

From: **amane alturk**
Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2026 at 13:15
Subject: OBJECTION AWDM/1596/25
To: <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Planning Officer,

Re: AWDM/1596/25 – Objection to proposed 5G mast and associated equipment

My name and address are:

Ms Amane Alturk
42c Eaton Place, Brighton, East Sussex. BN2 [1EG.UK](#)

I object to this proposal on the following material planning grounds, with particular emphasis on **appearance and siting**.

1) Appearance & siting: dominant, incongruous, harmful to character and street scene

The proposed mast and associated cabinets would, by virtue of their **siting and appearance**, be **dominant and prominent** within the street scene and would introduce a large, incongruous feature within existing green space. This would cause harm to the **character and appearance** of the surrounding area and conflicts with the objectives of the **National Planning Policy Framework (2024)** which seek high-quality, well-designed places and avoidance/minimisation of visual harm through sensitive siting and sympathetic design.

The equipment cabinets would also create **unnecessary clutter** in the public realm and increase the likelihood of **graffiti**, further degrading visual amenity.

The site is within a predominantly residential area and close to homes, schools and businesses. This is contrary to the objective in national guidance to **minimise visual impact** through **sensitive siting** and **sympathetic/camouflaged design** solutions.

2) Conflict with Worthing Local Plan Policy DM5 and DM6

Policy DM5 (Quality of the Built Environment) requires development to be of high design quality; to respect and enhance local character; and to enhance the local environment with attention to height, scale, form, landscaping/tree canopy, and impact on the street scene. This proposal fails those tests: its height/scale and associated clutter do not respect or enhance the prevailing character of the area, nor do they make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness.

Policy DM6 (Public Realm) and supporting text (including the emphasis on sense of place, security and quality of life) require development to contribute positively to publicly accessible space. This proposal would **not** enhance the public realm, landscape or townscape. It would **degrade** the site it is proposed to occupy and would not integrate into the landscape.

3) Proximity to sensitive receptors (siting is unacceptable)

The proposed installation is **too close** to multiple sensitive receptors and workplaces. Distances include:

- Residences on **Romany Rd** (immediately opposite), closest dwellings: **32.67 m**
- **Durrington Community Centre** (vulnerable young children and elderly): **32.96 m**
- **Columbia House** flats, closest: **72.24 m**
- **Tesco petrol station** (employees): **102.00 m**
- **Tesco supermarket frontage** and adjacent businesses (employees): **272.06 m**
- **Hawthorns Nursery School**: **296.95 m**
- **Hawthorns Primary School**: **307.41 m**
- **The Laurels Primary School**: **429.08 m**

This concentration of sensitive receptors, combined with the proposal's visual prominence, makes the siting inappropriate.

4) Health-related considerations relevant to siting (including medical implants) and perception of risk

The **perception of risk** is a material consideration as it relates directly to the **siting and appearance** of the equipment, particularly when placed close to homes, schools and community facilities.

In addition, recent case law has confirmed that local planning authorities are not limited to simply accepting an ICNIRP certificate where specific issues are raised. The courts have addressed the need to consider potential impacts on people with **medical/metal implants** (e.g., pacemakers and other devices) when such concerns are properly put before the authority, and that this may be relevant to siting decisions.

Unless the applicant has provided an adequate local assessment to address such implant-related concerns for the nearest receptors, reliance on an ICNIRP compliance statement alone is insufficient reassurance for this location.

5) Request

For the reasons above—especially the unacceptable impacts of **appearance and siting** and conflict with **Policies DM5 and DM6**—I request that **AWDM/1596/25 is refused**. If the applicant requires coverage improvements, they should be directed to less harmful alternatives, including mast-sharing, use of existing structures, relocation away from green space and sensitive receptors, and designs that materially reduce visual clutter.

--

Kind Regards.

Ms Amané Alturk

Psy BSc (Hons). Nat DIP, Nut DIP, Herbs DIP, Kinesiology DIP, Yoga DIP.