

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 May 2025 18:29:37 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 26/05/2025 6:29 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 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:	10 The Blackthorns Burgess Hill
----------	---------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection in response to amended plans received 25.04.2025, amended photo montage received 01.05.2025 and amended description 06.05.2025 As the specification of the tower remains the same, my original objections posted on the 24/03/2025 still stand.

I have not observed any amendments to the Technical Support Statement or the Planning, Design, and Access Statement. If the mast's specifications can be adjusted to accommodate a reduction of one-third in the number of antennae, this raises the question of whether the original planning submission overstated its requirements.

The only noticeable structural alteration appears to be a reduction in the headframe size from 3.5 metres to 3 metres. However, there is nothing to prevent a larger 3.5-metre headframe from being installed later, allowing for the addition of further antennae?

Given the reduction in antennae, would it not be reasonable to also adjust the dimensions of the mast accordingly? A smaller structure could mitigate future upscaling, ensuring that the mast remains proportionate to current needs.

Additionally, with fewer antennae and associated equipment, the necessity for 12 cabinets on site should be reconsidered. A reduction in equipment would logically result in a decreased requirement for storage and operational infrastructure.

Kind regards