

The Potting Barn
No.5 Hobbs Court
Bilsham Rd.

Yapton West Sussex BN18 0JY

Feb.2nd 2026.

‘Planning Application Ref. Y/89/25/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 sources provided by the applicant and from the internet. Some are my ‘opinions’..... not ‘legal advice’ as I am not qualified to give this. ‘Aspects’ are contained as ‘objections’ and for query and further investigation for accuracy instead.

1.Alleged Discrepancies in Email Correspondence Between the Agent and Planning in Outcomes ref, Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73 and Matters in Association.

a) Details from the agent to the Planning Officer are on the website for 16/1/2026 for Y/80/25/S73 and were headed: -
‘Confirming that the Scheme/Plans, ((for Y/80/25/S73)) are exactly the same as Y/32/25/PL.’ And continued in text -

‘The CIL information submitted with the S73 reflects this latest position. I do not think we updated the CIL form in the original submission, so this accounts for the discrepancy’.

Given we are effectively holding the previous application in abeyance subject to how the S73 progresses, suggest we leave the CIL on that for now. We can remedy if the previous application becomes ‘live’ again for any reason’

ai) The following **Objections** are regarding any alleged discrepancies in 'exactitude' claimed by the agent, which cannot apparently be upheld between the applications for Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73 and in association, and on which reliance was indicated should be placed.

b) **There is no CIL currently on the website for the application Y/80/25/S73, allegedly contra to the above agent details under (a).**

The CIL Payment Information currently on the website is for **Y/32/25/PL only** instead, as follows: -

bi) **A CIL 1 Form** was first submitted for Y/32/25/PL on 23/4/2025, in the name of **Redrow Homes Ltd.**, Amount stated £21,166.

bii) **Form1 Additional Information** (the second CIL form submitted also for the above) was in the name of **Redrow Homes Ltd.** on 21/5/2025. Amount stated, £22,319.10.

bii) Further house changes were listed on 9/9/2025 for Y/32/25/PL. No CIL was submitted on the website for them then, or to date additionally.

c) Another alleged 'discrepancy,' was that **The Application Form for Y/80/25/S73 was in the name of Barratt Redrow Southern Counties not Redrow Homes Ltd.** Representing a *notable change between* the applications for Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73.

ci) 'Barratt Redrow Southern Counties' is allegedly a 'Trading Name' for 'Barratt/Redrow' as the former is not on the Companies House listings as a Ltd. Company.

It is also understood necessary to identify an 'entity' who is intended to take on 'responsibility' for an application/'site', and any legal obligations, such as a CIL and S106.

cii) A 'Scheme' which identifies a legal 'entity' for one application but allegedly fails to do so in another for the same 'site' is not considered '*exactly the same*'. It is **Objection** because the absence of such in connection with the S73 also allegedly questions the latter's validity in details and as follow: -

civ) With reference to the '**Community Infrastructure Levy CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended)**'. (Allegedly mandatory for validation). *There is a strict requirement for CIL information to be submitted **at the time of the application**, rather than after it is approved. If this information is not submitted alongside the planning application, it may be deemed invalid*'.

cv) It is not allegedly a 'choice' for the applicant/agent to decide to agree the CIL 'later' with the LPA after any approval, nor allegedly in the light of (civ) details above. Also, where no specific 'entity' has been advised for Y/80/25/S73.

d) 'Barratt/Redrow' is a 'Group', and Barratt Redrow Southern Counties is a trading name only as stated. At present, it is uncertain which specific branch is to be involved .- Redrow Homes Ltd., OR **Barratt Southern Counties Ltd.**, as the 'nearest' name to the one submitted on the Application Form for Y/80/25/S73,..... or another.

di) 'Barratt Southern Counties Ltd'. submitted their accounts for a Dormant Company on **Jan.31st 2025**. IF that is the company to be involved, it shows current assets of £210,000.

dii) Again, IF that company is intended for the development, instead of 'Barratt Redrow Southern Counties' on the application form as not a company, the former could not be 'trading' as well as being Dormant on Dec 22nd 2025 when Y/80/25/S73 was

submitted. With no transactions listed in the **Jan 31st 2026** accounts.

dii) It is apparent from the details put out on the Application Forms as part of the 'Scheme' for Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73 that they are not 'the same', and there is currently no clear indication who is to be responsible for the development if approved.

div) It is in **Objection** that such details are not exact between the two applications and parties as indicated above. Also allegedly unclear, misleading and possibly invalid, according to other sources of information available in connection.

e) There also seems to be some confusion in the agent response of 16/1/2026 about whether Y/32/25/ PL is currently 'live'. All applications are understood to be 'live' unless stated otherwise by the LPA on the website, for whatever reason, or a decision has been reached regarding approval or refusal. It was helpful that the Planning Officer clarified those points in his response to the agent.

