

Steven King
Major Developments Team Leader
Mid Sussex District Council
Oaklands Road
RH16 1SS

23 June 2026

Dear Steven,

Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead

Response to Environmental Health Comments, 17th June 2026

1.0 Introduction

Further to our meeting and agreed approach to discharging condition 24 and allow the overheating assessment to be completed at the detailed design stage we have received further comments from Environmental Health for which this letter seeks to address from both a planning perspective and through technical acoustic considerations.

The comments are summarised below:

- 1.** The Environmental Health unit agrees there should be a balance of noise, ventilation and overheating in line with current guidance;
- 2.** Concerns don't relate to this principal, but instead whether the requirements of Condition 24 have been have been addressed in principle and thus the condition could be discharged following approval of the Reserved Matters (RM) application; namely:
 - a.** Have good acoustic design principles been followed to the site layout and building design to minimise noise exposure in the first instance;
 - b.** What basis has it been concluded that certain dwellings cannot achieve relevant internal conditions with open windows;
 - c.** What impacts are likely going to be required at the later stage once the overheating assessment is completed
- 3.** There is a desire from Environmental Health to provide the following information to demonstrate that in principle, the condition could be discharge:
 - a.** A statement demonstrating how good acoustic design principles have influenced the scheme;
 - b.** Identification of dwellings where the guideline internal conditions with windows open aren't achieved; and
 - c.** What likely strategy for those dwellings requiring further assessment is anticipated to provide confidence that the condition can be met.

This letter has been jointly prepared by Adam Walker, Principal Consultant at Peninsular Acoustics and Kate Brocklebank, Associate Director at ECE Planning.

Peninsular Acoustics Ltd

Liverpool: Office 402 Cotton Exchange, Bixteth Street, Liverpool, L3 9LQ

Birmingham: Studio 214 Scott House, Custard Factory, Birmingham, B9 4AA

London: 16 Woburn Place, London, WC1H 0LS

info@peninsularacoustics.co.uk Tel: 0151 933 9733 / 0121 517 2100 / 0208 226 0473



2.0 Item 3a: Has Good Acoustic Design Principles Been Followed?

In relation to Acoustic Design, it is important to take account of the current planning context for this request. Vistry Homes Limited, purchased the site following approval of Hybrid Planning Permission (reference DM/23/2699); the permission was secured by Welbeck Land LLP. The principle of development for the application site has already been firmly established through the grant of permission which approved the erection of up to 550 dwellings at Outline stage, together with the associated parameter plans and development framework, in line with the requirements of Site Allocations DPD allocation SA20 and granted Full Planning Permission for the spine road. The proposal was supported by technical evidence and negotiated with the council to include good acoustic design including through the inclusion of multiple secondary roads to access each parcel. The inclusion of which means traffic has the potential to naturally exit the spine road at several locations; and the majority of the Site (more than 90%) has no noise constraints for window openings when considering the agreed approach.

With the aforementioned principles in mind, it is important to state the purpose of the current Reserved Matters application is not to revisit the principle, scale, or quantum of development, of the elements with Full Planning approval but to secure approval of the detailed matters of layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping whilst remaining in accordance with the approved parameters and conditions attached to the Outline permission. Whilst Reserved Matters applications necessarily refine the detailed design of a scheme, they must do so within the scope of the outline consent and cannot fundamentally alter the development principles that have already been accepted by the Local Planning Authority.

In this regard, the proposed layout has been prepared to accord with the approved parameter plans and the strategic framework established through the Outline consent, whilst also responding to technical design considerations and placemaking objectives. Suggestions that the layout should be substantially reconfigured would, in effect, seek to reopen matters that were determined at outline stage and would undermine the certainty provided by the Outline Planning Permission. Furthermore, the Reserved Matters application seeks to deliver the full allocation of 550 dwellings envisaged by Policy SA20 and secured through the outline permission.

Reductions in developable areas (e.g., moving dwellings away from the spine road) or significant departures from the approved parameters would jeopardise the delivery of this allocated housing provision and conflict with the established planning strategy for the site. This is particularly important given that Mid Sussex District Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. In such circumstances, significant weight must be afforded to proposals that contribute towards addressing identified housing needs and delivering sustainable growth in accordance with the development plan. The application represents the detailed implementation of a strategically allocated site that has already been found acceptable in principle and which will make a substantial contribution towards the District's housing requirements. The focus of the Reserved Matters assessment should therefore be whether the detailed proposals satisfactorily deliver the approved development framework, rather than seeking to revisit the fundamental parameters of a scheme that has already benefited from Outline Planning Permission.

3.0 Item 3b: What dwellings cannot have windows open to achieve guideline internal conditions?

The Environmental Health unit has requested that the applicant provides: *"Identification of dwellings where the guideline internal conditions with windows open aren't achieved, with a clear explanation of why this is the case"*

As outlined in Section 7 of PA2091-L02-P02 (the updated appraisal based upon the approach agreed via the virtual meeting in May 2026) all plots can have windows open to achieve the agreed internal noise level as advocated by AVOG. There are no plots on Site that currently require windows to be fully closed.

The plots identified in the plan appended to the aforementioned appraisal would exceed the agreed internal criteria if windows were fully open and so restrictions are proposed. These restrictions would be included in the thermal modelling, completed at a later stage and embedded into the ventilation strategy for those plots.



4.0 Item 3c: What strategy could be used to combat overheating?

As advised, a small number of plots (<10% of the Site) require partial opening restrictions to achieve the agreed internal noise levels.

Vistry Homes Limited and David Wilson Homes, like other national housebuilders, complete thermal modelling and overheating assessments as part of Building Regulation processes using standard measures to reduce overheating. As outlined in Section 8 of PA2091-L02-P02 (the updated appraisal based upon the approach agreed via the virtual meeting in May 2026) the hierarchy already proposed within condition 24 will be followed.

Whilst each assessment is unique, typically, a strategy to combat any risk of overheating would follow the following hierarchy:

1. Apply the window opening restrictions and run the thermal analysis.
2. If the analysis showed an exceedance of the relevant overheating criteria, additional energy efficient options would be considered such as a reduced g-glazing value (to be considered in conjunction with other regulatory requirements) and cross-ventilation (already available in all dwellings identified and the majority of apartments);
3. Further measures would include providing mechanical ventilation or active cooling as a last resort.

Any of the above measures would be localised on a plot specific basis and would not impact the overall layout, or fundamentally change the scheme and are commonplace in many residential developments, since the enactment of Approved Document O.

5.0 Conclusions

In conclusion, this response demonstrates that the proposed development incorporates good acoustic design principles within the framework established and approved at the Outline Planning stage especially when considering the delivery of 550 allocated homes.

Furthermore, the acoustic appraisal, based upon the agreed approach, confirm that more than 90% of the site is free from noise constraints regarding window openings. For plots requiring partial opening restrictions, compliance with the acoustic and overheating hierarchy of Condition 24 will be achieved at the detailed design stage via standard mitigation measures which are plot specific. As such, they will not impact the overall layout, thereby providing the Council with full confidence that the requirements of the condition can be satisfactorily discharged.

Kind Regards,

**Adam
Walker**

Digitally signed by Adam Walker
DN: cn=Adam Walker, c=GB, o=Peninsular
Acoustics,
email=a.walker@peninsularacoustics.co.uk
Reason: I am the author of this document
Date: 2026.06.24 12:51:28 +0100

Adam Walker BSc (Hons) MIOA
Principal Consultant

Kate Brocklebank MRTPI
Associate Director