

The Potting Barn
No. 5 Hobbs Court
Bisham Rd.
Yapton

West Sussex BN18 0JY

October 7th 2026

Ref. Application Y/80/25/and Land West of Bilsham Rd. Yapton.
ref. recent additions regarding drainage and layout.

OBJECTION

Disclaimer:

As I have no legal qualifications, I cannot give legal advice. The content of this objection contains my views and concerns. All details submitted must be checked for verification.

Introduction

a) Some details in objection, have already been submitted, in Rep. objection to give transparency for public review, and through Environmental Information Regulation request details; and in the absence of an official report from the ADC Drainage Engineers since 15/7/2026 to date.

b) The details commence in report now, with the '*behind closed doors meeting*,' on 9th September 2026, and subsequent matters, and the outcome from the unscheduled IT Black-out between 18th September-20th September 2026 as follows: -

1.Chronology of Events and Consequential Detailing from: -

1a). 8th September 2026 13.12pm. Correspondence between the Associate Planner ECE, and ADC Principal Planner. From details obtained from an Environmental Information Request, (EIR), but not supplied to the portal at that time.

1b) The full details of the exchange above are in my Rep. objection of 28th September 2026. The following details are a precis, for continuation, completeness and public awareness.

1c). The details were sent ahead of the meeting on 9th September 2026, containing plans of the revised layout, including to basins and paths, and advised to the above: *‘May be in conflict as using a previous plan, and continued, emboldened by them: -*

‘These plans are to inform the meeting tomorrow and are not for publication on the website. And continue- *‘The outstanding matter is, of whether we can deal with ground water impact assessment/monitoring, by planning condition. As per my email of 20th August 2026, and last Friday, is also a consideration’.*

‘Ahead of our meeting tomorrow on drainage, please find attached the following: -

Primary updated layout-this incorporates the revised basin and other elements on ‘Blanked out’ Plan. Please note, the Pegasus drawings still show the layout prior to the update (therefore include some conflict between the basin and paths). The layout from Place shows the revised basin can be incorporated. Hopefully this is clear and will be an aid to discussions tomorrow’.

1d) 9th September 2026.Scheduled 10am. Meeting ID ref.336 437 639 414 580.ADC Teams Meeting Confirmation. From: Blanked out name, to Blanked out name.

1e). Direct Objection to 1a)-1d):

i) The objection here, is not that a meeting took place on the 9th September 2026, but that outcomes and plan/s were allegedly prevented from being added to the planning portal, on the

advice/instruction of the agent. *Outcomes* from the meeting were not uploaded to the portal from the 9th until 23rd/24th September 2026. Allegedly denying public knowledge and involvement and giving rise to concerns regarding alleged procedural difficulties, pretermination and predisposition by the council.

ii). It is also allegedly confirmed, that the ‘plans’ discussed on 9th September, were in relation to the layout plan I received (through EIR attachment on 24th August), **which showed the ‘new’ basin plan, dated 17/4/2025**. Although that specific plan was not added to the portal earlier, it contained the same latest enlargement of a new wetland on the ‘**new**’ Substituted Plans and Documents. (EIR references cease here in text, and details are now referred alternatively).

1f) Direct Objection Continues:

i) **Y/32/25/PL** plans were submitted for the same site on 23/4/2025 with Location Plans drawings dated **17/4/2025** with the tear-drop shaped pond. As approved ‘type’ for the same site **Y/52/23/PL**.

ii) **On 17/3/2026, Y/32/25/PL was refused.**

iii) **On 22/12/25, the application for Y/80/25/S73 was submitted with plans dated 17/4/25, still with a pond.**

iv) **On 8/7/2026 a Location Plan was submitted**, which shows a changed and enlarged more rectangular shaped basin, but not specifically identified as to use on the plan.

v) **On 23/9/2026, a new Substitute Layout Plan was submitted, which showed the basin had morphed into a huge square shape, approx.100m x 50m wetland**, (size quoted from text). Still

using the original plan of 17/4/2025. The same basic approved plan for Y/52/23/PL in January 2025 but with variations.

vi) Although there have been dramatic changes to that area of the site particularly, to try to solve the outstanding drainage issues from the high- water table (approx. 0.27m) since 22/12/2025 for Y/80/25/S73, it is without success, to date.

vii) The latest Substitute Plan is allegedly another attempt to revise the plan from 17/4/25. Also, to seek to resolve an ongoing drainage problem of the high- water table after approx.10 months deliberation and 5 EOTs, now possibly 6 EOTs, without success.

viii) The latest submission of technical tables by the Barratt Redrow drainage consultants, Pegasus Group and RSK Geosciences allegedly relate to *existing* site ground levels, as of 7th October 2026.

ix) They cannot be concluded, in the absence of ‘fill’ types being selected and submitted, and agreed first, and with appropriate testing results in conjunction.

x) In the absence of such details, being submitted or agreed, it is allegedly currently guesswork as to flow, flooding, and ground water outcomes in result of the recent changes proposed.