1A. The Article 13 Notice and S106 for Y/32/23/PL and Y/80/25/S73

a) An Article 13 Notice is on the website for Y/32/25/PL and a covering letter from the agent. There is no Article 13 Notice detail on the website for Y/80/25/S73 as of Feb.1st 2026 .

ai) It is allegedly a mandatory requirement to submit an Article 13 Notice to the LPA for an S73 for validation, whereby any other parties are involved in land ownership.

aii) Allegedly, concerning its requirement, 'Under the *Town and Country Planning (Development Management and Procedure)*

(England) Order 2015, and planning permission, including an S73 application, to vary or remove Conditions-requires an ownership certificate to be submitted’.

b) An Article 14 Notice is mentioned in the Planning Application for Y/80/25/S73, which is understood a ‘supporting’ document *for* an Article 13 Notice, but as stated, there is allegedly no indication on the website of a ‘covering letter’ for either an Article13 or 14 Notice for the S73, and no Article13 or14 Notices on the website for the S73 to date. Neither aspect is allegedly ‘covered’ by an Article 13 Notice for Y/32/25/PL and the S73, as it is an entirely separate application.

c) As these are allegedly *mandatory* requirements for validation, their absence on the website is questioned in **Objection**. It is also considered necessary for the public to know which business aspect of ‘Barratt-Redrow’ own the ‘site’, and which part they do not, so that any legal obligations can be confirmed regarding the land involved.

d) Planning details are on the website for Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73. If, however, the latter is assessed first as indicated, and then ‘*approved*’, it would allegedly be without public evidence ‘advertised’ of land ownership as indicated in a) and b) above.

e) Perhaps also complicated as previously stated, that the application details for the ‘site’, is referred to in the Application Form and in the Heading as ‘BN18 0LA’ (Grevatts Lane West, to the East) instead of BN18 0BW. Bittern Ave.to the West above ‘the site’. Barratt-Redrow do not own the domestic Rd. Grevatts Lane West or the field opposite in this application.

f) It is in **Objection** that the details submitted for an Article13 Notice for Y/32/25/PL is not ‘the same’, as an alleged absence of

both an Article 13 and 14 in the S73 application. Also questioned as to why a discrepancy.

1B. The S106.

a) The S106 was agreed on Appeal for Y/52/23/PL and is still apparently 'live'. But there is no content (draft) in either Y/32/25/PL or Y/80/25/S73 applications of reference as to its existence, or whether any changes by Dov are anticipated ref. 'affordable housing'. If there is nothing put in place for either application prior to Committee, the 51 affordable houses advised in prospect elsewhere, are allegedly a mirage.

ai) The Court of Appeal ruling by Lord Justice Lewis (April 2025), allegedly ruled, that, *'The public must be permitted to see the content of an S106 (or unilateral undertaking) on which to comment before a decision is taken on an application where it would be applied'*.

aii) It is noted that the application Consultation was scheduled from 22/12/2025-5/2/2026. No such details have been added to date 2/2/2026.

b) This matter is complicated by the lack of clarity as to the exact ownership of the 'site' as to whether it is Redrow Homes Ltd. or 'A. N. Other' as stated.

c) If an approval is given to either Y/32/25/PL or the S73, because there is no S106 in either, there is allegedly no 'obligation' included to continue with any affordable housing to which the original approval applies.

ci) It is considered that the applicant may allegedly be considering a 'Free- go loophole', to bypass the original S106 by submitting a 'fresh' application, but it is then allegedly up to the

LPA to ensure that the original obligations still apply.

If they do not, the proposed 51 houses specified may never come to fruition as stated. It is in **Objection** that this matter has not allegedly been resolved.

2. Alleged 'Errors' in Transcription by the Agency For their Submitted Plans in Relation to Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73.

a) As referred to again from details from the agent/agency to the Planning Officer on 16/1/2026, indicating that the content of the **Scheme/plans are 'the same'**.

b) For the purposes of this report it is felt necessary to attribute the content as submitted by the agent/agency where allegedly applicable, rather than any department at ADC. It would still also allegedly require the former to check that their submissions were correct by way of the 'Declaration' for all 'Forms' content and outcomes submitted to planning.

c) The first 'Redrow' application for Y/32/25/PL was on 5/1/2025, the second was for Y/80/25/S73 on 22/12/ 2025. It is disappointing that any 'typos' or allegedly 'confusing details' have not been corrected over time in relation to both. It is conceded that 'some' may have been corrected intervening, but the enclosed are with reference to my initial review at the time the S73 was added and to date.

