

From: **cotswoldwords (Sophie Gale)**

Date: Wed, 4 Feb 2026 at 14:04

Subject: Ref AWDM/1596/25

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

My name is Sophie Gale; my address is: Colncrest, RODBorough Lane, Stroud, GL52LN . I have friends near Worthing, so hence am a visitor, and I strongly object to the following application AWDM/1596/25 -

[Prior Approval for installation of a replacement telecommunications base station comprising 20m high monopole \(5G\), wrap-around cabinet, supporting 9no. antennas and 2no. 300mm diameter transmission dishes and ancillary development thereto. | Telecommunication Site Bn0914 North Of Durrington Community Centre 2 Romany Road Worthing West Sussex](#)

The proposed mast will be obtrusive and ugly, incongruous with the surrounding character and appearance, harming nearby residences with this detriment caused to the local character. It is thereby an incompatible siting. The site is close to homes, schools and businesses - which will be blighted and denied the proper protections contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

POLICY DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan requires all new development as follows:

DM5 - QUALITY OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT:

a) All new development... should:

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;

POLICY DM6 - PUBLIC REALM

5.73 The public realm is the space around, between and within buildings that is publicly accessible, including streets, squares, parks, open spaces and pedestrian and cycle routes. These spaces are dynamic elements that have a distinct and unique identity, whether they are spaces to move through or spaces to gather in. The quality and design of the public realm has a significant influence on quality of life because it affects people's sense of place, security and belonging, as well as having an influence on a range of health and social factors

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.

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

A recent court case against Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) has confirmed that lawful obligations extend beyond simply accepting the ICNIRP certificate. The court made clear that risks to individuals with metal or medical implants—such as pacemakers, clips, plates, and shunts, etc. —are not assessed by the ICNIRP certification process, and that these risks must be taken into account by local planning authorities when deciding where masts are sited.

Presiding Judge Jarman stated 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."*

The council must do its duty according this precedent set in case law - and fully examine the harms the proposal places on vulnerable residents who have metal implants. It is obliged to do so **in law**.
The only lawful response to this application is to reject.

Sincerely,
Sophie Gale.