

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 May 2025 09:11:09 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 23/05/2025 9:11 AM.

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 6 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. (amended plans received 25.04.2025, amended photo montage received 01.05.2025 and amended description 06.05.2025)
Case Officer:	Hamish Evans

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Flat 2 27 High Street Lewes
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Other type - not listed
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	This is a heavily residential area, on both sides of the railway. The proposed site is far too close to dwellings. The closest dwellings are on Blackthorns and Maple Close (approx. 60m) and Grange Close on the opposite side of the track (approx. 85m = nearest house), plus Valebridge Road.

The proposed site is next to a popular footpath. The area is enjoyed regularly by locals walking their dogs. Despite trees surrounding the proposed site, they will only provide some "screening" at the lower levels. The 30m lattice tower will dominate the area and thus the top section will be highly visible above tree tops from all angles. Note also that any screening will be seasonal. During autumn/winter, vegetation dies back.

Telecoms installations are overbearing and unnerving. For many people, they cause anxiety and stress. The impact of this proposal on the health and well-being of residents is a material planning consideration, which includes the fear and anxiety of harm.

Also of concern are the schools (approx. distances) - Manor Field Primary School (300m), Little Explorers Nursery and Pre-school (240m), Platform 3 Pre-school (260m). Children are deemed "sensitive receptors" at school, and this should apply at home too. Elderly individuals are also vulnerable.

There are 8 real-life 5G case studies which show serious harm to those who live / work close to 5G masts. This is a public safety issue. The distance of 500m is of particular interest after the new Hampshire Commission (now a Bill) recommended a setback of this distance for telecoms installations.

ICNIRP guidelines (2020) specifically exclude those individuals with a metal implant or an active medical device. The Guidelines state that people with "implantable medical devices" and "metallic implants" in the body are "outside the scope of these guidelines". (Examples: pacemakers, cochlear implants, dental implants etc). ICNIRP does not cover any wildlife or plants.

There has been a dramatic decline in both volume and species type of insects due to the effects of EMFs (from 5G and other communications masts).

How would this affect the council's Biodiversity Net Gain plans?

Could trees be damaged during ground work? They could be harmed by radiation longer term.

Is this a sustainable technology?

Does the council have an Environmental Impact Assessment for this or any mast?

Kind regards