

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 November 2025 12:57:59 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 26/11/2025 12:57 PM.

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:	23 Rocky Drive 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 am writing with concern on behalf of our family of 4, to formally object to Planning Application DM/25/1495, which proposes the installation of a 22.5 metre lattice mast with 9 antennas, 12

cabinets, and an electrical meter cabinet within a 2.4 metre fenced compound.

As a local resident and parent of young children, I have serious concerns about the impact this proposal would have on the local environment, residential character, and public health.

The Visual and Environmental Impact of a 22.5 metre mast would be highly intrusive and visually dominant, particularly in a setting where the surrounding built environment is of much lower scale. The structure would not blend with the character of the area, detracting from the visual amenity and the sense of rural or semi-rural landscape that residents value deeply.

This installation, including its chain-link fencing and multiple large cabinets, would create an industrial appearance entirely out of keeping with its surroundings. The cumulative effect would be a significant loss of visual quality, particularly for nearby homes and public pathways.

The Impact on Residential Amenity shows that the proposed site is close to residential properties where families live, play, and spend time outdoors. The presence of such a tall and conspicuous structure would negatively affect residential amenity, both in terms of outlook and the sense of tranquility that the area currently provides.

There are also legitimate concerns about the constant operational noise from the electrical and telecommunications equipment, especially during quiet hours, which would further detract from residents' enjoyment of their homes and gardens.

The Public Health and Precautionary Concerns, although official guidance states that masts must comply with ICNIRP exposure limits, many parents remain deeply uneasy about the long-term exposure of children to electromagnetic fields (EMFs), especially given the continuing scientific debate and the lack of long-term independent studies on cumulative exposure effects.

As a parent of growing children, I believe it is entirely reasonable to apply the precautionary principle that where there is scientific uncertainty, we should take caution. Our children's health and well-being must take precedence over commercial convenience.

As an Alternative Siting and Need, there appears to have been insufficient exploration of alternative sites that would minimise visual and residential impact. Government and MSDC planning guidance both encourage mast-sharing and the use of existing structures where possible. Before approving a new 22.5 metre lattice mast, it should be demonstrated beyond doubt that:

- Existing infrastructure cannot be upgraded or shared
 - Less visually intrusive alternatives were properly considered
 - The site selection process prioritised environmental and
-

community impact mitigation

Without this evidence, we feel the proposal does not meet the criteria of "least intrusive means", as encouraged under both NPPF paragraph 117 and local planning policy DP21 (Telecommunications).

The Impact on Local Ecology, would see the proposed compound and access arrangements, likely disturb local habitats and wildlife, particularly if the location involves hedgerows, mature trees, or green corridors. Given the council's climate and biodiversity commitments, it would be inconsistent to approve a development that may contribute to ecological degradation.

In light of the above, I respectfully request that the Council refuse Planning Application DM/25/1495 on the following planning grounds:

- Adverse visual and landscape impact
- Unacceptable harm to residential amenities
- Failure to adequately consider alternative siting and mast-sharing
- Potential health and wellbeing risks, particularly for children
- Negative environmental and ecological impact is inconsistent with local and national policy

This proposal would bring little local benefit while permanently changing the visual and emotional character of the area for residents who value its peace, greenery, and suitability for raising families.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objection. I would appreciate being kept informed of any developments or hearings related to this application.

Kind regards
Bernard Weber

Kind regards