

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 March 2026 12:41
To: planninginfo
Subject: DM/26/0328 Land north of Burdocks Drive, Burgess Hill

[REDACTED]
DM/26/0328 17.5m monopole application

Land north of Burdocks Drive, Burgess Hill

Dear Sirs

We have tried the online access but this appears to have been closed. We are therefore emailing you.

We wish to register our objections to the above planning application on the following grounds:

This is a purely residential area and the visual impact of the proposed mast (along with associated cabinets) will be extremely detrimental to the long established character of the surrounding area. The mast is too high, visually dominating and unappealing. It is incongruous to the nature of this neighbourhood.

It will represent an alien feature that will add unnecessary visual clutter to the area, ruining the aesthetic of the green 'haven' in this location.

It will adjoin a busy route for local families taking their children to and from school. Although companies seeking to allay fears about the impact of 5G technology upon health are always quick to state there is no evidence that it does, 5G is a relatively new technology and there is equally no evidence to prove that long term it does not, or will not.

Has the operator properly identified a need for this mast in terms of signal coverage for this area? We have never been canvassed for our opinion on this. There are alternatives available: Virgin Media has invested heavily in fibre broadband in Burgess Hill and it is available in this area for those who want it.

Has the operator to the satisfaction of the planning department properly explored alternative locations that would have less of an impact on neighbours and residents?

If the mast is for the benefit of the wider community, for example the large numbers of new houses that have been built north of the railway line, on both sides of the road, then has a location there, where there is more space for a mast been considered? It might be more appropriate and less impactful than on a small patch of greenery, tucked into a corner north of Burdocks Drive.

Finally, one of us was an original resident of Burdocks Drive when it was newly built at the end of the 1970s. We were very firmly told by Wimpey Homes at the time that there were restrictions on what was, and what was not, allowed on the residential development from the original farmland. This included a ban on commercial properties (ie no corner shops, of which there are still none on this estate) and we were advised to make sure we had a landline (this is years before mobile phones came into being) as the developers were not even allowed to install a public phone box. It seems

ironic that a phone box was prohibited in 1979 but a huge, overbearing and incongruous telecoms mast is being considered in 2026.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours faithfully

