

The Potting Barn
No. 5 Hobbs Court.
Bilsham Rd,
Yapton West Sussex BN18 OJY

Aug12th 2022

Planning Hybrid ref. Y3/22/OUT

Dear Mr. Davis.

I am concerned that there appears to be no indication on the planning website regarding times for sending in objections as an up to date completion date. I also advise that there was no yellow sign in my area regarding this, and we have had no hurricanes that would have caused the sign to fly away. I was advised of this by a councillor instead only very recently.

I would like to register an **objection** to the hybrid application Y/3/22/OUT for:

Full planning for phase 1 of the proposed development for 30 dwelling and outline planning permission for a further 110 to the West of Bilham Rd.

I concur with the variety of objections already listed on the planning application site in connection. It also appears that allegedly a local landowner and their associates feel that they have the right of say and sway over the area and its inhabitants, without consideration of the outcomes and detrimental impact on all those who live there. In addition:

1.The proposed pavement from Taylors Close to Grevatts Lane West, which has been mentioned before in earlier applications.

A proposed 1.5 metre pavement/ cycle track has already been **refused** by both ADC and YPC. Please check your records in relation to the earlier Little Meadow applications.(Mr Hyam's field).

Also in relation to the S106 in respect of the proposed pavement/cycle track, in relation to the Cinders Lane development (Crayfern Homes Ltd.) which was not implemented but allocated to another area for pavement later.

The area of verge does not belong to WSCC as has previously been advised but allegedly ignored.

They only own approx.1m to the highway, the rest is owned by the adjacent properties, who would be required to sell their verges. I would also like to point out that the proposed width would include part of my existing driveway and that it would be necessary to park on the proposed pavement for access which is understood unlawful. No risk assessment appears to have been undertaken in relation to the

Hobbs Corner bend where vehicles regularly ingress into the verge to avoid hitting one another. Cyclist racing down that stretch in prospect has not been considered either. Drainage from the road and into any ditches/verges owned by householders has also not apparently been considered. Neither has such a pavement been considered in terms of the heritage access/asset of Hobbs Court and Hobbs Farmhouse and in terms of the *refusal* of the Little Meadow proposal and comment from the conservation officer regarding the pavement, which advised that it was not acceptable as **urbanisation**. If all these aspects continue to be ignored, they will not go away or resolve safety issues. It is perhaps likely to result in a legal challenge/safety issues/ raised at a higher level.

2) Agricultural Environment

Agricultural fields are required for food production, in one form or another and as habitat for flora and fauna, or can be rented out, which appears to have been dismissed in favour of financial considerations instead.

I understand that there is a 'requirement' for allotments to be included in the area. Perhaps the local authority may consider how this could be done as a way to serve and feed the ever- increasing size of the community population, if farming is not intended on the fields put forward for development by those who own them.

Agricultural land is not of huge value until planning has been granted. Perhaps able to be purchased instead by the council or collectively by residents, and also to be included as an area of green space, water conservation area/recreation otherwise.

There is no amount that can be set for a CIL or S106 regarding any new development in that area that is considered would replace or mitigate any loss of it.

I understand that in the past a local landowner previously donated/allocated an area for allotments in Bilsham Rd., (not Cinders Lane), in consideration of the community and by way of example to all. It is sad that others do not apparently have the same regard for it.

3) Other considerations regarding objection the applications

Just recently an outline planning permission for development of Little Meadow(Hyam's Field) on the East Side of Bilsham Rd. was REJECTED ON APPEAL by the Secretary of State REF,APP/C3810/W22/3293935 for 73 houses in the Bilsham area and associated matters. It would seem a nonsense if a similar area proposed for development on the West side would be accepted instead.

A FULL planning application for 30 houses for development is seen as a 'sprat to catch a mackerel'. If approval was given for that, it could then be used as a known strategy and as a 'basis' for further development.

Also included on the plan for the area submitted in blue is an area adjacent also apparently belonging to the landowner. Again allegedly 'ripe' for development if earlier planning is approved in outline for the 110, although not stated as intention at this time.

4) Listed Buildings

The refusal by the Secretary of State to uphold the earlier development appeared to rely in part on aspects relating to the Grade 11 listed Hobbs Farmhouse in Bilsham Road. Of note: to the immediate West of Hobbs Farmhouse and in Bilsham Rd. is Hobbs Court. There are 4 Grade 11 listed properties there and 3 in Bilsham Lane. There are also several Properties of Character in the Bilsham area too.

There is an extensive section in text in the Local Neighbourhood Area Plan for Yapton (yet to be approved) concerning the Historic significance of those buildings in Bilsham. It is understood necessary for a local authority to take note of the requirements as advised in the NPPF regarding the recognition of heritage assets.

It is felt that ALL heritage buildings in the area of Bilsham should play an even greater part in decision-making for this proposed development in **addition** to the Grade 11 listed Hobbs Farmhouse, and as a 'precedent' has allegedly already been set by the Secretary of State regarding the refusal on appeal, in the same area. Also in the event that another appeal may be lodged if the current planning proposals are refused.

For clarity I refer in particular to items in the Secretary of State Appeal response in sections 38, 39, 41 and 68.

In text in part is as follows:

'The Planning, (listed Buildings and Conservation Area Act 1990), places a statutory duty on decision-makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its listed setting, or any other features of special architectural or historic interest when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects the setting of a listed building.

This duty is reflected in the Framework which goes on to categorise any harm to the significance of a heritage asset as either, " Substantial harm to or total loss of significance of an asset" and less than substantial harm to the significance of an asset" '.

It is noted from the planning application that the style of proposed housing does not reflect either the character or design of the heritage assets. It is apparently intended as just another **modern** development to fit in with a tick list mix of properties. **The proposal is also out of the development area.**

ANY development will allegedly bring harm to the heritage asset of Bilsham as a whole and if this aspect is not understood and acted upon, then the idea of 'recognition of heritage assets' is a paper and pointless exercise. Those who own a listed building have to abide by strict rulings when conducting even alterations to such properties. Developers are not absolved from the significance of them. As stated, the planning proposals whether for full or outline planning permission for the area is objected to in its entirety.

Yours sincerely,
Dilys Lownsborough