‘*Conditions*’ cannot be imposed on an uncertainty of results. The detail presented to date are incomplete.

xi) Any planning application is anticipated to be full and complete when submitted, (Y/80/25/S73). Site drainage difficulties were already in objection by the ADC Drainage Engineers from the base application Y/52/23/PL. If many ‘revisions’ are required for an approval, it allegedly casts doubt on it altogether. Also, in relation

to the legalities of a Section 73 application(S73). Including outcomes regarding the incorrect postcode.

2). Substitute Plans, Documents and Correspondence.

23rd. September 2026: - added 29th September 2026: 20, Substitute Plans,2 Substitute Documents, and 1 Additioal Document were uploaded onto the portal.

2a) These comprise: -

i) Substitute Document: added to the portal 23/9/2026. The FRA and Drainage Strategy, by the Pegasus Group, for Barratt Redrow, dated 17th September 2026.

ii) Substitute Document: added to the portal 23/9/2026. Lap Leap and Neap by Tetra Tech, for Barratt Redrow, dated September 2026.

iii) Additional Document: added to the portal 29/9/2026 Groundwater Impact Assessment, by RSK Geosciences, for Barratt Redrow, dated 24/9/2026.

2b) Direct Objection:

i) Because so many changes have been made to the Section 73 (S73) application, which are not 'minor amendments', it is queried why a fresh, new, standalone application was not made instead.

ii) While it is accepted that each application is reviewed independently, it is observed that the 'live' application general location plans for Y/80/25/S73 uploaded from 23rd. September 2026, refers to original plans undertaken prior on **17/4/2025.**

iii) The re-consultation started on 24th September 2026 for 14 days. Allegedly compromised, because details submitted by

RSK Geosciences, were not added to the portal until the 29th September 2026 *after* commencement of the reconsultation.

iv) The date, **(17/4/2025)** on the substituted plan, confirms they are not *new* as such. Substituted Plans and Documents, but allegedly already in the pipeline, from around the time of the Y/32/25/PL **Refusal** on **17/2/2026**.

v) The submission of a Substitute Document submitted to the portal on 23rd September 2026, but dated **17 April 2025, bearing reference numbers especially between 112-116** (irrespective of ‘revisions’), is allegedly conclusive that the plans also predate the application for Y/80/25/S73, ‘adjusted’ because of unresolved drainage difficulties to date.

vi) Although the reconsultation commenced for Y/80/25/S73, on 24th September, Simon Davis, planning officer, stated to the applicant agent in email (on the portal), 23rd September 2026, **that he had advised consultees they did not need to respond to the re-consultation**. Such advice is considered an alleged breach of requirement, and a failure in procedural administration, because new details had been added on which to comment.

vii) As stated, the applicant’s drainage engineers and consultants have been unable to provide an approved solution in approx. 10 months despite being given 5 EOTs, (and 6 in prospect). By contrast, it is also questioned, why the public were only given 14 days reconsultation time now, to assess *all* the additional details in that timeline instead, and before an 8th October 2026 deadline.

viii) The FRA and Drainage Strategy report 23/9/2026 from the Pegasus Group contains approx. **80** pages of text, tables, technical details, plans, comments, and conclusions. Also, in relation to high water table and ground-raising.

ix) The Lap Leap and Neap Tetra Tech report mainly involved play areas and would usually be consulted by ADC Environmental Health. Despite significant changes to the site, regarding the extensive wetland, green spaces, paths, and through ground-raising, there is allegedly no *current* Environment Agency response to this to date on the portal. (7th Oct. 2026)

x) Proposed layout changes also relate to the BNG report, 2nd June 2026. There has apparently been no BNG update on the *main portal* listed as heading, to accommodate the recent changes.

