

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

June 3rd 2025

**Planning reference Y/32/25/PL Redrow Homes Ltd.
Application for 170 Dwellings for Land West of Bilsham Rd.
Yapton, West Sussex BN18 0LA**

Further Objections to Y/32/25/PL (5)

**Phase 3 Archaeology Report by Development Archaeology
Services Ltd. Comments from Details Uploaded onto the
Website on 23/4/2025**

Dear Sir,

1. General Site Location

The report submitted for application ref. Y/32/25/PL was prepared for Boklok Housing Ltd. on Oct. 2024 for Y/52/23/PL, the same site as now, for Redrow Homes Ltd.

2. The Summary

a) Stated that investigations for Phase 3 were carried out by DAS, 'on the'.....?..... but no date was given in confirmation in the summary.

b) The report stated that *finds* were extensive, and indicative of significant development over thousands of years from Mesolithic/Neolithic to Iron Age and Romano- British. I object that such a rich source of archaeology is to be lost if this planning application is approved.

c) The site yielded examples from farmstead habitation in confirmation from the report, *'It has also been noted at the outset*

that this excavation was on a significantly higher level than the surrounding land and this may have ensured the greater level of preservation of the various archaeological features recorded on this excavation site’.

d) The summary also refers to earlier finds and occupation from Stages 1 and 2. Phase 3 appears to relate to an area to the South East, not the entire site, which, if excavated further, may reveal even more finds.

2. Introduction

a) Refers to earlier investigations by others, in Aug. 2023 and Oct. 20203. 42 trial trenches were undertaken by DAS in Oct 2023, in line with the written scheme of works for recovery of artifacts by Mr. Kenney, Heritage Officer for Chichester District Council.

b) The NPPF seeks to discourage development on such land, unless there is a local ‘need’. Satisfying build quotas for Arun, does not mean they must continue to fall on Yapton to fulfil.

c) There is no ‘need’ for additional houses in Yapton, to fulfil the NPPF criteria for development otherwise. There are approximately 200 houses on estate agents lists, most of which are new build, and many have remained unsold for months. Earlier development sites have still not been completed and will add to the list of housing available in due course.

d) Para. 197 of the NPPF states, *‘The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when determining a planning application.*

e) Para 203, 1.14 of the NPPF also deals with decision- making considerations,- *‘Where a development proposed would affect the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, requires a*

balanced judgement and having regard to the scale of harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset’.

f) The ‘harm’ is allegedly the loss of something irreplaceable with something for which there is no requirement or need at this time.

g) Further major development is also harmful to Yapton because it cannot assimilate any more adverse outcomes from them.

There is no infrastructure to cope. Development is not helping it is hindering.

3) Planning Background

a) **3.1.** Identifies the site and refers to the earlier consent for Boklok on the same site under Y/52/23/PL. Unfortunately, allegedly in error, as stating that this was for 178 dwellings. The application then and now, is for 170.

b) **3.2. states, ‘*The proposed development will take place within a known archaeologically sensitive area and in an area of high archaeological potential*’.** It is difficult to see how such a comment is compatible with its intended destruction.

c) **3.3 and 3.4** Confirms that the appropriate investigations were approved by Mr. Kenny as Archaeological Advisor and undertaken.

d) He also stated on the website, 15/ 5/ 2025, ‘*The archaeological investigation of this site has been completed satisfactorily. No further investigation is warranted.*’

e) It is disappointing to note, that after the required investigations had been undertaken for part of the site, the Archaeological Advisor has no comment to make about its preservation. Nor even for an advice of a ‘watching brief’ during any development, which is suggested now, as a condition going forward, if the development is approved.

4. Archaeological and Historic Background

a) **4.5 . ‘ The archaeological investigation identified a number of land drainage features that comprised a series of modern features along with several further red ceramic 19c land drains’.**

b) Such features are evidence that the site has required drainage features for at least 200 years, to deal with excess water. Also proof, that this is not a ‘new’ phenomenon but ‘ongoing’ over time.

c) **4.6,7 and 8** Advised of other archaeological geophysical features, and other Bronze Age ‘finds’.

d) Reportage from 5 and 6, also referred to trenches dug and content.

f) 7. Discussion and Conclusion

7.8 Their report confirmed again that the site was rich in artefacts.

5. Objection Details Conclusion ref. Archaeology

a) The evidence confirms agriculture and settlement on the site going back thousands of years. It is part of our British Heritage.

b) That the same field has been in agricultural use in the same way and still retains Grade 1 and Grade 2 status over millennia is considered a miracle in itself.

c) There is no need or reason for this little green jewel to be destroyed. To suggest that a new development would be an improvement is anathema.

d) Part of Bilsham is already officially recognised as ‘An Area of Character’. Surely the village should also be able to say with pride, that we wish to *continue* preserve part of its irreplaceable heritage as well.

e) Earlier and recent development in Yapton has already placed intolerable burdens on residents, our lives and infrastructure. Enough harm has been done already.

f) Residents do not object to developments per se as a matter of principle or flimsy reasons, they are facts. The additional possible loss of a time-honoured asset and agricultural land is important to retain for the future.

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsborough

From: Nicola Spencer on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 03 June 2025 12:08
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Further objection to Redrow development Y/32/25/PL Archaeology (5)
Attachments: archaeology objection for Y 32 25 PL Redrow Application.doc

Please can you upload an redacted and an unredacted copy PL- REP

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...

 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: 03 June 2025 09:43
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Further objection to Redrow development Y/32/25/PL Archaeology (5)

Objection

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2025 05:59
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Further objection to Redrow development Y/32/25/PL Archaeology (5)

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,

I apologise again for sending the same earlier objection twice.(for June1st 2025)

Please find as attachment further objection ref Archaeology (5).

Yours sincerely,
Dilys Lownsborough