

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 March 2026 16:38:34 UTC+00:00
To: "Catherine Cardin" <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0328

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 06/03/2026 4:38 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of 1 Burdocks Drive Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 0HJ
Proposal:	Proposed installation of a 17.5m monopole supporting 6 no. antennas, 2 no. 300mm transmission dishes, 3 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary development there to including 3 no. Remote Radio Heads (RRHs).
Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 2 Wykeham Way Burgess Hill

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am writing to formally object to the above planning application for the installation of a 17.5 metre telecommunications mast and associated equipment in the residential area north of Burdocks Drive, Burgess Hill, RH15 0HJ My objection is based on several concerns regarding the proposal's impact on the local community, including its suitability

within a residential setting, potential health considerations, visual intrusion, and overall risk.

Firstly, the proposed mast height of 17.5 metres would be significantly out of character with the surrounding residential environment. The structure would introduce a dominant and intrusive feature within an area primarily composed of residential homes, gardens, and community spaces. Such a large installation in close proximity to houses would negatively affect the visual amenity and character of the neighbourhood.

Secondly, the siting of the mast extremely close to residential properties raises concerns regarding the precautionary principle and the well-being of residents, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and individuals with health sensitivities. While telecommunications infrastructure must comply with national exposure guidelines, many residents remain concerned about the long-term and cumulative health impacts of continuous radio frequency emissions when installations are located so close to homes. As yet, such emissions from 5g frequencies have not been proven safe.

Thirdly, the proposal presents potential safety and environmental concerns. The installation of telecommunications cabinets, associated equipment, and maintenance access could introduce additional risks and disruption within a residential area that was not designed for such infrastructure. The presence of a tall mast may also pose structural and safety concerns during extreme weather conditions.

Furthermore, the applicant has not demonstrated that alternative sites-such as industrial areas, commercial zones, existing telecommunications infrastructure, or locations further from residential dwellings-have been fully explored. Locating such equipment in less sensitive areas would significantly reduce its impact on residents while still achieving network coverage objectives.

Given these concerns, I respectfully request that the council carefully consider the cumulative impact of this development on the local community and refuse the application in its current form. At the very least, the applicant should be required to investigate and propose alternative sites that are more appropriate and less intrusive.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objection. I would appreciate confirmation that my comments have been received and recorded as part of the consultation process.

Kind regards

