

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 January 2025 12:03:07 UTC+00:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application
DM/24/1689

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 15/01/2025 12:03 PM from Mr Nick Bennett on behalf of Environmental Protection.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/24/1689
Address:	East Grinstead Service Station 147 - 149 London Road East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 1ET
Proposal:	Variation of condition no 7 relating to planning application DM/21/2400.
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

A noise impact assessment has been submitted to address the likely impact of allowing later deliveries, given the nearby residential premises. As part of this assessment, BS4142 methodology has been used, as is appropriate for this type of noise. However, the acoustic correction penalties applied as part of the BS4142 have not been fully justified.

Comments: The standard suggests the following penalties (to be added together arithmetically)
Tonality: just perceptible at receptor 2dB, clearly perceptible 4dB, highly perceptible 6dB
Impulsivity: just perceptible 3dB, clearly perceptible 6dB, highly perceptible 9dB
Intermittency: if readily distinctive 3dB
Other characteristics: 3dB

Given that the expected deliveries and collections are likely to include lorry engine noise, refrigeration unit noise, reversing beepers, tailgate noise, lorry door slams, cages being moved, bin emptying etc, it is not clear how the report can justify only using a 3dB intermittency penalty for all deliveries. The adjacent Parkview House overlooks the site so the sounds identified above are likely to be clearly perceptible during the evening period that is relevant for this variation.

I request that the applicants review the chosen penalties or provide clear justification for how they are so low despite the likely tonal (reversing) and impulsive (tailgate, door slams, cages) or other (refrigeration unit) elements.

In the event that the penalties are increased, the applicants may need to consider whether any mitigation measures are appropriate. These could include for example, reduced hours (eg till 2200 hours rather than 2300 hours), smaller delivery vehicles, a non-reversing route/path for vehicles, low noise cages, relocation of delivery bay, acoustic shielding etc

I am not presently able to support the application to vary hours of deliveries, until the penalties are reviewed and any necessary mitigation measures implemented. However, I would welcome further discussion to reach a satisfactory resolution.

Kind regards