ci) In this instance it is also observed that computer 'words' have Software Packages for text correction, as automatically installed. It is accepted that everyone can make mistakes/typos occasionally, but if it is allegedly more widespread it can raise aspects of concern.

cii) Such aspects may be dismissed as ‘not relevant’ or ‘unimportant’ but when they are in connection with proposed changes to housing submissions/plans and other aspects regarding ‘Conditions’ as: Plans, Substitute Plans, Additional Plans and Superseded? Documents, it can allegedly take on other significance. For example, if not checked and corrected, before being put on the website in anticipation of being presented to Cllrs. at the Planning Committee.

It is in **Objection** that this aspect concerns one of the major consideration under **Condition 2** in respect of proposed housing changes to Y/52/23/PL under Y/80/25/S73 as follows: -

3.The Details Allegedly Contained in the Submitted Details for Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73 and in Objection.

a) In generality in planning terms it is understood that ‘OP’ and ‘OPP’ refers to ‘Outline Planning Permission’. But Outline planning permission was given for totally different house styles to those submitted now.

b) The proposed ‘Condition’ 2 is not for minor ‘tweaks’. They are total changes to layout and the Boklok house styles to those of ‘Redrow’, as they confirm.

bi) ‘MOD’ is understood as ‘Modification’, and ‘MID’ as ‘Method Implication Document’. Unfortunately, no planning referencing was able to be found for ‘MIOD’. Therefore, ‘MID’ and ‘MOD’ are unclear as to which is referred in confirmation.

bii) ‘MID’ can also mean ‘between’, and ‘OP’ and ‘OPP’, opposite. There is no index to support what those abbreviations mean for all to interpret, not just planners.

c) As follows the alleged text errors and in outcome from the website for Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73. Although the two have been advised that the content is ' exactly the same', this is not able to be verified from details submitted.

ci) Website Details for 'Plans' and in Association Allegedly Submitted for Y/32/25/PL

The *incorrect* spelling submitted with plans **approx. 90 times** was submitted as 'Superceded'. The correct spelling and meaning is SUPERSEDED, from the Latin '*supersedere*,' meaning to 'sit above something' or 'be superior to'. As 'Superceded' would be underlined in red from a 'word' package, it can allegedly be taken that an error was flagged up numerous times but ignored by those collating details.

cii) The details can be corrected and placed additionally with the originals, but the aspects in submission remain. A planning application is also required to be judged as submitted. If errors or uncertainties are contained, the application is allegedly flawed.

cii) Alleged errors submitted for Y/32/25/PL, Presumably for inclusion changes for 'Condition 2' ref. Y/52/23/PL: -

* 10/9/2025 Waste Tanker Access to **PUMPIONG** STATION SHEET 1 24-17-209 REV D.

* 9/9/2025 **STGOUR** FLOOR PLANS 1420 REV B.

* 9/9/2025 GENERAL **ARRANGMENT** 170 UNIT REPLAN 24-217-200 REV E.

* 9/9/2025 DESIGNER COMMENTS ON ADC **DRAIANGE** CONSULT RESPONSE.

*9/9/2025 PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE **CONSTRUCTION** DETAILS
SHEET 2 24- 217-154.

ciii) It is in **Objection** because accuracy cannot be assumed in total where there is any alleged lack of diligence in one part. 'Conditions' for house 'changes' cannot be assumed as all correct either over vast numbers included because of this.

civ) Website Details for 'Plans' and in Association Allegedly Submitted for Y/80/25/S73

civ) Alleged errors submitted for Y/80/25/S73, are apparently intended to be used ref. the 'Conditions,' (2 in this instance) for changes to Y/52/23/PL.

* 23/12/2025 WARWICK FLOOR PLANS (for several properties) **E3LEVATIONS** 1220 REV B. What is an E3Levation? **An 'E3' allegedly restricts development rights for garages and outbuildings. No indication could be found for a 'levation.'** No garage or outbuilding could be found for Warwick house types.

*23/12/2025 Advised for several properties overall as **STOURE**. Should be STOUR Floor plans 1427 REV A. **STOURE** is not a recognised house type for this development.

*23/12/2025 Plots as 28; as MID 30: **OP** MID 29, **OP** 31 ELEVATIONS TRENT 1404 REV B. If OP means outline planning it was for a different house type formerly.

*23/12/2025 Plots as 147; OP MID 148; as MID149; OPP 150 **STOURE** FLOOR PLANS 1427 REV A. (OP or OPP ref Outline, it was for other type of housing. **STOURE** does not exist for the proposed development.

