

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 March 2025 19:27:29 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 28/03/2025 6:27 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:	23, Valebridge Road Burgess Hill
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Additional Objections to Proposed 5G Mast Planning Application Dear Sir/Madam, Further to my previous objection lodged earlier today, we wish to raise additional concerns regarding the proposed installation of a 5G mast at the land north of Laylands Road, with reference to the Mid Sussex District Plan and relevant planning policies:

1. Non-Compliance with Local Planning Policies

The proposed development appears to conflict with policies outlined in the Mid Sussex District Plan, particularly those pertaining to environmental protection, heritage conservation, and community well-being. For instance:

- Policy DP26: Character and Design - This policy emphasizes that all development should contribute positively to the distinctive character and sense of place of the area. The introduction of a 5G mast at the proposed location does not align with this objective, potentially disrupting the existing aesthetic, environment and architectural harmony.

- Policy DP37: Trees, Woodland, and Hedgerows - the installation requires the removal or detrimental impact on existing trees and hedgerows, it is contrary to this policy, which seeks to protect and enhance the district's natural assets.

2. Proximity to Sensitive Areas

The proposed site is in close proximity to nearby schools, residential streets, playing fields and care facilities at Laylands Road, which are considered sensitive locations. The siting of telecommunications equipment near such facilities is discouraged due to potential concerns from the community regarding visual impact and perceived health risks, even if unfounded.

3. Impact on Heritage Assets

- the proposed location is on a conservation area, the installation adversely affects the setting of heritage assets. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local policies require that developments preserve or enhance the character and appearance of heritage assets and their settings.

4. Cumulative Impact -

There are already be existing telecommunications infrastructure within the vicinity. The addition of another mast contributes to visual clutter, exacerbating the cumulative impact on the landscape and local character, which is discouraged under both local and national planning policies.

5. Insufficient Justification for Height and Design -

The application lacks a thorough justification for the chosen height and design of the mast. Alternative designs that could potentially reduce visual impact, such as less obtrusive structures in alternative locations that have commercial and industrial uses elsewhere within the town and at higher elevation than low lying ground in the proposed location on the nature reserve, do not appear to have been adequately considered or presented.

6. Lack of Compliance with Code of Best Practice -

The government's Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England outlines guidelines for the siting and design of telecommunications equipment. The proposal does not demonstrate adherence to these guidelines, particularly in minimising visual impact and engaging with the local community.

Given these additional concerns, I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this application and request that the applicant explores

alternative solutions that are more in keeping with local planning policies and the character of the area.

Kind regards