

The Potting Barn
No.5 Hobbs Court
Bilsham Rd.
Yapton
West Sussex BN18 0JY

Feb.4th 2026

Planning Application Ref. Y/80/25/S73 Variation of Conditions 2,14,15,22, and 23, imposed under Y/52/23/PL etc., for Land West of Bilsham Rd.BN18 0LA.

OBJECTION

Disclaimer :

The following details are included from source, provided by the applicant and others. Aspects are contained as 'opinions' and 'objections' for query and further investigation in outcome only.

1.Design and Access Statements Y/32/25/PLand Y80/25/S73

Introduction :-

a) The Agent advised the Planning Officer in writing on the website on 16/1/2026, that the details in Y/80/25/S73 were 'exactly the same as for Y/32/25/PL'. It follows, that any alleged error in one is repeated in the other on that basis, would be twofold.

b) Careful note was taken of the *original* DAS application details for Y/32/25/PL when first submitted. Some of those included now as if 'originals,' are *not* allegedly all the same as the details I have on record, regarding the placement of Burndell Rd. in relation to the site, access, and pictorial detail.

c) It is noted that in the case of Revised Plans or Superseded Documents, both the original and changes are shown. It is in

Objection that some of the original details have not allegedly been addressed in the same way regarding content of the DAS.

d) An applicant is required to submit an *unequivocal* DAS, containing details of their understanding, rationale, design, and access indications. Also, aspects of infrastructure and sustainability of the proposed 'site'; and in relation to its surroundings as appropriate.

2 .DAS1, Y/32/25/PL, 23/4/25 and Y/80/25/S73, 22/12/2025

a) It is noted that the DAS is referred to as being compiled for Redrow Homes Ltd. in *both* cases on the frontispiece, but Redrow Homes Ltd. have not been identified as the applicants for Y/80/25/S73 and is in **Objection** because.....

b) At present there is no confirming identification of applicant for the latter, as stated in the Application Form otherwise, under a trading name of 'Barratt Redrow Southern Counties'..... In the absence of verifiable identification of who within the group 'Southern Counties' refers to, there is no evidence of authorisation that Redrow Homes Ltd. gave permission to another company or 'entity' to use the details for Y/32/25/PL, in a separate application for Y/80/25/S73 concerning the DAS content/otherwise.

bi) A DAS for an allegedly unidentified/verifiable/ company/entity for Y/80/25/S73 would appear at variance with requirement.

2A.DAS Part 1, Y/32/25/PL Uploaded 23/4/2025

a) **Item 6, Page 6, 'Site Location'**..... allegedly fails to identify that this is not Grevatts Lane West BN18 0LA as according to all published details to date for the site otherwise. The nearest correct location for the site location is Bittern Ave., BN18 0BW.

b) Item 7, refers to ‘An open Field and Ryebank Rife’. This is just a ‘generic name ‘allegedly used incorrectly for a field drainage ditch. ‘Ryebank’ Rife is located approx. 1/4 mile to the South from West to East and under the road by a property, ‘White Rails’ towards the B259, where it traverses towards Littlehampton where it becomes tidal. The field ditch is not tidal. See link for location.

https://www.google.com/maps/search/where+is+the+River+ryebank+Rife+in+Yapton/@50.8064229,-0.6184959,2931m/data=!3m1!1e3?entry=ttu&g_ep=EgoyMDI1MTUyMy4xIKXMDS0ASAFQAw%3D%3D

c) Items 29-31. The illustrative map in conjunction, states, ‘*The site lies immediately South of the SD7 Strategic Housing Allocation, a **proposed** large scale residential expansion identified within the Arun Local Plan,*’ And continues.....’*The SD7 **once delivered** will alter the special relationship between Yapton’s built form and the rural fringe placing the site with a more urbanised context*’.

ci)The applicant illustrative DAS 1 plan map shows ‘SD7’ as **an unspecified green area**, stated as ‘**for proposed future development,**’ is allegedly out of date, and misleading.

