

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 December 2025 10:09:18 UTC+00:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1495

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/12/2025 10:09 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adj. To Rocky Lane Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	The installation of a 22.5 metre lattice mast, mounted with 9No. antennas, 12No. cabinets, 1No. Electrical meter cabinet located within a compound comprised of 2.4 metre high chain-link fence topped with 3 strands of barbed wire and the creation of a new access from Rocky Lane and ancillary development thereto. (Additional Highways information received 08.07.2025 and additional ecology information received 10.11.2025)
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	1 Old House Lane Haywards Heath
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Sir or Madam, I wish to register my firm objection to the above planning application. While I recognise the importance of modern digital infrastructure, this proposal is wholly inappropriate for the location

and would inflict serious and unnecessary harm on the character, amenity, and environmental quality of the area. I urge the planning authority to refuse permission for the following reasons:

1. Excessive Visual Intrusion and Disproportionate Scale

The proposed mast is of a size and industrial appearance entirely at odds with its rural/residential surroundings. Its height and bulk would impose a stark, intrusive presence on the landscape, severely undermining the area's established character. The installation would constitute a dominant and unsightly feature that cannot be mitigated by landscaping or screening.

Recent decisions from planning authorities across the country demonstrate that such structures are routinely refused when they cause significant visual harm, particularly in open or sensitive landscapes. This proposal is no different and should be treated accordingly.

2. Harm to Residential Outlook and Local Amenity

The mast would impose a substantial visual burden on nearby homes, gardens, and public spaces, disrupting the sense of openness and tranquility currently afforded by the setting. For many residents, the structure would become the defining focal point of their daily view, diminishing enjoyment of their properties and eroding the peaceful nature of the locality.

Such an overpowering loss of outlook is an unreasonable and unnecessary impact on established communities.

3. Environmental Damage and Loss of Biodiversity

The installation risks the removal or degradation of existing vegetation, including mature trees and hedgerows that play a vital role in supporting local ecosystems. These natural features contribute to wildlife habitats, biodiversity corridors, air-quality regulation, and surface-water management.

Construction activity, ground disturbance, and maintenance access all pose a credible threat of long-term and potentially irreversible ecological harm. Safeguarding these natural assets must take precedence over placing a mast in this unsuitable position.

4. Unacceptable Precedent and Gradual Erosion of Landscape Integrity

Approving this proposal would set an unwelcome precedent for further intrusive infrastructure in similarly inappropriate locations. Such incremental encroachment leads to the slow but steady erosion of countryside character, urbanising landscapes that

should remain open, green, and visually coherent.

Protecting the integrity of the wider environment requires a clear and consistent refusal of developments that are fundamentally at odds with their setting.

5. Availability of More Appropriate Alternatives

National and local guidance consistently encourages the use of less visually intrusive solutions-such as co-location with existing structures, use of building-mounted equipment, shared infrastructure, or siting in areas of lower sensitivity. None of these more proportionate and responsible options appear to have been adequately explored in this case.

Infrastructure rollout must not default to the most convenient option for the operator when better alternatives exist that avoid imposing serious harm on established communities.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, this proposal fails to uphold the principles of responsible planning and would cause avoidable and lasting damage to the character, amenity, and environmental quality of the area. I therefore urge the planning authority to refuse this application and require the applicant to pursue a more suitable and less harmful solution.

Yours faithfully,

Jonathan Goldsmith

Kind regards