should permitted development rights for free standing solar panels restrict them to a minimum of 5m from the building curtilage and from any road bounding the curtilage?

Yes No

Question 28

Should permitted development rights for free standing solar panels restrict them to a maximum of 2m above ground level? If not, what height do you believe is appropriate and for what reasons?

Yes No

This should be appropriate for the scale of permitted development

Question 29

Should the permitted development rights for free standing solar panels allow a maximum surface area of 20m² within the curtilage of a building?

Yes No

Question 30

If you consider a greater area should be allowed, please state what area and the supporting reasons.

We feel that the maximum area for PD should be at least 30m² to allow maximum exploitation of suitable sites. This is especially true for PV which requires a greater surface area.

Question 31

Do you agree that the proposed restrictions on permitted development rights for free standing solar panels are reasonable in addressing safety issues beyond the host property?

Yes No

If the installer and equipment has been MCS certified, the installation should pose no threats to health and safety.

Question 32

Should permitted development rights for free standing solar panels be removed in AONBs, National Parks, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites where the installation faces onto a road and is visible from that road?

Yes No

Removal of PD rights is unnecessary given the size restrictions imposed will control their impact to localised views only.

Question 33

Should permitted development rights for free standing solar panels be removed in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

This is excessive given that the reason behind the designation is not to protect the landscape or amenity.

Question 34

Should permitted development rights for free standing solar panels within the curtilage of a Listed Building only be removed where Listed Building Consent has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Wind Turbines

Question 35

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines allow them to be a maximum of 3m above the highest point of the roof?

Yes No

Only a relatively small amount of carbon dioxide will be saved at this limit hence the threshold should be set in line with current and evolving technologies to ensure maximum efficiencies are achieved. It is not appropriate to set rigid thresholds if they result in maximums that make the machines inefficient.

Question 36

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines be for a maximum blade diameter of 2.5m?

Yes No

Limiting the blade size reduces output potential. The blade length should be

proportional to the turbine height to ensure maximum efficiencies are achieved in the machines.

Question 37

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines with a vertical axis be for a maximum swept area of 5m²?

Yes No

This should be greater as noise issues and vibration are very low with vertical axis wind turbines. The thresholds should be set with current technologies in mind to ensure maximum efficiencies rather than rigid maximum dimensions.

Question 38

Should permitted development rights allow one building mounted wind turbine within the curtilage of a non-domestic building?

Yes No

yes, but PD should allow more than one.

Question 39

If you consider more than one should be allowed, please state how many and the supporting reasons.

PD should be granted for up to 2 building mounted turbines on non-domestic properties. The minimum distance between each turbine is mandatory so this will restrict the number which could feasibly be installed anyway.

As they are building mounted there will be zero net effect on environmental/ ecological issues raised in an EIA. Also V.A.W.T have very low noise and vibration levels negating the need for an EIA.

Question 40

If you consider that permitted development rights should allow more than two wind turbines please explain why you consider that the environmental effects are not significant and that the threshold in Schedule 2 to the EIA Regulations should be amended.

Question 41

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines be deferred until noise and air safety issues can be satisfactorily addressed?

Yes No

No. It is important that PD rights are brought in asap. Mitigation of noise and air safety issues will be readily achievable (or may not even be applicable) in the majority of instances.

While MCS certification ensures machinery and installers are of a sufficient standard so as not to create the aforementioned issues.

Question 42

Do you agree that a permitted development regime for building mounted wind turbines should not entail the user having to employ a technical expert to carry out a noise survey either before such rights are exercised or to prove compliance?

Yes No

The Department could detail a list of appropriate turbines which are compliant with prevailing noise regulations and so which remove the need for a noise survey. This is especially true if MSC accredited equipment is employed.

Question 43

Do you agree that it is a matter for installers and manufacturers to ensure that there is no negative impact associated with vibration that may be caused by building mounted wind turbines?

Yes No

Yes - MCS accreditation ensures competency and quality of installation.

Question 44

If you do not agree that impacts associated with vibration should be addressed by installers and manufacturers how do you believe they should be addressed?

N/A

Question 45

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines be removed where they extend above public open space, roads and footpaths?

Yes No

Any proposed installation where there is the potential to impact on human health or human safety must be the subject of a full application.

Question 46

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines be deferred until a UK scheme has been developed that satisfactorily addresses the issue of radar safety?

