

From: **sylvie kinnear**

Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2026 at 05:14

Subject: objection to mast AWD1596/25

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

Hello,

I object to this proposal due to the following reasons(copy and pasted as it is wonderfully written and states in detail all that i want to say)-

APPEARANCE & SITING: The proposed mast and associated cabinets, etc. 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...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. **ADDITIONALLY:** 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. 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 ***NOTE TO COUNCIL: 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> **The ICNIRP guidelines DO NOT PROTECT individuals with metal in their body or an active medical device. 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. **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 **RECENT RESEARCH:**

MICROWAVE SYNDROME: 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/>

Regards,
S.Kinnear(308 queens park road, Brighton Bn29ZL-member of the public)