xi) The Groundwater Assessment RSK Geosciences Group report was uploaded on 29th September 2026. 5 days having been 'lost', for public review and comment, during the re-consultation, commenced, the 24th September, for a substantial report to be reviewed by 8th October 2026.

xii) It contains approx. **30** pages of text, tables, technical detailing, plans, comments, spread sheets and conclusions regarding the high-water table and ground-raising. Also contains suggested site rectifications between ADC Drainage Engineers and RSK Geosciences.

xiii) The huge amount of specialist information put out at the last minute with new details with only a 14day total window is considered inadequate time for response, restrictive for public review and comment, and adversely prejudicial.

xiv) In 21 days would be difficult to achieve, but 14, unrealistic. To attempt this, has already taken a full-time review over many days.

xv) The ADC Drainage Engineers Report. No final report from the ADC Drainage Engineers has been submitted as of **7th October 2026 (from their last on 15/7/2026)**. The last date for

their report submission during the consultation was to be on or before 6th October 2026 as their agreed date with Simon Davis.

xvi) Rep. Objection details must also be assessed by the LPA, to ensure that matters raised are addressed from them too. - Only at the last minute was there an advice given out on the portal that the ADC Drainage Engineers had not submitted their report and the Target Committee date had been shifted to 18th November 2026.

xvii) Correspondence between Simon Davis and the agent Paul Carnell on 5th October unloaded 6th October advised as reason: *'The ADC Drainage report had not been received- As he had just been made aware that someone at our drainage consultants involved in the case is unavailable for a while. Without the removal of the Drainage Engineers objection, they cannot proceed to committee. Also, that the new direction on the Scheme of Delegation Gateway in force from 31st. October 2026 must now be investigated regarding a Committee Meeting'*

xviii) The principle of a Committee Decision outcome for this application has been long established already. Delays have been caused through the alleged inability of the applicant to supply details in time for projected Committee Meetings over time.

3). Difficulties Caused by the Shut- down of the Planning Portal Friday 18th September-Late Sunday 20th September:

i). At a most sensitive time and while details were awaited from the ADC Drainage Engineers, and details from the 9th September were to be released, there was a complete shut-down of the ADC IT system between Friday 18th. September until late, Sunday 20th September.

ii) Planning Portal content email details between Simon Davis and Paul Carnell submitted during the IT Blackout on Friday 18th September 2026, were not uploaded onto the portal until 24th September 2026, the commencement date of the reconsultation as follows: -

iii) 18th September 2026 11.53pm. Email From: Paul Carnell to Simon Davis. Not uploaded until 24th September 2026.

‘Please find below.....

Updated FRA and drainage strategy, (presumed the submission of Pegasus on 18th September and Uploaded on 24th September - and continues- This addresses all matters raised by the ADC drainage engineers and is presented in a revised FRA document as requested, please can this be reviewed by the drainage engineers as a priority’.

iv) 18th September 2026 17.19pm. (out of hours), also not uploaded to the planning portal for view until 24th September 2026. From: Paul Carnell agent for Barratt Redrow to Simon Davis.

The general content relates to house plans and changes to Plot 1, and changes to basin size. Also included a list of drainage details for the ADC Drainage Engineers for urgent review.

3b) Direct Objection:

i). The incidental IT shut down prevented any investigation of existing or recently added details to the planning portal at an obviously important time giving rise to:

ii). Alleged Evidence of Procedural Unfairness and Confusion:

The administration of this application has allegedly created a landscape of confusion, making a fair public consultation completely unreasonable/ impossible, [Y80/25/S73].

iii). 24th September 2026, I received the Council's official Environmental Information Regulations disclosure [Y/80/25/S73]. This formal inbox response included internal correspondence where the developer's agent ECE, explicitly stated that he felt *'there was no need for a consultation'.*(18th September 2026).

iv). Due to the digital blackout that allegedly stifled the weekend details from the 18th to late the 20th September, the planning portal was completely compromised. [Y/80/25/S73]. It has since emerged that emails dated 18th September 2026, were sitting in the uploading queue, completely hidden from public view.

v). A private resident cannot be anticipated to untangle a broken system, whereby the council sent off official disclosures to my inbox, while simultaneously burying contradictory back-dated engineering files in a blacked out online portal queue, which did not resurface until 24th September 2026.

vi). 24th September 2026. 8.54 am. I emailed Simon Davis concerning the blackout reference, and compromised details sent (with an attachment).

vii) 24th September 2026. 10.52am. I received an email response from Simon Davis to my email, (and as on the portal), he states:

*'The email that you refer to as missing simply comprised the initial email from the agent setting out the list of amended documents and the download link and my responses asking for a summary of the changes. **This was omitted from that email chain** ((presumed EIR)) and will now be added by our scanning team.*

*I understand that our items are always uploaded to the website after 8pm. Every night. This is an automated service. **I had made***

clear in my instruction to admin. that I only wanted a 14 day re-consultation issuing to Engineers because the changes were minor and did not require the input of other consultees.

