

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 July 2025 14:22:31 UTC+01:00
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 05/07/2025 2:22 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.
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	26 Rocky Drive Haywards Heath
----------	-------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Having carefully examined the above planning application for a new 5G mast to the south of Rocky Lane adjacent to the London to Brighton mainline, I find it essential to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal. 1) The new mast will not achieve the aims laid out in the planning application.

Page 30 of the 'planning statement' says clearly that 'the primary focus of the project is to deliver seamless 4G connectivity to passengers using the Brighton Main Line'. The final map in the 'Technical Support Statement' (pages unnumbered, map marked 'Annex C - Network Coverage') clearly shows a sizeable gap in coverage to the south of the proposed mast. The penultimate map in the 'Technical Support Statement' (marked 'Annex B - Predicted Radio Coverage from the Proposed Site') fails to account for the two bridges over the railway just to the north of the mast, which will cast a large 'signal shadow' onto the railway tracks. For these reasons alone, one must conclude that this is a rather poor location for a mast intended to provide 'seamless' coverage to the railway line.

2) The new mast will be of very questionable utility

The penultimate map in the 'Technical Support Statement' (marked 'Annex B - Predicted Radio Coverage from the Proposed Site') shows the very limited range that the mast will provide. It will only cover approximately 900 metres of railway line, which will take the train about 25 seconds to travel through. Coverage to the local area will be negligible. Only the houses right underneath the mast on the edge of the Beeches estate will receive any signal. The coverage barely reaches Rocky Lane to the north of the mast.

3) The mast will be very large

There seems to be some question over the actual height of the mast. The planning application repeatedly claims that it will be 22.5 metres tall, but the elevation drawing included with the application documents shows that the height from the base of the tower to the top of the sizeable antenna array will actually be 23.8 metres. The aerials mounted to the top of the antenna array will increase the height still further, to something in the region of 25 metres. This discrepancy demonstrates a concerning lack of transparency evident throughout the application.

The antenna array itself requires specific mention due to its size and scale. The large antennas will be mounted in a circular drum-like structure that will have a rather solid appearance. This will measure approximately six metres across by approximately four metres in height, which is about the size of a bungalow.

4) The mast will be a dominant and defining feature in the landscape

Because the structure is more than double the height of the trees around it, the enormous antenna array will be clearly visible above even full summer foliage. It will totally dominate the outlook from nearby homes - the western side of the Beeches estate, the Kilnwood apartments, and the southern side of Bolnore village.

This appears in direct contravention of guidelines set out in the 'Mid-Sussex District Plan' for installation of communications infrastructure, which states that 'The location and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area' (pg72)

5) The mast will be very close to the edge of the Beeches estate

The planning application states that the mast will be located 110 metres away from the closest houses. However, examination of the map shows that this is inaccurate. The mast will in reality be located just around 40 metres from the exercise & children's play area on the edge of the Beeches estate, and just 70 metres from the row of houses. This is an error of about 40 metres, which is more than 50% of the real distance. Sizeable cooling fans at the base of the installation will be clearly audible from the houses on the western side of the Beeches estate.

6) The mast is a clear danger to health

A 2021 report commissioned by the European Union entitled 'Health Impact of 5G' concluded that 5G frequencies from 450 to 6000MHZ are 'probably carcinogenic' and 'clearly affect male fertility, and possibly female fertility too'. The study also concluded that exposure to these frequencies had 'possible adverse effects on the development of embryos, foetuses and newborns'. The report goes on to suggest that radiation limits from 5G installations such as the proposed mast be reduced by a factor of ten.

Because it is so close to the railway for which it is intended to provide signal, the mast will require antenna that are angled steeply downwards. If the antenna array were to be pointed straight ahead in a more conventional configuration, the signal would pass over the top of the train as it travelled by. This is a very unusual and troubling configuration. The steep angle required for this installation places the children's play area and the houses on the western side of the Beeches estate in direct and intense line of fire from the transmitter.

Because the mast will carry antenna to provide frequency coverage for four MNOs, the amount of radiation to which residents will be exposed at an unusual and disturbingly short distance is multiple times greater than that used in setting the ICNIRP guidelines cited in the planning application. The ICNIRP guidelines are now over 25 years old and out of date. They only cover the thermal heating effects of radiation, and only for specific frequencies - one at a time - and exposure periods of up to 30 minutes. The houses and play area below the mast will receive exposure to multiple frequencies from an astonishingly short distance away, all day, every day. This is extremely serious.

This information alone should clearly rule out the present location suggested for the mast.

