

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 May 2025 09:35:04 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 12/05/2025 9:35 AM.

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 6 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. (amended plans received 25.04.2025, amended photo montage received 01.05.2025 and amended description 06.05.2025)
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	6 The Blackthorns Burgess Hill
----------	--------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I would like to voice my objection to the proposal to build a 31.3 metre high phone mast, planning reference DM/25/0589. The environmental impact of building this mast was not sufficiently assessed due to the ecological survey taking place at an inappropriate time of year when various species known to inhabit

the area were not observed. These include, but are not limited to, woodpigeons (amber list), tawny owls (amber list), woodpeckers, foxes, bats, stag beetles. This is acknowledged in the report, therefore it would be premature to permit this application going forward without a full and complete survey taking place. There has also been no consideration to camouflaging the mast in order to blend in with the surroundings. Large white oblongs are not known in this area. As a 'through route' to the Bedelands Nature reserve only metres away, and part of the Green Circle, this mast would be grossly out of keeping. In addition, the plan states that there is no flood risk, however anyone that has walked the path during or after rain will know that this is not the case. As a resident backing on to the waterway, I have been reminded on numerous occasions by MSDC and Southern Water to ensure it is kept clear to avoid flood risk. Due to the effects of climate change, we have seen more and more occurrences of flooding, and without proper consideration during planning this will only get worse.

This proposal appears to be completely disproportionate to the aims of the applicant and offer no benefit to the local community. For the stated 50,000 commuters that this mast is supposed to benefit, the scale of this mast appears to be vastly overstated compared with the existing cellular infrastructure in Burgess Hill for a population of >30,000. Why is a mast such as this required when other forms of transport, e.g. buses, coaches and planes are able to provide connectivity to passengers without such large infrastructure?

I urge the planning committee to reject this application on the basis that there is little benefit compared with the environmental impact the mast's construction will cause.

Kind regards