

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 November 2025 22:05:21 UTC+00:00
To: "Catherine Cardin" <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2672

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/11/2025 10:05 PM.

Application Summary

Address: Pavement Adj 25 Church Road Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 9BB

Proposal: The installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 14 Downscroft Burgess Hill

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: This is a BT Street Hub with digital Advertising screens on both sides offering free public Wi-Fi, free UK calls it also accommodates monitors for air, sound and light as well as additional SMART CITY sensors that count pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle movements and similar data collection. ICNIRP certificate includes reference to an available document for workers on site, referencing an EXCLUSION Zone. Where are the calculations used to justify this toxic pollution? What about people walking past?

References a video camera in both sides not yet used in the UK.
What on earth could these be for?

Site - The proposed development would result in a substantial and prominent addition to the pavement and visual clutter and reduce the functionality of the public walkway, placing undue risk on public safety of pedestrians. People cross the road at this point, and their view of vehicles coming down Church Road is impeded. Vehicles coming down Church Road will have their view partially blocked.

Placing a solid structure of these dimensions on the pavement blocks visibility, unlike the old BT box that had a degree of transparency. This provides a perfect hiding place for would-be assailants, likely to make some people feel unsafe, possibly fearful of their surroundings.

As a solid structure, it is likely to cause disruption to visibility of the locality.

Appearance - The proposal would appear incongruous to the Application Site and its setting and is therefore unacceptable. Deliberately distracting illuminated changing advertising that could cause agitation. No regard for those who suffer with over-stimulation conditions such as autism or epilepsy. The glare and dazzle from these screens is distracting to road users driving down Church Road. This also distorts clear imaging from CCTV cameras.

Light pollution - consider the impact of these LED lit screens on local residences. The use of LED sources for lighting and display screens has an impact on human health. The proposed feature would be disruptive to neighbours' sleep quality and mental health, and the ability to enjoy the area in which they live.

Justification of need - Provision of 5G and Wifi could be provided as a simple pole installation and therefore large advertisement screens are excessive.

Unnecessary Commercialisation - the proposal acts as a revenue source for the applicant and advertisers - who approves the advertisements and what would be advertised? Do we need more junk food advertisements? How would local small independent businesses afford this form of advertisement? The proposed feature would result in the over commercialisation of this locality. It is not like for like replacements. The old phone boxes had static non-illuminated advertising. This new hub has changing illuminated advertising screens.

Power drain and Net Zero targets. - At a time of energy scarcity and unaffordability, what is the need for an energy guzzling installation running 24/7? A conservative estimate is that one large digital advertising screen (6.4 metres x 3.1 metres) uses more electricity than 3 average UK households. Who pays for the power to support their running?

Data capture - the proposal has the capability for add-ons such as monitors, sensors, small-cell mobile connectivity along with

electro-magnetic field radiation pollution. Who would monitor, regulate and control the collected data? These are issues around privacy and Human Rights. Who are the data controllers going to be?

Public exposure guidelines - Any addition with electro-magnetic field radiation is accompanied by an ICNIRP certificate as an important public health safeguard. Given that any ICNIRP certificate does NOT account for the effects of electro-magnetic field radiation on those with AIMD's or other metal implants in the body, what measures / warnings would be provided to assist avoidance of harmful levels of radiation to those who are vulnerable? Most of the residents of Burgess Hill have some metal in their bodies.

This is situated, ironically outside a Hospice Shop that supports residents with cancer and other terminal conditions. Children are particularly vulnerable to Radio Frequencies and are classed as sensitive receptors.

It should be refused.

Kind regards