

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 July 2025 22:06:36 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 10:06 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:	6 Buckeridge Way Haywards Heath
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	We strongly oppose this planning application and urge Mid Sussex District Council to reject it in full. While we of course recognise the need for improved internet connectivity, this must not come at the expense of our local environment, community, or the visual integrity of the area. The proposed 5G mast would cause harm to local biodiversity, disrupt the rural and residential character of the landscape, and raise valid health concerns with

negligible benefit. This application is inappropriate for this location, and we respectfully request that Mid-Sussex Council give full and careful consideration to the detailed objections outlined below.

Biodiversity: The proposed site for the mast installation is currently a wild, undeveloped area that supports a diverse range of species. The surrounding land, including the adjacent Foundry Gardens development, is home to various animals, plants, and trees (including larger wildlife such as deer and badgers). Construction and long-term operation of the mast will disrupt local ecosystems, inevitably reducing biodiversity. The Environmental Health Trust cites multiple peer-reviewed studies showing that essential pollinators like bees can be adversely affected by 5G masts, impairing their ability to pollinate. This poses a threat to local biodiversity. Alternative, less sensitive sites must be considered.

Overbearing Presence: It is clear from this application that the new mast will be well above the treeline based on diagrams and statements which confirm that 'the lowest array of antennas has to be above the surrounding trees to work effectively'. The installation of this phone mast will therefore be overbearing to local properties due to its scale, visual impact, and proximity to residential homes. It would dominate the surrounding landscape, severely break the character of the area and reduce the aesthetic value of the neighbouring developments, affecting the value of local homes. Alternative, less intrusive locations should be considered to preserve visual integrity of the area and the residential amenity.

Health Concerns: The installation of a 5G phone mast raises potential health concerns due to prolonged exposure to radio-frequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF) for local residents. While research remains limited and inconclusive, there is growing concern that certain groups, particularly children and individuals with pre-existing health conditions could be more vulnerable to potential effects. Given this uncertainty, it would be prudent to take a precautionary approach and explore alternative locations away from residential areas to minimise potential risks to public health, particularly given the number of children living in the neighbouring developments.

Minimal Benefit: According to the supporting documents, the proposed mast will improve coverage over approximately 0.75 miles (around 1,200 metres) of track. A Class 700 Thameslink train which is one of the main trains on that route, is roughly 250 metres long and travels this section at an average speed of 60 mph according Network Rail specifications, meaning passengers would only experience enhanced coverage for less than one minute. As a daily commuter to London Bridge, a journey lasting around 45 minutes, this improvement is negligible and overlooks

many other parts of the route with limited or no coverage. Furthermore, the proposal offers no tangible benefit to local residents, making it unacceptable to impose significant disruption on the community for such minimal gain.

Kind regards