Yes No

Building mounted turbines will involve development of a size and scale that will, in most instances, not interfere with radar safety. To defer their implementation for an undetermined period of time is contrary to the ethos of supporting sustainable development.

Question 47

Do you agree that there is currently no need to condition permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines in terms of their potential to induce seizures?

Yes No

We are not aware of any proven medical evidence to support this assertion.

Question 48

Should the potential impact of building mounted wind turbines on telecommunications systems be addressed through the publication of guidance material on the best way to site wind turbines to reduce the risk of electromagnetic interference?

Yes No

Guidance material is appropriate on this basis.

Question 49

Should the potential impact of building mounted wind turbines on birds and bats be addressed through the publication of guidance material on the best way to site wind turbines to minimise that impact?

Yes No

This would be a helpful development.

Question 50

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines be removed in AONBs, National Parks, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites where the turbine is mounted on a roof or wall that faces onto a road and is visible from that road?

Yes No

The small scale machines that are permitted within the proposed regulations would not be of a significant enough level to cause any damage to the amenity of the area and it is excessive to prohibit them in all areas of landscape protection.

Question 51

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines be removed in ASSIs as a precautionary measure to protect bats and birds?

Yes No

Appropriate siting guidance will provide sufficient protection for bats and birds especially when they are mounted on buildings given these will already effect the flight patterns of birds/bats. Single turbines pose little threat to bats and birds. The RSPB supports wind technology.

Question 52

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines within the curtilage of a Listed Building only be removed where Listed Building Consent has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Question 53

Subject to the further limits outlined later in this paper, should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines in non-domestic land uses should be allowed up to a maximum height of 15m above ground level?

Yes No

The 15m limit on maximum height is too low. A 15m hub height would be more acceptable and appropriate as manufacturers produce this size of wind turbine. Using Proven turbines as an example, limiting the total maximum height to 15m would restrict you to using a 6kw turbine on a 9m pole. This would greatly reduce the efficiency of the turbine and generate such a small amount of energy that it would be economically inefficient. Increasing the hub height to 15m would allow users to mount the 6kw turbine on a 15m pole, greatly increasing efficiency or allow them to opt for a more suitable 15kw turbine (designed for small commercial buildings) which would otherwise be ruled out as it requires a 15m pole.

The total height could be increased to 20m, in line with the PD recommendations in the Republic of Ireland.

Question 54

Should permitted development rights for free standing horizontal axis wind turbines allow a blade diameter of up to 6m?

Yes No

Limiting blade diameter to 6m reduces the efficiency of the turbine.

Question 55

If you consider a different blade diameter is appropriate, what is it and please state your supporting reasons.

The blade diameter should be increased to 9m. Again, using the popular Proven turbines as an example, increasing the maximum blade diameter to 9m would allow customers to install the 15kw turbine which is more suitable for a small commercial property.

Question 56

Should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines with a vertical axis allow a maximum swept area of 28m²?

Yes No

28m² is much too low to offer the chance of installing a turbine that will have any significant impact on the energy needs of a non-domestic property.
Advice should be sought from the machine manufacturers given the proportions are as important to an efficient running machine as the overall height and blade diameter.

Question 57

Should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines require that they are located a minimum of 17m from a neighbouring building curtilage or road?

Yes No

17m is a reasonable distance to ensure that noise and safety issues are accounted for. The most appropriate site may be close to a boundary so the distance should not be anymore excessively restricted.

Question 58

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines be deferred until a UK scheme has been developed that satisfactorily addresses the issue of radar safety?

Yes No

Refer to question 46 above.

Question 59

Do you agree that there is currently no need to condition permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines in terms of their potential to induce seizures?

Yes No

Refer to question 47 above.

Question 60

Do you agree that the risk to members of the public outside the curtilage posed by wind turbines falling over is sufficiently addressed by the requirement for them to be located a minimum of 17m from a neighbouring building curtilage or road?

Yes No

Question 61

Should permitted development rights require that the blade tips of a free standing wind turbine must be a minimum of 5m above ground level?

Yes No

Providing they have MCS accreditation.

Question 62

Should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines allow only one turbine within a building curtilage or on an agricultural unit?

Yes No

This is suitable for the scale of permitted development.

Question 63

Do you agree that a separation distance of 34m between free standing wind turbines on neighbouring properties is sufficient to address cumulative visual impact?

Yes No

It is unlikely that everyone will avail of the opportunity to install a turbine under permitted development rights given the significant outlay and time taken to recoup costs so this distance is an extreme worst case scenario.

