

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 September 2026 14:40:12 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0164

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 10/09/2026 2:40 PM from Oliver Benson on behalf of Environmental Protection.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/26/0164
Address:	273 London Road Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 9QU
Proposal:	Retrospective application for conversion and external works to building to form 6 flats. (Noise Impact Assessment received 08.09.2026.)
Case Officer:	Deborah Lynn

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

	The submitted DAA Noise Survey dated 30th July 2026 largely addresses the previously raised concerns regarding road traffic noise affecting future occupants. The assessment demonstrates that acceptable internal noise levels can be achieved, subject to the incorporation of suitable acoustic ventilation measures and the acoustic performance of the existing building fabric.
Comments:	However, further clarification is requested regarding several aspects of the assessment. The report concludes that the existing glazing is suitable for retention and has an apparent sound reduction performance of approximately Rw 38 dB from site measurements. Whilst such performance may be achievable, it would be higher than would typically be expected from standard domestic double glazing. The submitted report does not provide details of the glazing

specification assessed and it is therefore unclear whether the windows comprise standard double glazing or an enhanced acoustic specification. Confirmation of the glazing build-up, including pane thicknesses, cavity width and whether laminated or acoustic glass has been installed, should therefore be provided together with any available manufacturer performance data.

In addition, the report identifies that alternative means of ventilation are required in order to achieve the stated internal noise criteria and indicates that standard trickle ventilators would not be appropriate. However, the specific ventilation strategy proposed has not been clearly identified. Instead, a range of potential solutions is listed, including acoustic wall ventilators, positive input ventilation and MVHR systems. Further details should therefore be provided confirming the ventilation system proposed for the development.

Clarification should also be provided demonstrating that noise generated by the proposed ventilation system itself has been considered and will not result in internal ambient noise levels exceeding the relevant BS8233:2014 design criteria during normal operation.

Subject to satisfactory clarification of the above matters, I should be in a position to have no further objections to this application.

Kind regards