

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 30/03/2026 2:29 PM from Mr Nadeem Shad on behalf of Environmental Protection, Environmental Health & Licensing.

Application Summary

Reference: AWDM/0106/26

Address: Development Site At Upper Floors Of 32 To 34 Marine Parade Bath Place Worthing West Sussex

Proposal: Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 3 (Materials/finishes); 4 (Design details) ; 5 (Construction management plan); 8 (Surface water drainage); 12 (Noise attenuation); 14 (Sound insulation); 15 (Noise impact assessment); 20 (Sustainability measures); 23 (Sustainable travel pack) and 24 (Refuse storage) of approved application AWDM/1174/23.

Case Officer: Giles Holbrook

Comments Details

I refer to the acoustic assessment prepared by 7th Wave Acoustics dated 23 January 2026 (ref [1208.001R.2.0.JP](#)) in support of the discharge of conditions 12, 14 and 15 of permission AWDM/1174/23.

Comments: These conditions relate to acoustic protection and overheating (12), sound insulation (14) and acoustic assessment of commercial noise at ground floor level (15).

The report proposes mitigation against external noise using mechanical ventilation for areas overlooking external commercial plant. The report concludes that other facades will achieve compliance with acoustic criteria using trickle vents provided windows remain closed. There is no reference to overheating which I would suggest will be a potential issue on the southern facade. ProPG states that open windows can be used

to mitigate overheating. Therefore, should the planning authority accept a scheme is to be assessed with windows closed, but this scheme is reliant on open windows to mitigate overheating, it is also necessary to consider the potential noise impact during the overheating condition.

Notwithstanding this, a separate overheating strategy has been provided by Muraa Ltd dated 22 January 2026 (refD0126) which makes reference to the acoustic assessment. Whilst acknowledging its methodology, I do have a concern with its reference to opening windows for purge ventilation. Section 4 refers to acoustic mitigation and states in 4.1.2 "Where occupants elect to open windows for natural ventilation during warmer periods, the enhanced acoustic performance of the glazing provides improved noise attenuation compared to standard glazing.....". Any enhanced acoustic protection is lost when a window is opened and I would therefore suggest that an alternative means of ventilation is provided for those rooms subject to high noise levels when windows need to be opened for purge ventilation.

The assessments relating to conditions 14 and 15 appear satisfactory provided amplified music remains at a background level (assumed to be no greater than 75dB LAeq15min).
