

**From:** planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 10 October 2025 12:15:23 UTC+01:00  
**To:** "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application  
DM/25/2373

## 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 10/10/2025 12:15 PM from Oliver Benson on behalf of Environmental Protection.

### Application Summary

Reference:	DM/25/2373
Address:	6 Highfields Brighton Road Warninglid Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 5SY
Proposal:	Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the construction of four detached dwellings with garages.
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

### Comments Details

I have reviewed the acoustic report submitted in support of the planning application.

While I would not raise concerns with the technical accuracy of the report, I do question whether the proposal fully aligns with the principles of good acoustic design as set out in ProPG: Planning and Noise (2017). I acknowledge that the dwellings will be located close to the A23, and that this results in elevated noise levels at both the façades and within the external amenity areas. Although mitigation is proposed in the form of acoustic fencing and enhanced glazing, there is limited evidence that the layout and orientation of the dwellings have been optimised to reduce noise exposure through design.

ProPG encourages the use of site layout and building orientation as primary tools to mitigate noise before reliance on physical barriers

or mechanical systems. In this case, the gardens are positioned in a way that leaves them exposed to road traffic noise, and the report does not indicate whether bedrooms have been located on the quieter façades. These are both key aspects of good acoustic design that could reduce the need for mechanical ventilation and help address overheating risks without compromising acoustic performance.

The overheating screening assessment identifies exceedances of Approved Document O criteria during the night-time period and recommends further assessment by a ventilation specialist. While this is appropriate, it is worth noting that the internal layout of the dwellings could be used to mitigate these risks. For example, placing bedrooms on the façade furthest from the A23 could reduce exposure to night-time noise, at least in some of the properties and potentially allow for natural ventilation without breaching noise thresholds. This would be preferable to relying on mechanical systems, which may introduce additional complexity and cost.

If the applicant has considered these options and ruled them out, they should explain why. If they have not, then I would expect the layout to be revisited to explore whether the design could be improved to reduce reliance on mitigation and better protect both internal and external spaces from noise. This is particularly important given the exceedances identified in relation to Approved Document O and the potential implications for overheating and ventilation.

At this stage, I would recommend that the applicant either provides a formal Acoustic Design Statement in accordance with ProPG, setting out what options were considered in relation to the design and the noise environment, or revisits the layout to demonstrate how good acoustic design principles can be more effectively incorporated.

---

Kind regards