

From: **deborah**

Date: Sun, 25 Jan 2026 at 12:18

Subject: OBJECTION AWDM/1596/25

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

Cc:

From:

Deborah Short, 9 King Edward Street, Wirksworth, Derbyshire DE44FE

Dear Adur-Worthing Council

I wish to submit an objection to the above application:

APPEARANCE & SITING: The proposed mast will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character and appearance, resulting in detriment to the visual amenities of the area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of residential properties nearby.

The cabinets will cause unnecessary clutter, inviting graffiti

The site is in a predominantly residential area in close proximity to homes, schools and businesses - which is contrary to the clear objective behind the guidance in the NPPF to minimise potential visual impact through sensitive siting and sympathetic or camouflaged design solutions.

The mast will have 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 perception of risk is a material consideration to the siting and appearance of the proposed equipment.

The proposed mast and associated cabinets by virtue of their siting and appearance, would be significantly dominant and prominent within the street scene and would introduce a large and incongruous feature within the existing green space that would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024...

THIS PROPOSAL WILL NOT ENHANCE THE CHARACTER AND CONTRIBUTE POSITIVELY TO THE PUBLIC REALM, LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE.

THIS PROPOSAL WILL DEGRADE THE SITE IT IS PROPOSED TO OCCUPY AND IN NO WAY WILL IT INTEGRATE INTO THE LANDSCAPE.

NOTE TO COUNCIL: Castle Point council in Essex has recognised the potential health effects of masts to 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

FURTHERMORE:

5G uses much higher frequency radio waves than in the past and it makes use of very new- and relatively unevaluated, in terms of safety- supportive technology to enable this higher data transmission capacity, points out Professor Frank. <https://www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/>

The proposed installation would be:

TOO CLOSE to the local community centre, residences, schools and businesses, within 500m of the proposed site, which will be subjected to high levels of radiation beaming from this mast throughout the day and night. The impact of this proposal on the *health (including mental health) and well-being of residents must be taken into account, and is a material planning consideration.

AS FOLLOWS:

TOO CLOSE TO residences on Romany Rd, immediately opposite the proposed site, the closest dwellings being - 32.67 m

TOO CLOSE TO 'sensitive receptors' at Durrington community centre - 32.96 m - which serves a demographic of vulnerable young children and the elderly, daily.

TOO CLOSE TO residences (flats) at Columbia House , the closest being - 72.24 m

TOO CLOSE TO 'sensitive receptors' at Hawthorns Nursery School - 296.95 m; Hawthorns Primary School - 307.41 m; The Laurels Primary School - 429.08 m; - 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

TOO CLOSE TO Tesco petrol station, where employees will be subjected to 5G frequency emissions throughout their work day - 102.00 m

TOO CLOSE TO Tesco supermarket frontage - 272.06 m, with its various restaurants, shops, businesses etc., where employees will be subjected to 5G frequency emissions throughout their work day

***A recent court case against Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) has confirmed that lawful obligations extend beyond simply accepting the ICNIRP certificate.**

DUTY OF CARE

There is no excuse for public servants in councils to be ignorant of good science that shows very serious health impacts of wireless radiation. It is not acceptable that public servants in councils mindlessly follow the industry biased government diktats. There is no shortage of good, unbiased science that shows indisputable

risk: <https://www.emsafetyalliance.org/index.php>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Jjt1EZ2wYQ>