

Mr Hamish Evans
Planning Services Division
MSDC
Oaklands
Oaklands Road
Hayward Heath
RH16 1SS



6th April 2025

Dear Hamish

Ref; DM/25/0589

I strongly oppose the above detailed planning application, for the following reasons and pose questions to the Council, which I'd be grateful to have acknowledged and answered.

The proposed 31.3m lattice tower and 9 antennas would be **out of character** with the surroundings, with the potential to **cast its shadow** over properties. We chose our property on the basis of a good trade-off between living in very close proximity to a busy mainline railway line and the wonderful, protected, wildlife haven between. The mast would be an inappropriate addition to this beautiful green space setting and would be a massive and **incongruous** eye sore, seen by the whole neighbourhood and beyond. We would lose our **visual amenity** and also our privacy. The 30m+ lattice tower will dominate the area and the top section will be highly visible above the tree line from all angles. Screening will only apply during the summer months, including any considered 'dampening effect' of foliage to potential noise pollution.

The proposed mast is in a heavily residential area on both sides of the railway and is far too close to dwellings, our home being only 75m away.

I have a pacemaker and have researched into ICNIRP Guidelines regarding the safety of individuals with metal implants in their bodies. **Can the Council guarantee that my pacemaker won't be affected by the proximity of this mast? Can the Council guarantee that the ICNIRP certification covers people with metal implants in their bodies?**

The 'Declaration of Conformity' does not appear to be a certificate. Please can the Council seek confirmation of this particularly important aspect?

An extract taken from the ICNIRP Guidelines quotes;

“Compliance with the present guidelines may not necessarily preclude interference with, or the effects on, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators and cochlear implants.”

The ICNIRP does not cover any wildlife or plants.

Only 14 households were notified. The letters included the incorrect closing date for submission of comments as 3rd April. Only one site notice was provided near to the proposed site; this mentions the closing date for comments as 10th April. This seems very confusing and unfortunate, considering the level of objections already received for this proposal. I believe there is potential for some individuals to not email their objections, as the MSDC website now clearly states;

“Comments may not be submitted at this time. The consultation for this period has now ended.”

Please could a further message be included on the website to explain the date error, and that comments can be sent via email until 10th April 2025?

Further questions to the Planning Committee;

- MSDC purchased the land in 2013. What was the purpose of buying this land?
- **What is the specific reason for the mast?** The technical drawings depict the 9 antennas as pointing away from the railway line. The proposal states that the purpose of the mast is to provide better coverage for train users. The information given by the Operator is unclear.
- Was the Council previously made aware of the potential loss of Visual Amenity, i.e. the sheer scale and bulk of the mast and how it might be perceived as **disproportionate and completely incongruous** to the surrounding environment?
- **Potential ‘relegation’ of the Wildlife Site, in terms of the ecological importance of the area;** why were the other two locations (initially considered for the mast), later dropped? If the answer is related to the protection of valued green space, then the land in question shares its biodiversity directly with Bedelands Nature Reserve. Owls, bats, hedgehogs, stoats, woodpeckers, birds of prey, frogs, newts, moths and butterflies have all been observed. Other local nature reserves are designated habitats for the Brown Hairstreak Butterfly and there is potential for this species to be found at this site also. **Will the Council demand a full Ecological Survey, if the proposed mast is to go ahead?**

Misleading information: Why were the montage images produced from photographs taken in the Summer, whilst the ecological survey was conducted in the Winter? Surely the timings of these two surveys should have been swapped, in order to not appear deceptive/misleading? We have observed bats each evening, emerging from the dead oak that will be removed as part of this planning application. 'Strategic' photography (in order to create the montage images) used summer foliage and 'clever' positioning, thus providing a false impression, in some instances. There can be no denying that a lattice tower will be a complete eyesore in a natural area and to suggest otherwise, seems misleading.

- **Important Omissions from reports submitted;** Why was the water course omitted from the ecological survey?
- **Loss of privacy:** There would be a profound loss of privacy. What assurances do we have that surveillance cameras would not be in operation? And will we be subjected to constant maintenance behind our homes?
- Why is the proposed positioning of the mast to the front of the railway embankment area, which has not been future proofed against potential further landslip? This area was badly affected in 2019 by a major landslip. The demise of large trees during this period, greatly destabilised the whole embankment area. That said, the dead oak trees are all inhabited by roosting bats. What assurances do the Council have that these bats will be safeguarded?
- Does the MSDC have evidence that Network Rail is aware of this proposal and any possible implications regarding the placement of the mast?
- **Noise Pollution:** Will any cooling fans make a noise, especially during the Summer?
- Is this sustainable technology? Does the Council have an **Environmental Impact Assessment** for this or any mast?
- Why were the local schools and nurseries not contacted, (i.e. Oak Tree Primary and Little Explorers) especially as children are deemed "sensitive receptors".

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

