From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 05 April 2023 14:29
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0375/23

Flag Status: Flagged

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 05/04/2023 2:29 PM from Mr J Philipps.

Application Summary

Address:	Land Opposite 214 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex
Proposal:	Application for determination as to whether prior approval will be required for the siting and appearance of proposed 15m 5G telecommunications monopole with wrapround cabinet at base and associated ancillary works.
Case Officer:	Gary Peck

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr J Philipps
Address:	23 - 24 New Broadway, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 4HP

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment
Comments:	The proposed antenna and associated equipment will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character and appearance of the area, contributing to visual clutter resulting in detriment to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby. The 5G equipment would result in an imposing and overbearing impact on the amenity of the nearby area causing local residents unnecessary upset and anxiety, impacting the quality of the local area.

The mast may create a visual distraction to road users, and its associated equipment cabinets would clutter and degrade the look and feel of the area.

GPDO - The proposed development would not comply with Condition A.3(4)(a) of Schedule 2 Part 16 of the General Permitted Development Order as the proposed development, by reason of its siting and appearance be an unsightly, bulky and incongruous addition to the character of the local area.

Our government has decreed that telecommunication companies must ensure the cumulative non-ionising exposure of these masts stay within ICNIRP limits. Who is policing that across all telecommunication companies and all installed masts? The safety of EMF technology is based on the premise that the ICNIRP guidelines are suitable safety limits. These guidelines do not safeguard against the biological effects of this technology. Numerous scientific studies demonstrate these EMF's cause cancer and other disease.

In 2008 the Head of ICNIRP, stated that ICNIRP Guidelines were technical and were not intended as medical or biological exposure guidelines. The ICNRIP is now being questioned worldwide as to its very credibility. The precautionary principle should be followed until there is concrete proof that this technology is entirely safe for all life on earth.

According to The National Planning Policy Framework :

- Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places - section 8.91

- Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment-section 15.170

- The number of masts should be kept to a minimum and equipment should be sympathetically designed -section 10.115

- Policies should prioritise full fibre connections (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution) -section 10-112

This application contradicts all of these.

Kind regards