*23/12/2025 REFUSE VEHICLE **SWWEPT** PATH etc. Should be.

‘REFUSE VEHICLE **SWEPT** PATH ANALYSIS SHEET 1 24-217-202
REV D.

*23/12/2025 PRELIMINARY EXTERNAL CONSTRUCTION WORKS
DTAILS. Should be PRELIMINARY EXTERNAL CONSTRUCTION
WORKS DETAILS 24-217-213.

*23/12/2025 PROPOSED SURFACE WATER **DRAIANGE** LAYOUT
SHEET 7 of 8 24-217-238 REV C.

*23/12/2025 PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE CONSTRUCTION DETAIL
HSEET 1 24-217-253.

* 23/12/2025 PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE **CONSTRUCITON** DETAILS
SHEET 2-24-217-154.

* 23/12/2025 PLOTS AS 18; **ASMID** 17; OP BUXTON FLOOR PLANS
1201. ASMID is not a reference, should be **AS MID**. OP if outline
planning, refers to another house type design.

*23/12/2025 PLOTS as 41; OP 45,48 CAMBRIDGE FLOORPLANS
AND **ELEVAIONS** 1280 REV A.

* 23/12/2025 PLOTS AS..... 6 numbered then OP 142
CAMBRIDGE FLOOR PLANS AND **ELEVAITONS** 1281 REV A .

*23/12/2025 A significant number of plots are referred to as
having a single **GAREGE** FLOORPLAN 1500.

*23/12/2025 PLOTS AS 139 ‘**MIOD**’. MID or MOD or something
else? ‘MIOD’ could not be found as ‘classification’.

*23/12/2025 ELECTRIC SUBSTATION FLOOR PLAN, **EELVATIONS**,
ROOF PLAN.

*23/12/2025 PLOTS AS 28; **ASMID** 30; **OPMID** 29; OP 31 TRENT
FLOOR PLANS 1403 REV A. Such classification could not be
found, only **AS MID** and **OP MID** instead.

*23/12/2025 PLOTS AS 77; OP TYNE **FLOO RPLANS** 1430.

cv) The **Objection** is to the above under '3' is for several reasons: -

*It is not just because of typos or spelling errors although of obvious concern regarding the presentation of details in general , it is what it represents ie.,-

*Wrong house- type names, MIOD, ASMID and OPMID are not recognised abbreviations, there is no 'E3' in connection with Warwick garages, as they have none, and a 'levation' does not exist either. 'Superceded' instead of 'Superseded;' the latter as correctly used by architects and agents otherwise.

cvi) Because of these alleged errors and in **Objection** it is not possible to say with certainty or confidence, that *any* of the hundreds of references for house numbers and cross referencing presented with the S73 are accurate. It would allegedly be impossible to 'cut and paste' for 'Condition 2' as the S73 stands.

cvi) If the alleged errors are rectified, it still reflects on how the application has been presented regarding the most dominant feature regarding the proposed 'Condition' 2 for the S73. The outcome allegedly falls well below the required standard for presentation and accuracy.

d) Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73 were advised to the planning officer on 16/1/2026 that they were 'The same in Scheme/Plans' as stated. If they were, all and any errors in Y/32/25/PL would be the same as for the S73. There are many more in the latter.

Anyone can make a mistake, but with something of such importance, thorough checking of submitted details by the applicant/agent/agency before presentation would seem advised.

di) The applicant could have submitted 'Conditions' to the Y/32/25/PL. It is alleged that they did not do so, because they were unable produce satisfactory drainage solutions for that application and chose to produce an allegedly flawed S73 instead. For this and all the other reasons in objection it is respectfully suggested that the S73 is refused/thrown out and Y/32/25/PL, until proper evidenced details are produced.

Thanking you in advance for your kind attention.

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsborough

PL- Rep

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	 Our core foundations	 
---	--	--	--	---	--

Connect with us: [Facebook](#) | [X](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Nicola Spencer <Nicola.Spencer@arun.gov.uk> **On Behalf Of** Planning

Sent: 02 February 2026 16:39

To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: objection details ref Y/80/25/S73 and Y/32/25/PL ref discrepancies ref Condition2 for Y/52/23 PL and otherwise.

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>



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 February 2026 16:18
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: objection details ref Y/80/25/S73 and Y/32/25/PL ref discrepancies ref Condition2 for Y/52/23 PL and otherwise.

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 objection for Y/80/25/S73 ref. discrepancies between it and Y/32/25/PL and in relation to Condition 2 for Y/52/23/PL.
Kind regards,
Dilys Lownsbrough