However, this request was not followed and all consultees and residents have been reconsulted. However, as the plans were visible on the 24th and the expiry date is 8th October everyone has the full 14 days to comment.

Irrespective of this date we allow representations to be made right up to the date of the Committee Meeting, and they will be brought to the attention of the members’.

3c) Direct Objection:

i) The changes were advised by the planning officer as ‘minor’. There are a substantial number of Substitute plans and Additional Plans/Documents added. Correspondence to review and Rep letters. Referred to under **1)** and **2)**. Also ref, reports ref Pegasus Group and RSK Geosciences.

ii) There have been no updates from the ADC Drainage Engineers side since 15/7/2026. The council has allegedly failed in its duty to provide **clear unequivocal and accessible data** to the public throughout the reconsultation process. Strict timelines were given for this reconsultation for public comment. My earlier request to the planning officer for an extension was refused but now afforded to others by contrast.

iii) In principle, any applicant is required to present their application in full. That Barratt Redrow has not succeeded in doing so, even with major changes, raises obvious concerns over their full understanding of the site and its implications.

iv) The applicant currently has an EOT to the 23rd. October and possibly beyond if a 6th EOT is granted, the same additional time should be allowed so that any further details can be addressed by the public. Not to only be passed to the Committee.

4. Recent Update and Summary Regarding the Proposed Committee Meeting on the 21st. October 2026, as noted on 5th October 2026 and Proposed change to an 18th November 2026 Committee Meeting and Matters in Association.

Finally, I must draw the councils' attention to the alleged procedural failures and technical vacuum that currently invalidates any immediate validation of this application.

1.Failure of Statutory Technical Appraisal: -The 6th October 2026, marked the final 14- day window for the reconsultation submission by the ADC Drainage Engineers. The actual date for closure for the public being 8th October 2026. The public record confirms that no internal technical appraisal has been submitted, with the department citing extended staff absence at an unfortunate time.

It is allegedly an established a principle of planning law, that a highly complex high- risk Section 73 application (S73) **which transforms an approved pond into a massive 100mx50m open wetland basin**, cannot be legally approved without an active vigorous engineering sign- off. To consider the application in the complete absence of internal expert drainage scrutiny would allegedly constitute gross procedural maladministration

2.The Immovable Technical Roadblock.

The case officer has correctly noted on the public record that approval cannot be granted while a formal technical objection

remains unresolved. I wish to state categorically in relation to this aspect of objection, - grounded in severe unaddressed discrepancies regarding heterogeneity, capillary wicking, lateral spread and the lack of defined 'fill' material specification **will not be lifted** until Barratt Redrow provide absolute, verifiable, engineering solutions.

3. Procedural Integrity and the Delegation Gateway Test

The public portal reveals active internal confusion regarding whether this volatile application now falls within the post 30th October 2026 **Delegation Gateway Test**. Given that this application represents a fundamental material departure from the approved **2025 master plans**, any attempt to bypass full democratic scrutiny by rushing a decision, under officer delegated powers would allegedly be highly improper.

Given the immense environmental risks and the complete breakdown of the Council's internal appraisal timeline, the Chair, and Vice Chair of the planning committee is allegedly understood to have statutory duty to ensure that this application is heard in a transparent public forum, but with all correct, necessary, details.

In the light of the missing technical data, the absence of statutory consultee reports, and the unresolved structural contradictions on site, the Council is respectfully requested to refuse this application or at a minimum halt this application until a transparent comprehensive review can take place.

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: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 October 2026 17:09
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection detail for Y/80/25/S73 Chronology of events, new basin plan, IT blackout etc., ref 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 as attachment additional **objection** details ref Y/80/25/S73. Ref Chronology of events, new basin plan ,IT black out and changes to scheduled committee meeting.
Yours sincerely,
Dilys Lownsborough