From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 August 2024 22:31:00 UTC+01:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0894/24

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 11/08/2024 10:30 PM from Ms Paula Mitton.

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of Car Park Old Shoreham Road Lancing West Sussex
Proposal:	Application for Prior Approval for Proposed 20.0m High Street Pole on new root foundation together with 6No. Antennas 2No. 300 diameter Dishes, 2No. Cabinets and associated ancillary works to include 5g technology.
Case Officer:	Gary Peck

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Paula Mitton
Address:	29 The Drive, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 5LN

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity - Other
Comments:	As a regular visitor to the area I believe that the proposed ugly 5G pole would have a detrimental effect on the appearance and character of the area, being very close to the Leisure Centre and would result in an incompatible land use. The ICNIRP guidelines that are used to prove 'safety' of these

masts do not take into account metal or medical implants such as pacemakers, which can act as conductors for the radiation. If a pacemaker fails when someone is driving nearby they could have a fatal crash. This issue has been tested in court and the authority was found in error, when it did not consider medical implants. The following is an excerpt from this article:

Navigating 4/5G Mast Objections: Thomas v Cheltenham Borough Council - Sharpe Pritchard

Thomas v Cheltenham Borough Council 2004 EWCH 1035 (Admin), decided on 11 April 2024, is a case that serves as a good reminder that in making decisions, potential impacts raised by objectors, even where fairly unique points are raised, are capable of being planning material considerations.

The Court found that the authority's failure to address the potential impacts of the proposed equipment on individuals with medical implants constituted an error.

If someone becomes ill or injured from the mast, who has liability? The following is an excerpt from a question to and response from Wandsworth Borough Council in the FOIA Request for Information - WBC-FOI-05223 - Environmental Impact Assessments:

Q:- "Please would the Council send me the exact clause in their public liability insurance that shows that the Council is indemnified against claims on the Council for harm caused by emf radiation."
A:- "The current opinion of the Council's incumbent insurer is that such claims would not be covered under the Council's liability policy...."

The Council should take note of the above, as it may be subject to claims, if illness or injury should occur, following the approval of a mast.

Kind regards