

From: Nicholas Martin

Sent: 25 January 2026 18:28

To: 'planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk'

Subject: AWDM/1596/25

My apologies regarding the below – the planning application is AWDM/1596/25

From: Nicholas Martin

Sent: 25 January 2026 18:26

To: 'planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk'

Subject: RE: Registration Confirmation Request

Please would you enter my objection below as there is a fault with your server currently - as you can see from your email to me below:

Here is my objection as a person who visits the Worthing area:

1. First of all the ICNIRP is in the name of "EE & H3G" which is not an entity of "persons with approved powers under the ECC".

2. Would the case officer please obtain and make available the technical details of the proposed apparatus. Including the power potentials of the 5G non isotropic antennae in dbm and the power drop off over distance in relation to the ICNIRP guidance of 1mw/cm2 and in line with recent court cases which are pointing out that people with pacemakers and metal implants and the like, are not covered by the ICNIRP guidance which the Council is relying on for safeguarding the health of its residents.

To clarify, Adur and Worthing Council relies in ICNIRP. 4G and the lower Gs – drop off in accordance with the Inverse Square Law. 5G is entirely different. 5G is directed energy – that is the focusing of energy into beams which is the essence of non isotropic radiation. Exclusion zones make sense for 4G as the energy is isotropic and drops off in intensity in relation to the square of the distance from the emitting source. This does not apply for 5G non isotropic radiation. So much so that Ericsson – which make 5G antenna – said the following “Size of exclusion zone makes 5G network roll-out a major problem

or impossible.” They said that because to create an exclusion zone to ensure that immediately outside it there is compliance with the ICNIRP guidance metric of 1mw/cm² – would require such a huge zone as to make it impossible to roll out 5G.

Given that Adur and Worthing Council needs to comply with ICNIRP, the Council needs to satisfy itself that based applicant’s 5G antenna design that the power will drop off so that given the exclusion zone relevant to this application, that at the end of the zone, the applied for apparatus will be emitting a power density compliant with ICNIRP’s 1mw/cm².

If the Adur and Worthing Council does not obtain this information it would not be able to say the applied for antenna array complies with ICNIRP’s metric of 1mw/cm².

An ICNIRP certificate is totally insufficient to verify this – since such certificates do not provide the power density of the 5G apparatus nor the information of drop off of power density with distance. Adur and Worthing Council now has full knowledge of circumstance of this issue.

In the absence of this power drop off information the application should be refused.

3. Referring to the court cases referred to above, Judge Jarman’s ruling as backed up by the Court of Appeal – means that people with metal implants and the like (including pacemakers) fall outside the ICNIRP purview. This means that Adur and Worthing Council needs to conduct a consultation with all residents potentially living proximal to the proposed mast and such consultation would need to be in accordance with the Gunning Principles. That is the relevant people need to be made aware, in the consultation, that Adur and Worthing Council relies in ICNIRP for their safety and that the relevant people are not covered under ICNIRP. The consultation would in fact need to cover all residents within the Council’s boundary, because of what Ericsson stated and as referred to above. In addition Nokia who are also involved in the supply of 5G antennae – said a single 5G mast can cover 100s of square miles.

In view of the complications as set out in 1, 2 and 3, above, the application should most certainly be refused.