

From: Tybie House [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 April 2026 13:29
To: Neil Crowther; Karl Roberts
Cc: [REDACTED] Kelly Mills; Dawn Hudd; Emma Strudwick; Helen Perry; Beccy Cooper MP
Subject: Formal objection to validation – A/44/26/PL / Article 13 / Certificate B - Mayflower Meadow, Angmering. (Case Ref: BC11823)

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Mr Crowther and Mr Roberts,

We write formally to object to the Council's validation of application reference A/44/26/PL on the basis of the ownership certification and Article 13 notice process.

The application now on the portal is the April 2026 application. However, the Certificate B schedule lodged with that application appears to state that notice was served on 25 July 2025. On its face, that is not the notice date for this application. It therefore raises an immediate and serious question as to whether the Certificate B relied upon for validation was completed truthfully and specifically for the application now before the Council. For the avoidance of doubt, the notice dated 25 July 2025 referred to within this application states expressly that it relates to the application submitted at that time. It affords no basis for reuse in a later application and is, on its face, application-specific.

That concern is only reinforced by what actually occurred in practice. We were served with an Article 13 notice relating to this latest application on 14 April 2026, and at least two other owners were served by hand only on 27 April 2026. Those notices plainly relate to the current application, and not to any application in July 2025. The Council cannot therefore lawfully treat the July 2025 notice date recorded in the application form as if it were the operative notice date for the present application while simultaneously ignoring the fact that fresh notices were in fact issued and served in April 2026.

The legal position is straightforward. GOV.UK guidance states that an ownership certificate is a certificate which confirms that an appropriate notice has been served on any other owners and agricultural tenants. It also states that an application is not valid, and therefore cannot be determined by the local planning authority, unless the relevant certificate has been completed, and that it is an offence knowingly or recklessly to complete a false or misleading certificate. ([GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ownership-certificates))

The same guidance further states that, when making an application, an applicant is required to sign a certificate confirming the ownership of the land and that the relevant notices have been served. That is the critical point. The statutory and procedural scheme is framed on the basis that notice has already been given by the time the application is made and the certificate signed. ([GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ownership-certificates))

Accordingly, the "21 days before the date of the application" wording in Certificate B identifies the persons who must be notified; it does not authorise indefinite reuse of a historic notice for a later application. A notice said to have been served in July 2025 cannot safely be treated as the operative Article 13 notice for an April 2026 application, particularly where fresh notices were in fact issued and served in April 2026 in connection with that later application. On any ordinary reading, the application form therefore appears to rely on a facially inaccurate Certificate B.

This is not a mere technical discrepancy, nor a matter of administrative convenience. It is a question of whether the application was lawfully made and lawfully validated. If the operative notices for this application were only served on 14 April 2026 and 27 April 2026, they post-date the application. If, alternatively, the Council says that the operative notices are those allegedly served on 25 July 2025, then the application form appears to rely on notice for an earlier application cycle rather than this one. Either way, there is an obvious and serious defect in the ownership certification process.

In those circumstances, we ask the Council to confirm urgently:

1. whether it accepts that the Certificate B schedule lodged with this application records 25 July 2025 as the relevant notice date;
2. whether it contends that the July 2025 notices are the operative Article 13 notices for the April 2026 application;
3. if not, how the Council can treat the application as valid where the fresh notices relating to this application were served only after the application was made; and
4. whether the Council will now revisit validation in light of this facial inconsistency and the evidence of retrospective service.

For the avoidance of doubt, we do not object to Sigma making an application. Our objection is to the Council validating and progressing an application which, on the face of the documents now published and the notices actually served, does not appear to have complied with the mandatory Article 13 / Certificate B process.

Given the seriousness of the issue, and the fact that the Council has now been put expressly on notice of it, we should be grateful for a prompt written response, and do not expect the Council to work to the extremities of its 10-day reply policy.

Kind regards,

Dr Tym Huckin BSc(Hons) FIAP MBCS