

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 April 2025 16:49:20 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <hamish.evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/0589

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/04/2025 4:49 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of Leylands Road Burgess Hill West Sussex
Proposal:	The installation of 1 No. 30 metre high lattice tower mounted with 9 No. antennas, 12 No. cabinets, within a compound comprised of 2.4 metre high palisade fencing painted green, 1 No. electrical metre cabinet and associated development thereto.
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 11 Coopers Close Burgess Hill

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	We are situated to the North of the proposed development and have lived in our property for over 40 years. The existing trees near the planned development are visible from our road, over neighbouring houses, all year round. They are visible from ground level and more so from upper floors and roof, so the proposed structure, at some 10m higher than the tallest nearby tree, will be significantly visible, particularly if it has a dense cluster array of antennae at its apex.

We raise the following Objections:-

The siting of mast:

No rationale or specific need appears to have been provided for the reason for the requirement for the mast, nor of the siting chosen for the mast nor any explanation for the need for the mast to be so high therefore the reason can only be surmised, however it appears to be the tallest mast allowable, positioned in the lowest land setting for the locale.

If height is the main criteria then why not utilise the existing nearby electricity pylon alongside the railway bridge at Rocky Lane?

The location criteria may be met by simply expanding on the existing telecoms mast on the other side of the railway track on Valebridge Road.

If coverage is the requirement, might not this be better achieved by a different (higher) location. This seems to have been the accepted premise for transmitters previously.

As it stands, this appears to be an unnecessary development that will be environmentally and visually disruptive both in the short and long term.

Effect on wildlife:

We live in a rural setting and over the years have noticed a significant decline in the numbers of wildlife in the local area. We used to observe both bats and Greater Spotted woodpeckers regularly commuting between Long Wood, Coopers Shaw and the woodland surrounding the proposed site.

The woodland near the proposed development suffered when the embankment was repaired, with several mature trees dying as a result. The arboreal survey is unclear as to whether any of the deceased trees will be cleared during development with resulting loss of habitat.

Also, There are studies that raise concern regarding the adverse impact of Ultra high frequency noise and higher EMF (electromagnetic field) strength signals transmitted via masts on bats and the insects they feed on.

Effect on local Solar PV production:

We have Solar PV panels on our roof the start of whose electric production is controlled by the sunrise over the rooftops of the neighbours houses on the southern side of the road. This is in general line of sight with the proposed development. Houses nearer the proposed development will be materially affected by the sun blocking effect of the mast and particularly the antenna array, especially in winter when the suns path is lower in the sky. No consideration appears to be made for this.

Visual effect:

The combination of the height of the structure, along with siting it

in an area of nature, at a lower level of a rising conurbation topography means that the mast will be visible to a large number of houses on the north and Eastern sides of the town. This is in conflict with policies outlined in the Mid Sussex District Plan of heritage conservation, and community well-being. Also, no detail has been provided for the mitigation of visual disruption caused by the development other than the colour of the fencing. What colour will the cabinets be, likewise how will the mast be coloured, bearing in mind its differing effect from each viewpoint.

We urge the Council to refuse this application and seek the applicant to explore an alternate solution that is more attuned with local planning policies and the character of the area.

Kind regards