cii) The area illustrated is not ‘green,’ it is the Thakeham- Hyde Wildbridge site, already in existence, approved under Y/91/17/OUT for 250 dwellings on 27/8/019. Advised on Thakeham’s own website, as commenced build in August 2022, and scheduled to be completed in May 2025. It was.

d)A site visit would confirm its completed status. It is noted that the ‘Redrow’ **planning** application was submitted for Y/32/25/PL, on 1/5/2025... the same month as the Thakeham completion.

dii) It is in **Objection** that the applicant has submitted details that cannot be confirmed as current fact, as are allegedly out of date for commencement by approx. 3 years; also completed approx. 8 months before the S73 was submitted in Dec. 2025.

e) In the Boklok application for Y/52/23/PL in the DAS of 25/6/2023 under their DAS 1, page 28, Under 'Photos, Site Assessment', photo 3, shows the Thakeham site already under construction. Also, a further 4 photos similarly, which state, 'Site Assessment photos North, Thakeham'.

f) It is also questioned in **Objection**, how the latter site earlier confirmed to be in existence/construction by the same agent/agency for Boklok in 2023, was not allegedly correctly referenced now, as still referred to as an SD7 instead. A 'green' area, as if still only 'proposed' for development in the Redrow Homes Ltd. DAS 1 in 2025, when completed.

g) Plan 'indications' are shown elsewhere for the Thakeham site for Y/32/25/PL, but not as a completed, *named* major development, and how its existence reflects on the 'Redrow' 'site'. Surroundings are supposed to be recognised in a DAS. I.e., 250 dwellings on top of 170 more proposed.

gi) 'Bittern Ave.', as the main feature road on the Thakeham site is only shown in other plans as 'indicative'. It is the primary road on that site into Bilsham Rd. and is adjacent to the 'Redrow' 'site', but unnamed on any plans. Lack of acknowledgement of an existing new development site/road in proximity to that of 'Redrow,' is in **Objection**.

h) The 'runoff' water from the Thakeham site goes into the same ditch as for Y/32/25/PL. There is allegedly no calculation

indicated, as to how any 'runoff' from the above site may affect the latter.

i) It is in **Objection** that the DAS has allegedly failed to report a major 'influence' for a site in the locale. Lack of reference is also important regarding additional householder numbers, putting strains on infrastructure such as schools over- subscription and travel in association. Also, as follows-

2B.DAS2 Under 'Local (Immediate) Context'

a) A photo is shown under Item 41 'C' Page 18, '**Meadowcroft Surgery**' and states : -

'Ensuring convenient access to essential healthcare services'.

Also referred to under Item 46 in text as existing. But an unsustainable claim. **The Meadowcroft Surgery closed at the end of August 2025.It is currently still advertised on the estate agents lists on the open market (Simms Williams) as of Feb. 2026.(7months).**

ai) To include a defunct service that *was* nearby the 'site' but no longer exists is considered a major flaw in providing details in a DAS, affecting the whole of Yapton.

b) It is in **Objection** that a matter of major concern in the community has been 'left off' two DAS planning application statements.

c)The Meadowcroft Surgery 'Group' advise on their website that they are only accommodating existing Yapton patients elsewhere in their Group, **external** to Yapton.

d) The Avisford Group and Dr. Meller, the other side of Yapton, and Meadowcroft, stated collectively on their websites that they are only taking on any new patients under strict criteria (ie.,

additional family member), and that those new to the area would likely have to find alternative surgeries, not in Yapton.

e) Available medical services are advised as a *'material consideration for developments'*. *'Local planning authorities are required by the NPPF to ensure that new developments are supported by the necessary infrastructure including healthcare facilities. (internet source)*. A 'pharmacy' is not a GP Surgery and is only equipped to advise on minor medical matters and prescriptions. It cannot replace a proper medical service for thousands of people.

f) It was also advised on the internet on **Sept 27th 2024**, NHS Sussex were informed about the immediate closure of *'Innovations in Primary Care (IPC). The GP Federation that provided services in West Sussex, indicated may have included the Meadowcroft Surgery, and lead to service disruptions and transfers for many patients in the area'*.

