

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 April 2025 12:30:43 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/0589

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 02/04/2025 12:30 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of Leylands Road Burgess Hill West Sussex
Proposal:	The installation of 1 No. 30 metre high lattice tower mounted with 9 No. antennas, 12 No. cabinets, within a compound comprised of 2.4 metre high palisade fencing painted green, 1 No. electrical metre cabinet and associated development thereto.
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 16 The Willows Burgess Hill

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	1. I understand that this application will be assessed to be in conformance with the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024). Section 10 Para 119 explains that communications infrastructure should be a part of a plan to include all mobile and fibre communications etc. Section 10 Para 120 explains that the number of sites / antennas should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers. a. Where are the comments from the existing operators explaining

why they can't meet the needs of the railway?

b. We already have 4 providers providing service in this area. I always get coverage on the train in this area.

c. It also says that it should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged. The mast is the largest allowed (30m) and no attempt has been made to disguise it. Why is this? Why can't an existing mast structure be used?

d. Section 10 para 122 says that nearby schools should be consulted. Manor Field / Oak Tree Primary School is only 325 metres away but has not been consulted. (see Site Specific Supplementary Information)

2. The Technical Support Statement Annexe A and B . Two other mast locations are shown, one South of Hayward Heath and one south of Burgess Hill both apparently in the middle of fields.

a. The reason that this Mast location has been chosen is that it sits between the two without regard to the fact it will be in a built-up area.

b. It can be clearly seen that more masts will be needed to fill in the holes in coverage - again there is no proper plan.

3 The "Site Specific Supplementary Information" statement says there

a. are few alternative locations due to topology of the area "and the location of the railway line which is often within a cutting". But none of the area covered by this Mast (see Annexe B) is in a cutting.

b. are two other poles that have been refused on Valebridge Road (532052 / 20567) which were 10 and 15 metres high. Why is a Mast 30m high now being considered very close by in this green corridor in a built-up area.

4 The Burgess Hill Town Plan includes the following policy

POLICY G4 LOCAL GREEN SPACE

The following sites and areas and sites are designated as Local Green Spaces and protected from development.

- Land between Chanctonbury Road and the railway line The green space forming part of Burgess Hill Rugby Club on the boundary of Dunstall ward (Sparrow Way) and Snake Wood (ancient woodland).

- Land immediately west of Wivelsfield Station, north and south of Leylands Road.

- Green space and wooded areas to the west of the railway line adjacent to St. Wilfrid's Bridge.

Why is Mid Sussex ignoring the Burgess Hill Town Plan?

Kind regards