

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/12/2025 10:36 AM from Mr J Philipps.

Application Summary

Address: Telephone Exchange 1 Tarmount Lane Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 6DA

Proposal: The removal of 2 no. antennas and the installation of 2 no. new antennas (5G) at roof level on the quadpod previously approved under application reference AWDM/0265/24; The removal of 1 no. antenna and the installation of 1 no. new antenna (5G) at roof level on the northwest elevation; Replacement of 1 no. existing cabinet with 1 no. new cabinet at ground level on NW side; Installation of remote radio units (RRUs) break out boxes (BOBs), combiners and GPS node; Removal of existing mast head amplifiers (MHAs); Associated apparatus and ancillary works.

Case Officer: Marie O'Keeffe

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr J Philipps

Email:

Address: 1 New Broadway Worthing West Sussex

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: I object to this upgrade on the following grounds:

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-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.

These concerns were recently raised in a Swansea Council meeting, where councillors requested a pause on the 5G rollout pending further investigation.

Presiding Judge Jarman stated at paragraph 46 of his ruling: "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>)

That passage was not overturned on appeal. On the contrary, 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>)

Transmitter density required for 5G means that more people will be exposed to radio frequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMFs), and at levels that emerging evidence suggests, are potentially harmful to health, argues Professor John William Frank, Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh.

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 ICNIRP guidelines DO NOT PROTECT individuals with metallic implants active / medical device in their body.

The Guidelines state that people with "implantable medical devices" and "metallic implants" in the body are "outside the scope of these guidelines".

(Examples of metal in the body include metal pins, plates, rods, discs, screws (hip/knee replacements) Cardiovascular - implantable heart loop recorders, stents and pacemakers. Implants to treat and monitor health conditions, deliver drugs or to restore bodily functions e.g. diabetes related products. Magnetic cerebral spinal fluid shunts. Cochlear implants for hearing loss. Dental work - braces, implants, metal crowns, pins, denture arches, mercury amalgam fillings.)

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 the local residents.

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.

If there is no disability impact assessment in relation to this technology, it could be argued that provisions of the Equality Act 2010 may well have been broken.

RECENT RESEARCH: The eight (8) recently published case-studies demonstrate the real-life effect of 5G on human health. These clearly show that 5G deployment is a serious public safety issue.

The cases covered individuals living / working close to 5G antennae as well as a family holidaying close to one, and a young 8yo boy who suffered severe symptoms at school.

Symptoms included severe headaches, tinnitus, nosebleeds, insomnia, anxiety, memory loss, irregular pulse, skin rashes etc.

The distances from the antennae ranged from 5m to 125m (2023 cases); just under and over 500m (2 base stations), and 285m (2024 cases).

A summary of the first 7 cases can be found here -

<https://rightsfreedoms.wordpress.com/2024/06/27/the-first-study-in-the-world-on-5g-health-risks/>

Read more here:

<https://www.fortunejournals.com/articles/a-woman-aged-82-years-with-electromagnetic-hypersensitivity-since-almost-four-decades-developed-the-microwave-syndrome-after-insta.html>

<https://www.medtextpublications.com/open-access/an-eight-year-old-boy-developed-severe-headache-in-a-1582.pdf>

NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMISSION

In 2019, a Commission on 5G was set up by legislature in New Hampshire, USA. It was the first legislation passed in the United States calling for the formation of a Commission to explore the health effects of 5G. The findings were published Nov-2020, and on the back of this, a Bill was introduced requiring a setback of 500m as a protective distance from mast radiation.

Their recommendation was evidence based, and as such, is globally applicable.

FINAL report

= <http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>

Video of commission member Kent Chamberlin discussing NH Commission Setback Justification 28-Dec-2021 (20 mins) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWK74ie7krc>

New Hampshire BILL

= https://gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/legacy/bs2016/billText.aspx?sy=2024&id=1797&txtFormat=html
