

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 April 2026 01:09:23 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0568

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/04/2026 1:09 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Network Rail London To Brighton Railway - Copyhold Junction To Haywards Heath Station Clair Road Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	The installation of an 8.1m pole supporting four antennas, with one equipment cabinet on steel mesh grillage with a handrail and screw pile foundations
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:	Industry Admissions of Harm: Swisscom Patent & BT Report The Council is now on notice of industry-led evidence of biological harm. Swisscom Patent WO2004075583A1 explicitly states that RF radiation has "genotoxic effects" and that "human DNA can be damaged" with the risk of "cancer-triggering" effects, even at levels below standard guidelines. Furthermore, in its 2017 Annual Report, BT Group PLC identified RF emissions as a "Critical

Risk," admitting that the technology carries significant litigation and financial liability risks due to potential health harm. Statutory Duty of Protection (Health and Social Care Act 2012) The Council is reminded of its duties under the Health and Social Care Act 2012, Section 11 (inserting Section 2A into the NHS Act 2006). This places a statutory duty on authorities to protect the public from "other dangers to health," which explicitly includes "ionising or non-ionising radiation" (Section 2A(3)(a)). Given my presence in the area as a pacemaker user, the Council has a specific duty to protect me and other residents in a similar situation from the "danger to health" posed by non-ionising radiation interference.

The Insurance Void & Internal Audit Notification

Major insurers, including Lloyd's of London, apply Exclusion 32 (Electromagnetic Control Exclusion), which explicitly refuses to cover any liability for "biological, health or other effects" of non-ionising radiation. If the multi-billion-pound telecoms industry and global insurers refuse to cover the risks of this technology, why is this Council asking the local taxpayers to self-insure that liability? To the Head of Internal Audit: I am formally raising this as a governance and risk management failure. By permitting an uncertified mast, the Council is "self-insuring" against unquantifiable personal injury claims without a designated budget. This unmanaged financial liability is currently absent from your Corporate Risk Register and represents a critical failure in the Council's fiduciary duties. The Council has a duty to ensure that any infrastructure it approves is backed by a robust safety and financial net.

I request that the Council require the applicants to provide written evidence of a current insurance policy that explicitly covers "Non-ionising Radiation" or "Pollution Liability" for RF-related health claims.

If the applicants cannot provide this-as is standard for the industry-then the Council must acknowledge that it is approving a project that carries an unmitigated financial risk to the community. MHRA Guidance & Breach of Equality Duty

The MHRA guidance warns that RF sources can cause life-threatening malfunctions in active implants like mine. Approving a mast here without a site-specific risk assessment for those with medical implants is a breach of your Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under the Equality Act 2010

Kind regards