g) It is observed that such details of concern were available to all, well before the applicant submitted their applications for Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73 that the surgery was due to close imminently. Because of the closure, there is significantly less available healthcare in Yapton than when the application was put in for Y/52/23/PL, (Boklok).

gi) **Loss of community facility:** *'Planning policies often seek to protect community services. The loss of a surgery can only allegedly be justified if there is no longer a need for the facility. It is no longer financially viable or will be replaced by a better accessible alternative facility'.(Internet source)*.

h) In the absence of any S106 in either application and a CIL only for Y/32/25/PL, there is no indication submitted by way of mitigation for a replacement surgery, or comparable facility to accommodate this difficulty.

i) Also compounded because the 6,339 population numbers reported in 2021 have increased significantly in number through new developments in Yapton since.

j) It is in **Objection** that the applicant has allegedly ignored this significant aspect and the 'fallout', because of the loss of that local amenity.

k) Under Item 44 'F', in the same section is a photo and text acknowledging that it is Taylors Close. It is correct there, but allegedly at variance with details in 'Site Analysis' details below.

l) Another local amenity also mentioned as 'close' by the 'site,' is a hairdressers. Near to the site is a Barbers for men and boys only. The hairdressers in central Yapton closed in 2021.

3.DAS 2 Continued

a) Site Analysis Photos No1.Page16 shows a photograph and in relation to a pictorial rendering opposite in association. The text refers to Bilsham Rd splitting at Burndell Road. The latter is to the East in Yapton only, the same road to the West, is Main Rd. Yapton.(not in photo).

ai) The photo showing a split in the road, is in Bilsham Rd. The other road shown is Graham Rd., not Burndell Rd. The pictorial rendering for '1' is a location for Bittern Avenue on the Thakeham site. The two aspects do not tally in reality, because Bittern Ave.,'1' is to the West of Bilsham Rd and the photo is to the East'.

b) Photo No.6 is a field drainage ditch, but attributed to the Ryebank Rife, but the latter is indicated to the south as evidenced under 2A (b) above.

c) **Local Character Page 24 Text and Pictorial Image**

Scroll down to the end of page 24, items 66 onwards numbers 2-5 which allegedly indicate incorrect detailing.

ci) 68 in text reads : -

‘The local character study identifies 4 key character areas within Yapton selected for their contextuality, appropriate built language aligning with the principles outlined in the YCADC.’

cii) Unfortunately, the evidence is contra to those submitted details as follows: -

Text states that ‘2’ on the pictorial image is **‘The Development at Drove Lane’**. *‘The recently permitted development at Drove Lane provides a key precedent for higher density housing within the immediate context. It demonstrates how contemporary design can interpret local vernacular, offering a reference point for shaping the central neighbourhood of the proposed scheme.’*

cii) Unfortunately the above details ref Drove Lane under 2 are in error and in **Objection. The correct location of the Drove Lane (Ryebank Gate) development is not indicated correctly as such anywhere on the pictorial map. The correct location although not identified in text is under ‘3’.**

ciii) This would appear an unfortunate omission, as the true Drove Lane Development is a Barratt’ Redrow development (David Wilson Homes). **It is in Objection and of obvious concern that the applicant was unable to supply correct details about their**

own ongoing development in Yapton, and attributing it to another existing development instead.

civ) 'F' and '2' are NOT *'a new high density major development or Drove Lane'*. Instead it is a 'combination' of Taylors Close (59 properties BN18 0FN, (Rightmove details), and Lambs Cottages, (100 properties BN18 0JN, (Rightmove details), developments both built approx. 9-10 years ago to the East of Bilsham Rd.

Further inconsistency ref, '2', it is later referred to just in text as Taylors Close, although the definitive detailing pictorially submitted is as above.

civ) The Drove Lane development is accessed from the Main Road in Yapton to the West, then Drove Lane, it cannot be accessed by Bilsham Rd. or Burdell Rd, the latter being approx. 1 mile away to the East in Yapton centre.

d) '3' Item 68 in text, and in pictorial reference (should refer to '2', as Taylors Close and Lambs Cottages), but incorrectly stated again for '3' as: - *'Burdell Rd. and Cinders Lane are one of Yapton's key growth areas. The development exhibits an urban character which draws from the local built language offering a contextually appropriate approach to growth'*.

di) '3' is shown as an undeveloped 'green' area. Neither Burdell Rd. nor Cinders Lane are situated in '3'. This is allegedly a continuation of an incorrect detailing that was allegedly removed from earlier details. It also allegedly stated that the access to the site was Burdell Rd. Showing for '1' now pictorially, when in fact it is Bittern Ave., now allegedly removed, but also seen by others in confirmation at that earlier time.