Question 64

If you consider that a greater separation distance than 34m between free standing wind turbines on neighbouring properties is required, what is it and please state your supporting reasons?

n/a

Question 65

Should the potential impact of free standing wind turbines on telecommunications systems be addressed through the publication of guidance material on the best way to site wind turbines to reduce the risk of electromagnetic interference?

Yes No

This would be a helpful development.

Question 66

Should the potential impact of free standing wind turbines on birds and bats be addressed through the publication of guidance material on the best way to site wind turbines to minimise that impact?

Yes No

This would be a helpful development.

Question 67

Should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines be deferred until noise issues can be satisfactorily addressed?

Yes No

MCS accreditation ensures noise issues are monitored. It is not appropriate to place further obstacles in the way of its implementation.

Question 68

Should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines in AONBs and National Parks be required to be located within 50m of the nearest building which will utilise the electricity produced?

Yes No

A restriction of 50m may prevent the best exploitation of the wind resource on the site.

Question 69

Should permitted development for free standing wind turbines be removed in Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites?

Yes No

Question 70

Should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines be removed in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

Given neither are designated to protect amenity it is unreasonable to restrict turbines.

Question 71

Should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines within the curtilage of a Listed Building be removed?

Yes No

Hydro

Question 72

Do you agree that there should be no permitted development rights introduced for in-stream works associated with hydro microgeneration in non-domestic land uses?

Yes No

It should require full planning permission because of the complexity of the process.

Question 73

Should the provision of a new or replacement turbine house for an existing hydro microgeneration scheme be permitted development provided it is a maximum of 3m in height, has a maximum floor area of 10m², is located at least 5m from the building curtilage and not nearer to any road which bounds the curtilage than the part of the existing building nearest to that road?

Yes No

Question 74

Do you agree that no further restrictions on the permitted development rights for new or replacement turbine houses are necessary in AONBs and National Parks?

Yes No

Question 75

Should permitted development rights for new or replacement turbine houses be removed in Conservation Areas, World Heritage Sites, ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

Question 76

Should permitted development rights for new or replacement turbine houses associated with existing hydro schemes within the curtilage of a Listed Building only be removed where Listed Building Consent has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Biomass and combined heat and power plants

Question 77

Should a new building or extension to house a biomass or CHP boiler be permitted development provided the new building or extension has a maximum floorspace of 10m² and a maximum height of 3m?

Yes No

While CHP should be permitted development this is overly restrictive and too small in size to accommodate the type of CHP units that are currently in the marketplace. The thresholds proposed would render the CHP unit inefficient. The floorspace should be extended to at least 15m² with a height of 3.6m.

Question 78

Should a new building or extension to house a biomass or CHP boiler for non-domestic buildings with a floor area of 1,000m² or more be permitted development provided the new building or extension has a maximum floorspace of 75m² and maximum height of 3m?

Yes No

3m height isn't enough, this needs to be increased to at least 3.6m to tie in with what is available in the general marketplace. it is not appropriate to set thresholds which would result in a unit having to be specially manufactured. Advice should be sought regarding the latest technologies from the manufacturers with flexibility built into the guidance to allow the dimensions to be changed as technologies advance and monitoring of PD developments demonstrate the lack of amenity issues.

It is more appropriate to set the thresholds within a supplementary guidance note that can be updated every few years.

Question 79

Should permitted development rights for a new building or extension to house a biomass or CHP boiler require that the development is a minimum distance of 5m from any boundary of the building curtilage and not nearer to any road which bounds the curtilage than the part of the existing building nearest to that road.

Yes No

Question 80

Should it be a condition of permitted development rights for the provision of a biomass boiler for non-domestic use that the fuel must not include products derived from animal wastes or wood containing dangerous substances?

Yes No

Question 81

Do you agree that noise impacts from biomass and CHP boilers is a low risk and that this risk is minimised by other restrictions upon permitted development rights for boiler houses?

Yes No

Question 82

Should a new building or extension to an existing building to house fuel for a biomass boiler be permitted development provided the new building or extension has a maximum floorspace of 10m² and maximum height of 3m?

Yes No

Advice should be sought in relation to the most appropriate size thresholds to ensure an efficient boiler system although it would seem as a minimum. The maximum floorspace for fuel storage needs to be bigger, 15m² and 3.6m high.

Question 83

Should a new building or extension to an existing building to house fuel for a biomass boiler for non-domestic buildings with a floor area of 1,000m² or more be permitted development provided the new building or extension has a maximum floorspace of 75m² and maximum height of 3m?

