

**The Potting Barn
No5 Hobbs Court,
Bilsham Rd.
Yapton,
West Sussex BN18 0JY**

**Redrow Planning application Ref Y/32/25 PL Land West of
Bilsham Rd. BN18 OLA, for 170 proposed houses.**

Dear Sir,

I wish to object to this proposal on the following grounds:-

1.Introduction

a) It is a requirement that all planning application details submitted by an applicant or their agent, should be clear and unequivocal. Reliance is placed on their accuracy, by the public, the ADC Planning Department/ADC Planning Committee when making their comments and decisions.

b) As some of the details submitted with this application appear to be at variance with this requirement, they form part of my objection as follows:

2.Site Location Plan and Block Plan.

a) This is required to show the main site outlined in red, other areas owned by the applicant in blue, but also the surrounding areas in relation to it.

b) The Thakeham site to the North is indicated in depth.

c) The scale of the site is shown in such large proportion, that the Hamlet of Bilsham is not recognised or named in its own right.

Part of Bilsham Lane is included, but Hobbs Court and Grade II listed Hobbs Farmhouse as part of Bilsham are excluded by way

of recognition. Apparently at the expense of major urbanisation shown in details to the North.

d) As Bilsham is referred to later in text in relation to Heritage assets, it would seem a serious omission to deny the ability from words to identify them in reality by way of location.

e) In the DAS Part1, Hobbs Court is obliterated in existence by the words 'Bilsham Rd'.

3. The 'RPS Group' Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Plan

(Submitted onto the planning website on 2/5/2025).

a) The Title referred to, 'Officer Recommendation'. No evidential details or verification were included in support from any 'officer', department, or when, any 'recommendation' was made, or even if it was in relation to this application or another entirely.

b) It appears from the two illustrated plans in this section, that they are at variance with the areas as indicated in the Block Plan and Location Plan submitted by the agent elsewhere.

c) To the West and South, it shows farmland which exists.

d) To the North shows a large area of GREEN, stretching the full width of the development and adjacent to the proposed development site.

e) By its 'green' nature, is indicative of a major source of biodiversity adjacent to the proposed site, and also indicative of a 'green gateway' to the village.

f) Unfortunately, the *'green area' depicted does not exist in reality.* It is an existing development instead. It would appear to be necessary in generality for an agent, to confirm that any external

report commissioned contains matters accurately appertaining to the site in question, otherwise, it could be invalidated.

g) Any such allegedly misleading inclusions are concerning, as to purpose and intention by the applicant/agent.

h) The 'green area,' included in the plans as indicated in this section, are part of the Thakeham site as already built/in build. The planning ref. for it is Y/91/17/OUT approved on 4/4/019 and further items in approval added on 27/8/019 **approx. 5 years ago.**

i) It is noted that the agents now acting for Redrow, were also acting for Boklok for the same site, under planning ref. Y/52/23/PL. An updated Block Plan Dwg. ,was submitted on the website on 18/8/23, clearly showing a knowledge of the Thakeham site as not a green area from 2023.

j) Anyone unfamiliar with that area of Yapton now, would perhaps take that green area as existing instead, just because it is on the application plan details.

k) The reason for the applicant/agent allegedly supplying out of date, and conflicting details, which are not representative of present biodiversity in the area as a whole, is unexplained, and allegedly raises questions as to accuracy and inconsistency perhaps elsewhere.

4. RPS Group Biodiversity report Cont. Appendix A, site Photographs, Photo 4.

a) The photo is of a pink house. This is a recognisable property in the area. *It is only allegedly permitted to take a street view of a property from a public land, space or area. i.e., road, without permission.*

b) The photo was apparently taken from the Redrow field site in the application, not a public area. No permission was obtained from the householder to take the photo or place it on public website. If for some reason a photo could be taken without permission, publishing it is apparently another matter.

5. Phase 3 Archaeological Strip

a) In order to get to Phase 3 it is necessary to refer to stages 1 and 2 by consulting details submitted in the application Y/52/23/PL.

b) As of 14/5/2025, only ref.to stage 1 Archaeological (Desktop) Survey by Development Archaeological Services Ltd. is shown on the website for Y/52/23/PL, on 26/5/2023. It was prepared for former owners of the site and field (Dogleg) to the West for Landlink Estates in 2021, submitted by Boklok onto the planning website on 26/5/ 2023 as said.

c) No reference was made in the Gov. Inspector report for Y/52/23/PL appeal ref. Appeal Decision APP/C3810/W/24/3343922, regarding archaeology, so it cannot be claimed that any earlier position was accepted before, for any consultation now. It is suggested that the earlier report should be assessed alongside the latest one for completeness.

d) A Development Archaeological Services Ltd. Stage 3 report is dated Oct. 2024 for Boklok, has been submitted by the applicant/agent with the planning application Y/32/25/PL now.

e) The Archaeology Index indicates Figs 1,2.and 3,states a Location and Block Plan.

f) Although allegedly an 'updated version' from 2023,the Oct.2024,report, Figs 1 and 2 do not show the Thakeham site (already in situ), and indicate that the development area and the

'Dog leg' are *both* owned by the applicant Boklok in 2024. Interestingly, by contrast, the Site Block Plan for Y/52/23/PL does *not* include the Dogleg in ownership of Boklok. Aspects from 2024 presented now in 2025. Both cannot be correct. 'Archaeology' report content will be addressed later.

5. Do all these differences matter in relation to sites applications and ownerships?

a) Landlink originally owned the current Redrow site and the Dogleg. Landlink apparently sold the present development site to Boklok for 17.4m.

b) The Section 13 form and Application form, indicate that another party is involved in ownership of the site/tenant. In view of all the different aspects put out regarding ownership and development in the vicinity over time, it is impossible to know who owns the land.

c) That details have been redacted regarding the Application and Section 13 form is considered to be unhelpful, confusing and secretive, because eventually, Land Registered Titles, ownerships and purchase values will be a matter of public record on the Land Registry Titles website details.

d) By contrast the applicant and landowner/s of the site have the opportunity to read and comment upon any objections submitted regarding the application. Residents have been denied this opportunity reciprocally with regard to those involved with the ownership of the site.

f) Are any of the alleged errors in site plans submitted, going to be corrected to give a true and accurate picture to all?

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsborough






REP

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notifications of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



Our priorities...

 Improving the wellbeing of Arun	 Delivering the right homes in the right places	 Supporting our environment to support us	 Fulfilling Arun's economic potential	 
--	---	---	--	--

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 May 2025 16:38
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Objection to Redrow application for Land West of Bilsham Rd. BN8 OLA planning Ref Y/32/25/PL Lownsborough

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 May 2025 16:25
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Redrow application for Land West of Bilsham Rd. BN8 OLA planning Ref Y/32/25/PL Lownsborough

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. Davis,

Enclosed, attachment ref objection to the Redrow site for 170 houses for Land West of Bilsham Rd Yapton BN18 0JY.

Yours sincerely
Dilys Lownsborough