

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 August 2025 15:49:25 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/1986

Consultee comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

A consultee has commented on a Planning Application. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 29/08/2025 3:49 PM from Oliver Benson on behalf of Contaminated Land.

Application Summary

Reference: DM/25/1986

Address: Phase 1c, Burgess Hill Northern Arc, Land North And North West Of Burgess Hill, Between Bedelands Nature Reserve In The East And, Goddard's Green Waste Water Treatment Works In The West

Proposal: Reserved matters application to consider access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for parcels 1.7, 1.7b, 1.8 and OS1.8 comprising: a) Eastern Neighbourhood Centre: Up to 270 residential dwellings and extra care units; commercial floorspace; the community building, the neighbourhood square, cycle and pedestrian connections, parking and associated infrastructure. b) Eastern Parkland comprising open space, multi-use games areas (MUGA), public art, green circle cycle link and associated infrastructure.

Case Officer: Joseph Swift

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: I have reviewed the Environmental Noise Assessment submitted in support of the reserved matters application for parcels 1.7, 1.7b, 1.8 and OS1.8 of the Northern Arc development. The report, prepared by Ian Sharland Ltd, Ref: M4874 and dated 20 July 2025, identifies a number of plots and elevations where external noise levels exceed the thresholds set out in Approved Document O for overheating mitigation via open windows. In these cases, the report

recommends the use of mechanical ventilation systems (MVHR or equivalent) to maintain internal acoustic and thermal comfort.

While I acknowledge that previous reserved matters applications within the wider Northern Arc development have been approved with MVHR specified for certain plots, it is important to note that since those decisions were made, local authorities across Sussex have become more consistent in applying the ProPG: Planning & Noise hierarchy. This hierarchy clearly states that mechanical ventilation should only be considered after all reasonable design-led mitigation options have been explored and exhausted. These include measures such as site layout optimisation, façade orientation, acoustic screening, and specification of acoustically attenuated natural ventilation systems.

The current submission does not provide sufficient evidence that such alternatives have been considered. In the absence of this, the recommendation of MVHR appears premature and inconsistent with the expectations of the ProPG guidance. This is particularly relevant given the wording of Condition 9 of the outline planning permission (DM/18/5114, as amended by DM/21/3279), which requires that an Acoustic Design Statement be submitted “in line with the recommendations of ProPG” and that the design and layout of the reserved matters area “has ensured that best practicable noise conditions are provided.” The condition also allows for mechanical ventilation only “in the event that the required internal noise levels can only be achieved with windows closed,” which implies that alternative design-led solutions must be considered first.

In light of this, Environmental Health would request a revised Acoustic Design Statement, which demonstrates how the ProPG hierarchy has been followed and that mechanical ventilation is only being proposed where no other practicable acoustic solution is available. Further justification is also required for the exceedance of external noise levels in amenity areas, particularly the west elevation of Block C, to confirm that best practicable means have been applied.

Kind regards