

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

Jan. 18th 2026

Planning Application Ref. Y/80/25/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

Dear ADC Planning,

Background and Details in Association

- a) Also, in connection with Y/32/25/PL and Y/52/23/PL for the 'same' site as both are referenced in the details submitted for Y/80/25/S73.
- b) The ADC Planning Officer also advised in email to me prior, that although the opportunity for objections had officially closed on 9/10/ 2025 for Y/32/25/PL, he would continue to accept them until a Committee Date was set.
- c) The applicant Redrow Homes Ltd. submitted their original application for Y/32/25/PL, which was validated on 1/5/2025.
- d) Over the last approx. 9 months considerable leeway has allegedly been given to the applicant to make additions and alterations.
- e) This has caused numerous delays for that application to come to Committee for. Aug., Sept., Oct., Nov. and Dec. 2025. Each time with an EOT. The last EOT was advised on the website on 20/11/2025 for **14/1/2026**.

ei) Requests for an EOT are understood required to be made and agreed *before* the expiry date, not backdated. It is confirmed that there was no request on the website by the agent for an EOT for Y/32/25/PL, to cover any period *after* 14/1/2026 or to date, 18/1/2026.

ei) The Nov. EOT also ran out on same day as the scheduled ADC Planning Committee Meeting. The application for Y/32/25/PL was not on the agenda, because the long-awaited details from the Redrow Homes Ltd. Drainage Engineers, had not been supplied to the ADC Drainage Engineers for assessment.

f) Because of the delay over time, I emailed the Planning Officer on 14/1/2026, advising that the EOT had expired, and with a request to know the current position. The response was, ' *The crucial response on drainage will be that from ADC's own Drainage Engineers*'.

g) There was no direct response from the Planning Officer regarding the EOT and its expiry in outcome.

h) It is also apparent that Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73 are inextricably 'linked', as containing some of the same referencing and connections. Those applications were also advised in email as intended to be heard at the same ADC Planning Committee meeting, which would also have public representation.

i) Correspondence emails between the Agent and the Planning Officer ref. Y/80/25/S73, were uploaded onto the website on 16/1/2026. They were dated, Jan. 9th and Jan. 13th, (the day before the EOT expiry date). Also referencing the Dec. 22nd validation date for Y/80/25/S73.

j) Statements Made by the Applicant Agent in Their Emails of 9th and 13th Jan. 2026 ref Y/80/25/S73 and in association: -

They stated: '**Confirming that the Scheme Plans are exactly the same as for Y/32/25/PL**'. (With reference to Y/80/25/S73). This is disputed as will be covered in a separate **Objection**.

k) There is also reference for a CIL being submitted, for Y/80/25/S73. But there is none available, so it will be addressed in a separate **Objection** representation.

l) The lack of an EOT allegedly complicates matters for all parties. Both the applicant and ADC Planning Department allegedly have stringent 'options' in that scenario.

m) It appears that the most recent reason for another delay was still because the applicant was unable to provide a rebuttal or report response to the *objection* by the Drainage Engineers for Y/32/25/PL of Oct.10th 2025.

n) Meanwhile it is also listed that Y/80/25/S73 is due to have a decision by 23/3/2026. From details available it is question how this Gordian Knot is intended to be severed.

o) It is in **Objection** that after considerable leeway being given to the applicant over approx.9 months, the whole aspect of the 'site' is in limbo because the applicant has allegedly failed to submit required details to the ADC Drainage Engineers as required.

p). One option for the ADC Planning department is to decline to continue on the grounds that: (AI)

'A local authority would be justified in refusing a planning application where an applicant has caused a deliberate delay and has been unwilling to agree an extension of time; such behaviour

will be taken into account in determining any claim for costs if the applicant makes an appeal'.

q) May I respectfully request that the alleged actions of the agent/agency on behalf of their client/s with regard to Y/32/25/PL and Y/80/25/S73 regarding 'delay and EOTs' as all connected, receives consideration to abandon the application project entirely for the above applications, and in relation to 'Conditions' for Y/52/23/PL.

Thanking you in advance for your kind attention.

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsborough

Nicola Spencer

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 January 2026 17:43
To: Planning
Cc: Simon Davis
Subject: Objection to Y/80/25/S73 and Associated Matters. Lownsborough
Attachments: EOT and Ref Y 80 25 S73 V1.doc

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

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 ADC Planning,
Please see as attachment, response in objection to Y/80/25/S73 and associated matters.
Kind Regards
Dilys Lownsborough