

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 June 2025 00:24:50 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1349

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/06/2025 12:24 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Ockley Park Ockley Hill Ockley Lane Hassocks West Sussex
Proposal:	The installation of 1 No. 25 metre high lattice tower mounted with 9 No. antenna apertures and 3 No. GPS nodes, 12 No. cabinets, within a compound comprised of 2.4 metre high green palisade fence, 1 No. electrical metre cabinet and associated development thereto
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 14 Downscroft Burgess Hill

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	The siting, positioning and development of this proposed, urban, intrusive, unattractive, alien structure would adversely affect the rural character of the area. It will be another blot on the landscape, introducing anxiety to the visitors, and locals aware of the known harmful effects of radiation associated with such an installation.

(It will be prominent, even more so when the trees shed their leaves naturally.)

This Planning Application must be rejected.

Reliance upon "Local Planning Authorities must determine applications on Planning Grounds only. They should not set health safeguards different from International Guidelines for Public Exposure" directly conflicts with the Council's and the Councillor's legal obligations.

As stated by Lord Gill in *Suffolk District Council v Hopkins Homes* "The guidance given by the framework is not to be interpreted as statute"

In their own literature, the INCIRP Guidelines refer to "substantiated adverse health effects"

The health and wellbeing of all is paramount.

Being aware of "substantiated adverse health effects" caused by radiofrequency EMFs and not allowing these to be inflicted upon the public is "not seeking to set health safeguards different from the International guidelines" it is instead, protecting the public from known exposure and the "substantiated adverse health effects" by not permitting the installation and erection of equipment that directly causes it.

These harms are clearly evidenced by the other objections lodged in response to this planning application.

It is our legal right not to be subjected to proven harmful emissions, leaving the public (including yourselves) increasingly vulnerable, whilst aware of these "substantiated adverse health effects" is simply unconscionable.

Look at the independent research that has been provided to you and also understand the industry funded marketing for what it is.

A self certified compliance certificate is meaningless.

People with metal inserts are excluded, have they been consulted?

This application must be rejected.

Kind regards