7) Access to the mast represents a clear danger to life

The planning application proposes that a new junction be built to the east off the southern extent of Rocky Lane, about 175 metres to the south of the roundabout where Rocky Lane meets the A272. The site proposed for this new junction is in a steep valley, with a sharp bend severely limiting visibility to the south, and foliage limiting visibility uphill to the north towards the roundabout. The speed limit on the road is 40mph, and cars often come around the bend in either direction at some considerable speed.

The drawings showing the junction provided with the application appear entirely insufficient. The 'Junction Design' drawing shows only two or three metres to the south of the proposed entrance and perhaps five metres to the north. A consultation response from WSCC highways notes that visibility of 2.4 by 120 metres would be required for this junction given the speed limit. This would be impossible particularly to the south due to the bend in the road.

I do not believe it would be possible to construct a safe junction at this location without totally altering the shape and layout of the road. The design proposed represents a clear danger to life.

8) Access around the field represents a clear risk to local ecosystems

The proposed site of the mast is directly adjacent to large veteran trees. The proposed accessway around the edge of the field to the mast site runs parallel to a watercourse bordering on ancient and protected ancient woodland. Construction and maintenance of a mast in this location would be extremely disruptive to delicate local species such as bats, owls, newts, and glow worms - present in the woods below the proposed site. The planning application disregards this issue entirely, avoiding the point by focusing only on the habitats within the field around which the accessway is to be constructed. This does not give an accurate view of the local environment.

9) The planning application itself contains numerous omissions and inaccuracies

As I read through the planning application and supporting documents, I became aware of a pattern of omission and inaccuracy. Simple facts like the height of the mast and the distance to nearby houses are incorrect by a significant factor. The drawing for the proposed junction does not show enough of the road to be able to assess the safety of the entrance, as noted

in the response from WSCC highways.

The 'photomontage' document contains images showing how the proposed mast will look in the landscape, but the locations chosen are bizarrely distant from the mast. No attempt has been made to show how the mast will look from the homes near to it.

Assessment of the environmental impact of construction and maintenance of the mast and associated accessway seems lacking. Information about the removal of certain trees appears missing, and no mention is made of the adjoining ancient woodland and the delicate flora and fauna it contains.

The application largely ignores the impact the mast will have on residents of nearby homes. The 'Planning, Design, and Access Statement' states that 'residential properties are located some distance from the site', which is untrue, and that 'only the top of the mast will be visible in long distance views', which is also untrue, and totally ignores the massive size of the top of the mast.

Such obvious omissions and inaccuracies call the whole application into question.

10) Limited attempts have been made to inform and engage with the local community

I am very concerned that only those properties extremely close to the proposed mast have been notified of the planning application, and that insufficient time has been given for local residents to research and consider the proposal. Key information such as the exact location of the proposed mast and the size and visual appearance of the structure were initially frustratingly obscure. It is likely that many residents have not had the time to find out these basic pieces of information about the proposal.

11) Alternative equipment would be a better fit for the project

The stated objective of this proposal is to provide 'seamless' coverage to the London to Brighton mainline. The Mid Sussex District Plan states that 'The location and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area', and that 'Preference will be for use to be made of existing sites rather than the provision of new sites'. Smaller antenna arrays that make use of pre-existing railway infrastructure, do not adjoin or point at nearby residential buildings, and would provide better coverage over the long and narrow London to Brighton mainline, would be a better fit for this project. Instead, the application has proposed a gigantic mast in the middle of a field.

I understand that when considering a large mast, the 'Code of practice for wireless network development in England' requires justification to be made as to why smaller installations would not work. No attempt seems to have been made in the planning application to approach this.

12) Alternative locations would better suit the project

It is startling and bizarre that this location has been selected for the proposed mast. It is very, very close to residential buildings, directly oriented at said residential buildings which dramatically increases health concerns, and provides poor coverage with a large gap to the south and sizeable signal shadow to the north. The suggestion of alternative sites made in the 'Planning, Design, and Access Statement' appears token. Only four other sites are suggested, of which two make no sense at all.

I suggest that as an absolute minimum, significantly more work must be done to identify a number of potential sites before one could be put forward for consideration.

Moreover, significant work should be spent evaluating alternative sizes and types of equipment to fulfil the stated aims of the project so close to both densely populated residential areas and valuable ancient native woodland.

I would urge all concerned to reject this proposal which stands to cause significant harm to residents and the environment alike, while providing almost no benefit even to passengers of the vanishingly short stretch of railway that it is designed to serve.

Kind regards