

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 October 2026 16:24:57 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1377

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 06/10/2026 4:24 PM from Adam Dracott on behalf of Environmental Protection.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/26/1377
Address:	Land At Mill Lane Sayers Common West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposal for 9 new build homes. (Amended plans and information received 15.09.2026, 11.08.2026 and 28.07.2026)
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments: I refer to the planning noise assessment prepared by Anderson Acoustics dated August 2026 (reference 8768_002R_1-0_JN) submitted in support of the application.
The site is characterized by high noise levels from traffic on the A23 which runs along the eastern boundary of the site. The report indicates a number of measures to attenuate the noise and thereby reduce the impact on future residents. These include a 2m earth bund topped with a 2.1m solid fence; use of mechanical ventilation and heat recovery (MVHR) in all residential units and a “windows closed” solution to control internal noise; placing acoustically non-sensitive rooms on the eastern façade although the report notes that this has not been applied throughout the development; increasing distance separation between source and receptor by putting the access road to the east of the dwellings although this has only a small benefit.

The author of the report states that it is their understanding that

MVHR will be installed throughout the development. This is a critical feature that will be necessary to avoid significant adverse noise impacts on future residents. Confirmation of this point from the applicant will be necessary to ensure that the development does not proceed without a firm commitment that this will be factored in to the design build and the economic assessment for viability of the scheme.

The report also assumes a number of measures in calculating internal noise levels and assessing their suitability in terms of the British Standard BS8233. These include the positioning of any ventilation openings not being through the window or external walls but ducted above the ceiling; the sound reduction properties of the walls and roof; sound reduction properties for the glazing; and the room reverberation times. If these measures are not implemented as the design and build progresses, the conclusions of the assessment cannot be relied upon and the development may expose future residents to unsatisfactory internal noise levels.

An overheating assessment has been carried out, and this notes that at least one bedroom in Plots 1-8 and the double and single room in Plot 9 would exceed the criteria and would therefore indicate that occupants cannot rely on opening windows to control overheating. Some suggested solutions have been included but the report states that these options would require further specialist input. This has not been provided at this point.

Regarding the external noise environment, primarily the private gardens which are considered amenity areas, it has been acknowledged by the author of the report that noise levels will be high and therefore the higher upper limit of 55 dBL_{aeq,16 hour} has been considered appropriate. In relation to the acceptability of external amenity standards, BS8233:2014 is quoted:

These guideline values may not be achievable in all circumstances where development might be desirable. In such a situation, development should be designed to achieve the lowest practicable noise levels in these external amenity spaces but should not be prohibited.

This is then applied to this development suggesting that the design has achieved the lowest practicable noise levels across the site and that basis it is acceptable. However, the question over whether this development is desirable is a more significant question when considering the statement in BS8233. If the development falls within the local plan or is desirable to meet a local need, then it may be considered desirable even if the development will require a mechanical ventilation and heat recovery system for ventilation and overheating which is difficult to justify as sustainable development.

If you are minded to approve this application, I recommend that confirmation is sought from the applicant about their proposals to

install MVHR in all residential units. I also recommend the other measures contained within the acoustic report are made explicit requirements by a condition on the approval document:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme for protecting the proposed development from noise that implements the measures described in the noise assessment by Anderson Acoustics reference 8768_002R_1-0_JN dated August 2026, shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works, which form part of the approved scheme shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details

Kind regards