

From: **cotswoldwords (Sophie Gale)**

Date: Sun, 25 Jan 2026 at 20:22

Subject: OBJECTION AWDM/1596/25

To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Cc:

From: SOPhie Gale

Address: Colncrest, Rodborough Lane, Stroud, GL52LN

I strongly object to the proposed mast, which will be ugly and completely disrupt the tone and appearance of the area. As so often seen, the cabinets will undoubtedly caused clutter and invite graffiti.

This location is a largely residential area; it is perilously close to homes, schools and businesses - directly contravening NPPF 2024 advice to **minimise visual impact through sensitive siting**.

The fact is that councils are causing enormous distress and anxiety to the very residents the council has a duty to **protect**.

Worthing's Local Plan, POLICY DM5, requires all new development as follows:

- i) be of a high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area.
- ii) enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping, tree canopy, impact on street scene and layout of the development;
- iii) make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area

The proposed development contravenes every one of these, to the letter.

Importantly, nor will the proposal contribute positively to the "public realm", as specified in POLICY DM6.

Castle Point council in Essex has recognised the health effects of masts on vulnerable persons and the importance of exclusion zones in its proposed Local Plan policies. SEE page 154/155

here: https://consultation.castlepoint.gov.uk/planning/the-castle-point-plan-pre-submission-regulation-19/user_uploads/castle-point-plan---regulation-19-draft---consultation-version---july-2025.pdf

It would be irresponsible to allow a mast close to "sensitive receptors" - Hawthorns Nursery School - 296.95m; Hawthorns Primary School - 307.41m; The Laurels Primary School - 429.08m; (See: Limiting liability with positioning to minimise negative health effects of cellular phone towers by Prof. Joshua Pearce - https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337624982_Limiting_liability_with_positioning_to_minimize_negative_health_effects_of_cellular_phone_towers)

The council must note that a recent High Court case against Cheltenham Borough Council makes clear the obligation on them to examine the risks of 5G masts to people with metal or medical implants (including, but not limited to, pacemakers, clips, plates, shunts etc). ICNIRP does not take account of these; but the council is required to. In [Thomas v Cheltenham Borough Council \(CBC\)](#), the Presiding Judge Jarman stated:

at para. 39: *"...the guidelines expressly stated that EMF's can cause harm by interfering with medical implants, and that such issues were beyond the scope of the guidelines. A consideration of such an issue, for example by considering whether the proposed development in the present case should be sited further away from Lefroy Court, would not in my judgment involve setting health guidelines different from ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure so as to fall foul of [118] of NPPF. The reason for that is that the guidelines do not address the issue of potential harm caused by EMFs in relation to medical implants. I do not accept Mr Kohli's [Defendant] submission that... there is no such impact. The wording of the guidelines, albeit in the context of medical procedures, clearly refers to such a potential impact, and indeed goes further and refers to a potential impact on electrical equipment more generally."*

at para. 43: *"...the failure on the part of the authority to grapple with potential impacts on medical implants was, in my judgment, an error and this ground succeeds."*

at para. 46: *"The issue of medical implants was not raised in respect of the residences closest to the proposed equipment. If it had been so raised, then it may well have been a factor in a decision to re-site the equipment."* (SEE: <https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewhc/admin/2024/1035>)

At appeal, the higher court confirmed that risks to those with implants represent a separate consideration beyond reliance on ICNIRP, and may influence mast siting where properly raised. The Council claimed it was prohibited from considering health impacts, but the Court made clear that this position was incorrect. The longstanding

mantra—"we cannot consider health"—can no longer be relied upon by any planning authority. (SEE: <https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewca/civ/2025/259>)

As the ICNIRP guidelines state that people with "*implantable *medical devices*" and "**metallic implants*" in the body are "*outside the scope of these guidelines*", such people are particularly vulnerable and need to be afforded extra protection under the council's obligations within the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

Therefore, please be aware, Worthing Council, that: **Unless some sort of local risk assessment has been performed to demonstrate the contrary, it is highly likely that the ICNIRP certificate does not cover a large proportion of local residents.**

The proposal must be struck out.

Sincerely,

Sophie Gale