Yes No

The thresholds should be set to ensure maximum efficiency and advice should be sought from the manufacturers as to what that level is although it would seem the height needs to be increased to at least 3.6m.

Question 84

Should permitted development rights for a new building or extension to an existing building to house fuel for a biomass boiler for non-domestic buildings be restricted to those located a minimum distance of 5m from any boundary of the building curtilage and not nearer to any road which bounds the curtilage than the part of the existing building nearest to that road?

Yes No

Question 85

Should permitted development rights for a new building or extension only apply to the first biomass/CHP boiler house and the first fuel biomass fuel store erected under permitted development rights within the curtilage of a building?

Yes No

More than one boiler may be needed.

Question 86

Should permitted development rights for the installation of a flue for a biomass or CHP system be allowed provided the height of the flue does not exceed 1m above the highest part of the existing roof?

Yes No

The flue height should be consistent with what is required for the system or specified by the manufacturer.

Question 87

Should permitted development rights for the replacement or alteration of an existing flue to allow it to be utilised by a biomass or CHP system be allowed provided the replaced or altered flue is located in the same place as the existing flue and is of dimensions that do not exceed the existing flue?

Yes No

Question 88

For biomass or CHP systems in industrial buildings do you consider the above proposals for permitted development could be replaced by permitted development rights for flues up to a maximum height of 15m above ground level without greatly increasing visual impacts?

Yes No

The flue must be capable of working within the system by providing the required draft. Some boilers will require a higher flue than others.

Where a site is already in industrial use it is feasible to increase the height beyond 15m as there will not be any risk to amenity of adjacent residents given they are already used to industrial operations and buildings.

Question 89

Do you agree that there should be no additional restrictions on permitted development rights for biomass and CHP boiler houses, fuel stores and flues within AONBs, National Parks, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites?

Yes No

Question 90

If you do not agree, what additional restrictions do you consider would be appropriate and please state your supporting reasons?

n/a

Question 91

Should permitted development rights for biomass and CHP boiler houses and fuel stores be removed in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

Given the ecological importance of this area it is appropriate to control burning given the risk to air and water quality which could threaten these important and sensitive environments.

Question 92

Should permitted development rights for a biomass or CHP boiler house, fuel store or flue only be removed where Listed Building Consent has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Question 93

Should permitted development rights be provided for anaerobic digestion plants on an agricultural unit?

Yes No

Question 94

If you agree that permitted development rights for anaerobic digestion plants should be provided should they be subject to similar restrictions to those for agricultural permitted development rights as outlined ?

n/a

Question 95

Should permitted development rights for anaerobic digestion plants be limited to those that use only materials generated on the agricultural unit on which the plant is located?

Yes No

Question 96

Do you agree that permitted development rights for anaerobic digestion plants do not need to be further restricted in AONBs, National Parks, World Heritage Sites or Conservation Areas?

Yes No

Question 97

Should permitted development rights for anaerobic digestion plants be removed in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

Question 98

Should permitted development rights for anaerobic digestion plants within the curtilage of a Listed Building only be removed where Listed Building Consent for the development has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Heat Pumps

Question 99

Should permitted development rights be provided for ground source heat pumps in non-domestic land uses, subject to appropriate restrictions?

Yes No

Question 100

Should permitted development rights for ground source heat pumps be restricted to those where the area of excavation does not exceed 0.5ha and the area of excavation is returned to its state prior to the development taking place?

Yes No

Question 101

Should permitted development rights for above ground elements necessary for the operation of a ground source heat pump within the curtilage of a building with floorspace of less than 1000m² be restricted to buildings or extensions that do not exceed 3m in height and of a maximum area of 10m²?

Yes No

Question 102

Should permitted development rights for above ground elements necessary for the operation of a ground source heat pump within the curtilage of a building with floorspace of 1000m² or more be restricted to buildings or extensions that do not exceed 3m in height and a maximum area of 75m²?

Yes No

Question 103

Should the above ground elements necessary for the operation of a ground source heat pump be required to be located a minimum of 5m from the boundary of the building curtilage and from any road, and to be located not nearer to any road that bounds the curtilage than that part of the existing building nearest to that road?

