



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Development Control
FROM:	Environmental Health and Licensing
REFERENCE:	DC/26/0592
LOCATION:	Land at Lower Broadbridge Farm, Billingshurst Road, Broadbridge Heath, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3LR
DESCRIPTION:	Reserved matters application for the erection of 133 dwellings following approval of outline application DC/22/1052 as amended by DC/25/1886, relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale
RECOMMENDATION:	Further information required

Noise

Environmental Health have reviewed the Cass Allen Noise Impact Assessment dated 31 March 2026 and we have the following comments to make.

1. The above provides a report on an environmental noise survey at Land at Lower Broadbridge Farm between 03.02.26 and 09.02.26. We note that the following is detailed in Appendix 2 in relation to noise levels in measurement locations L1, L2, N3 and N4 i.e. those closest to the A264.
 - Average noise levels during the daytime – 72dB LAeq,0700-2300hrs
 - Average noise levels during the night-time – 63dB LAeq,2300-0700hrs
 - Typical maximum noise levels during the night-time – 82dB LAmix
2. We note the modelling results have been provided in Appendix 3 which is welcomed, however when the figures titled 'Daytime noise levels (LAeq,16hr) at 1.5m above ground level' and 'Nighttime noise levels (LAeq,8hr) at 1.5m above ground level' are enlarged these two figures become illegible. We would therefore be grateful for these two figures in a higher resolution – we will have further comments to make on internal noise levels, ventilation etc once these have been provided.
3. We note the comments in section 4.33 in relation to the localised 2.4m high fence around gardens where noise levels are highest along with a 3m high fence along the southern and eastern edges of the site. From discussing fence heights with the planning officer it is however not clear if these fence heights are acceptable to the LPA.
4. We note that even with the above fence heights noise levels in amenity spaces in the southern and eastern part of the site are still above the 55dB criteria in BS8233. We would therefore be grateful if Cass Allen can confirm if the all the modelling in Appendix 3 is based on the above-mentioned fence heights.
5. We have reviewed the figure titled 'Daytime external amenity noise levels (LAeq,16hr) at 1.5m above ground level' and we note that approximately 17 of the plots in the south-western part of the site will be subject to noise levels above the 55dB criteria detailed in BS8233.
6. With the above comment in mind we note the comments in section 4.36 in relation to 2dB over the 55dB criteria, however as detailed in WHO guidance health effects from noise exposure increase significantly when noise levels exceed 55 dB. 55dB is also widely accepted as the upper limit for daytime noise in gardens and residential outdoor amenity spaces because it represents the threshold where noise becomes a significant source of annoyance and begins to negatively impact the usability of the space.
7. We also note that reference has been made to the Appeal Statement of Common Ground and comments in relation to an acceptance of 57dB as the 'upper limit' for this site. We have however reviewed the DMH Stallard 'Statement of Common Ground', dated September 2023, and have been unable to find any reference to 57dB. There is a statement that noise levels in gardens are acceptable, crucially this is however subject to detailed design at the reserve matters stage. We would therefore be grateful if Cass Allen can confirm how they have formed the view that an upper level of 57dB has been accepted.
8. We appreciate that there are constraints in south western part of the site, it is however a reasonable expectation that future residents will expect a good level of amenity which, in our view, is not currently the case for residential plots in this part of the site – in our view the majority of the plots in the south western part of the site will have poor quality amenity spaces.
9. We will have further comments to make the once the information detailed above has been provided, however based on the information that has been provided to date we remain unconvinced that the layout as currently proposed represents good acoustic design, as detailed in with ProPG – Planning and Noise.

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:	
N/A	
NAME:	Kevin Beer
DEPARTMENT:	Environmental Health and Licensing
DATE:	11/06/26