

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

July 1st 2026

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

OBJECTION

Corrections to agent Correspondence Ref. Hemlock water dropwort. (Uploaded on 26/6/2026).

Dear Planning,

1. It is noted that the application for Y/80/25/S73 was submitted by the agent for Barratt Redrow ((PLC)) and Barrat Redrow Southern Counties ((Ltd.)), approx. 5 months ago, on 22/12/2025 including later EOTs. Details submitted also included any external evaluations from professional assessors.

2. The Rep Objection letter of 26/6/2026, referred to matters of Ecology on the proposed site, with reference to the Condition amendment to item 22 in the application. Which is considered a Material Consideration.

2.1. Particularly with reference to '**Hemlock water dropwort**' as a highly toxic and dangerous plant and in association with the proposed development site. Reported in the 'Pegasus' investigations commissioned by the applicant.

3. The agent response to the Rep Objection on 26/6/2026, referred to the toxic plant as '**Hemlock Drop Wort**', which is not a plant.

The Rep Objection letter correctly advised the offending plant as **'Hemlock *water dropwort*'** instead. Any **'Hemlock'** reference otherwise, although similarly poisonous is a different plant altogether and not known to be subject matter on the site.

4. The agent also referred in their response to the Rep Objection that the adjacent watercourse to the site is the 'Ryebank Rife'. That is not its location. The Ryebank Rife is located alternatively, to the West and South of the of the watercourse indicated on the proposed site.

The Location Plan 1000 submitted by the agent with the application details, states 'Bilsham Ditch' as the watercourse adjacent to the proposed 'site', not the 'Ryebank Rife.' In contradiction to the details advised by the agent in response to the Rep Objection.

4.1. The Ryebank Rife is to the North, West and South of the site, and is approx. a field away from the proposed site. Although not named on the Location Plan1000 it can clearly be seen there.

4.2. The Location Plan 1000 also shows a black line termination of the Bilsham Ditch to the North. Not the Ryebank Rife.

4.3. Water *from* the Bilsham Ditch flows into the Ryebank Rife further South of the proposed site, then flowing West to East towards the A259, and Littlehampton instead.

4.4. Although it is possible that 'Hemlock water dropwort' may also be downstream in the Ryebank Rife, the latter area is not subject matter for this application.

5.The Rep Objection referred to the proposed amendment of Condition 22 as in the application details for Y/80/25/S73,states: *'The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in*

accordance with the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures specified at para 6.2 of the Ecology Assessment ref. DFA23031V2'.

5.1 The agent response to the Rep Objection to Condition 22 refers to Condition 10, but which is not part of the *condition amendments* stated in the application for Y/80/25/S73.

6. As the agent has referred to Condition 10 in their response to the Rep Objection for Condition 22, it is responded to now.

6.1. Condition 10 regarding LEMP is considered a general note for the area advised. It does not acknowledge any specific dangers to the public through the presence of Hemlock water dropwort, nor that the red boundary line is shown on the Location Plan 1000 as in the middle of the ditch. Nor that an easement would be needed to include the 2 Riparian owners involved. Any remedial action to one ditch bank only, would not solve any potential difficulty with the toxic plant.

6.2. Condition 9 is not referenced in the agent response now, although connected to 10, but any 'works' in that area also allegedly requires an easement and safeguards for workforce in both cases, and because of plant toxicity. Indications that items in (9) and 10 would be addressed (and perhaps 22) after any approval, is considered insufficient for requirement details for comment in a Consultation.

6.3. Conditions attached to an application does not mean that they will be accepted when remedial steps are presented, and it is often the case that pre- commencement conditions are sought to be lifted as soon as possible after any approval to give more leeway to the developer.

6.4. The agent also indicated in response that 'herbicide' is intended to be used to seek to eliminate the plant. Unfortunately, when 'in abundance' as stated in the Pegasus report, digging out is likely and this can damage the bank/s structure. There is no certainty of total removal, and further remediation will be needed over time too.

7. It is also noted from the Environment Agency Consultation comment on 11/6/2026 that a Permit or an exemption is required from them before any works can commence '*On or within 8m of a main river*'. This would also allegedly need to be applied to both sides of the ditch in ownership. It appears that the necessary permit is required before Conditions 9 and 10 can be sought to be undertaken, as well as for Condition 22.

7.1. Advice in the agent response that any matter of concern for (9),10,or perhaps 22, would not be attended to, until after any approval is not considered part of a full planning Consultation process.

8. The point of the Rep. Objection regarding Hemlock water dropwort was to alert of the potential dangers because it was mentioned in the Pegasus report as most recent for Y/80/36/S73.

9. The reason for a planning Consultation is understood to be so the applicant can present their case. Also, for Consultees and the public to express their views on the details presented either for or against. Both sides have their say and those aspects are assessed by the LPA and at the ADC Planning Committee Meeting thereafter, as ultimate arbiters.

Thanking you in advance for your kind 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>



From: Nicola Spencer <Nicola.Spencer@arun.gov.uk> **On Behalf Of** Planning
Sent: 01 July 2026 20:35
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Public response to details by the agent after an earlier Rep objection ref Hemlock water dropwort

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...



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 July 2026 13:13
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Public response to details by the agent after an earlier Rep objection ref Hemlock water dropwort

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 attachment response to the agent response to earlier Rep objection ref Hemlock water dropwort.

The response now, highlights discrepancies between the original Rep objection and any unsubstantiated information by the agent. It was felt necessary to do this unfortunately so that correct details are on the website.

Kind regards
Dilys Lownsbrough