Burdell Rd. is in the centre of Yapton as part of the B2233 to the East. Cinders Lane and road sign is situated to the East of Bilsham Rd, the entrance of which is adjacent to the Meadowcroft GP Surgery now closed.

dii) '3' in the DAS 2 also contains the 'green' area again as stated earlier as SD7 on the DAS map as 'Strategic Site Allocation'. Still with vague green 'nonspecific' indications of future development. The Thakham site access is from Bilsham Rd. It is not currently connected of the Drove Lane development either at this time. Although the pictorial map indicates it is all one area.

e) Item 4 DAS 2 Pictorial Reference and text stated as Lambs Cottages and Taylors Close

e) Incorrect again. '4' is Cinders Lane and The Potteries to the East of Bilsham Rd. incorrectly stated as, for Taylors Close and Lambs Cottages. But stated as, *'A residential development within the site's immediate context, responding to its rural surroundings and providing a gentle transition from the built environment to the open countryside.*

ei) It would be perhaps a correct detailing for Taylors Close and Lambs Cottages if shown as situated off Bilsham Rd, instead of incorrectly off Burdell Rd. in the centre of Yapton to the East.

f). Item 5 DAS 2 Pictorial reference and text.

Also allegedly indicates other Redrow sites of Valley Park and Meadow Gardens, advised as in North End Rd. BN18 0DU. They are located in Ford Lane instead under BN18 0DT.

g) All the aspects notated in text and pictorially for DAS 2 between 2-5 are allegedly incorrect. In addition, aspects of DAS1 as advised. It is in **Objection** that details in presentation and

description do not tally with the reality. It is of obvious concern how they relate, as DAS statements are anticipated to be correct.

4. Conclusion

a) It is understood that a DAS for a planning application is a statutory requirement. Also, a 'Framework' for the applicant to explain how a proposed application content is 'suitable response to the site and its setting'. Inaccurate details can allegedly undermine the credibility of it and hinder the planning authorities ability to assess the proposal.

b) It is also understood in 'generality' that any inaccuracy in a DAS as presented can lead to invalidation. Fines can also allegedly be imposed for giving false or misleading information.

c) Also, that in the case of an Inspector review the original details are allegedly assessed in 'mistakes' too. In Judicial Review allegedly decisions in 'mistakes of fact' can result in the application being quashed.

d) It is in **Objection** to see how the DAS 1 and DAS 2 can realistically be accepted as presented as indicated in this report as allegedly applied, for Y/32/25/PL AND Y/80/25/S73 as they are allegedly at variance with reality as indicated.

I respectfully suggest that this allegedly flawed application is thrown out /refused because it is allegedly impossible to have confidence in it in its present form, in this instance in relation to DAS 1 and 2 and in association.

Thanking you for your kind attention and consideration.

Yours sincerely,






Dilys Lownsborough

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

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



Our priorities...

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

From: Nicola Spencer <Nicola.Spencer@arun.gov.uk> **On Behalf Of** Planning
Sent: 05 February 2026 10:49
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Objection to DAS referencing for Y/32/23/PL and Y/80/25/S73 for Land West of Bilsham Rd .Lownsborough

Nicola Spencer
Technical Support Manager
Planning Services

T: 01903 737945


E: nicola.spencer@arun.gov.uk

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

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



Our priorities...

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

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 February 2026 23:21
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to DAS referencing for Y/32/23/PL and Y/80/25/S73 for Land West of Bilsham Rd .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 Planning,
Please find enclosed my objection ref DAS 1and 2 for Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73.
Kind regards
Dilys Lownsborough