Yes No

Question 104

Do you agree that there should be no additional restrictions upon permitted development rights for ground source heat pumps within AONBs, National Parks, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites? _____

Yes No

Question 105

Should permitted development rights for ground source heat pumps be removed in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

Question 106

Should permitted development rights for above ground elements of a ground source heat pump within the curtilage of a Listed Building be removed only where Listed Building Consent for the development has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Question 107

Should permitted development rights be provided for water source heat pumps in non-domestic land uses subject to appropriate restrictions?

Yes No

Question 108

Should permitted development rights for water source heat pumps be restricted to those where the pipework does not exceed an area of 0.5ha?

Yes No

Question 109

Should permitted development rights for above ground elements necessary for the operation of a water source heat pump within the curtilage of a building with floorspace of less than 1000m² be restricted to buildings or extensions that do not exceed 3m in height and an area of 10m²?

Yes No

Question 110

Should permitted development rights for above ground elements necessary for the operation of a water source heat pump within the curtilage of a building with floorspace of 1000m² or more be restricted to buildings or extensions that do not exceed 3m in height and an area of 75m²?

Yes No

Question 111

Should the above ground elements necessary for the operation of a water source heat pump be required to be located a minimum of 5m from the boundary of the building curtilage and from any road, and to be located not nearer to any road that bounds the curtilage than that part of the existing building nearest to that road?

Yes No

Question 112

Do you agree that there should be no additional restrictions on permitted development rights for water source heat pumps within AONBs, National Parks, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites?

Yes No

Question 113

Should permitted development rights for water source heat pumps be removed in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

Question 114

Should permitted development rights for water source heat pumps within the curtilage of a Listed Building be removed only where Listed Building Consent for the development has not previously been granted?

Yes No

Question 115

Should permitted development rights for air source heat pumps be deferred until noise issues can be satisfactorily addressed?

Yes No

Question 116

Do you agree that a permitted development regime for air source heat pumps should not entail the user having to employ a technical expert to carry out a noise survey either before such rights are exercised or to prove compliance?

Yes No

Question 117

Should permitted development rights for air source heat pumps for buildings with a floor area of less than 1,000m² be restricted to a maximum volume of 30m³?

Yes No

Question 118

Should permitted development rights for air source heat pumps for buildings with a floor area of 1,000m² or more be restricted to a maximum volume of 75m³?

Yes No

Question 119

Should air source heat pumps be located a minimum distance of 5m from any boundary of the building curtilage and not nearer to any road which bounds the curtilage than the part of the existing building nearest to that road?

Yes No

Question 120

Should permitted development rights for air source heat pumps require that they do not exceed the height of the existing building?

Yes No

Question 121

Do you agree that there should be no additional restrictions on permitted development rights for air source heat pumps within AONBs or National Parks?

Yes No

Question 122

Should permitted development rights for air source heat pumps within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites be removed where any external element of the heat pump within the curtilage of the building is mounted on a wall that faces onto a road and is visible from that road?

Yes No

Question 123

Should permitted development rights for air source heat pumps be removed in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest?

Yes No

Question 124

Should permitted development rights for air source heat pumps within the curtilage of a Listed Building be removed only where Listed Building Consent for the development has not previously been granted?

Yes No

DOMESTIC MICROGENERATION

Question 1

Should restriction on permitted development rights for roof mounted solar panels on a dwellinghouse in ASSIs be removed on the basis that such development would not prejudice the reason for ASSI designation?

Yes No

They would have no impact on the ASSI.

Question 2

Should restriction on permitted development rights for wall mounted solar panels on a dwellinghouse in ASSIs be removed on the basis that such development would not prejudice the reason for ASSI designation?

Yes No

Question 3

Should permitted development rights for free standing solar panels within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest be removed?

Yes No

Question 4

Should permitted development rights for biomass fuel containers within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest be removed?

Yes No

Question 5

Should permitted development rights for building mounted wind turbines on dwellinghouses in ASSIs be removed as a precautionary measure to protect bats and birds?

Yes No

Single turbines pose little threat to bats and birds, The RSPB supports wind technology.

Question 6

Should permitted development rights for free standing wind turbines within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest be removed?

Yes No

Question 7

Should restrictions on permitted development rights for flues within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse in ASSIs be removed on the basis that such development would not prejudice the reason for ASSI designation?

Yes No

Question 8

Should permitted development rights for ground source heat pumps within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest be removed?

Yes No

Question 9

Should permitted development rights for water source heat pumps within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest be removed?

Yes No

Question 10

Should permitted development rights for air source heat pumps within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse in ASSIs and Sites of Archaeological Interest be removed?

Yes No