



planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Wed 24 Jun,
17:23 (21
hours ago)

to me

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 24/06/2026 5:23 PM from Mr Joel Goacher.

Application Summary

Address: 29 Grafton Gardens Sompting West Sussex BN15 9SP

Proposal: Application to vary Condition 3 (materials) of approved AWDM/0303/23.
Amendment: to replace the approved hung tiles and brown brick with Hardie VL Plank composite cladding in Midnight Black, with black uPVC windows, gutters, soffits and fascias in place of the approved white finish.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Joel Goacher

Email:

Address: 37 Grafton Gardens Sompting West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Design

Comments: To the Planning Case Officer,

I am writing to formally object to the Section 73 application seeking to vary Condition 03 of the approved planning permission. The applicant proposes to substitute the approved materials (hung tiles, brown brick, and white fenestration) with Midnight Black composite cladding and black uPVC details.

This proposal should be refused as it would cause substantial harm to the visual amenity of the street scene and would fundamentally disrupt the established character of the terrace. My objection is based on the following planning material considerations:

1. The Purpose of the Original Condition and the Importance of the Terrace

Condition 03 specifically stated that external finishes must match the house at number 29. The Planning Inspectorate and Local Planning Authorities routinely apply such conditions to terraced properties to preserve their architectural rhythm, visual unity, and symmetry. Terraces derive their character from uniformity. The applicant acknowledges that the approved finish was "hung tiles and brown brick... with white fenestration." Introducing "Midnight Black" composite cladding and black uPVC to a single dwelling within this unified row is not a minor alteration; it is a highly discordant and incongruous addition that will aggressively break the visual link to number 29 and the rest of the terrace.

2. Misleading Contextual Justification

In Section 3 of their planning statement, the applicant attempts to justify the design by providing reference photographs of "nearby buildings with similar cladding." This justification is deeply flawed and materially irrelevant:

The applicant has deliberately omitted photographs of the actual terrace in which the property sits.

The architectural merit and established character of a specific terrace cannot be overridden by the existence of different materials on detached or unrelated properties in the wider vicinity. The primary contextual baseline for this property is its adjoining neighbors, specifically number 29, not unrelated "nearby buildings."

Furthermore, the applicant's own reference examples fail to support their case. Both properties included are only part-clad. One features cladding as a replacement for original tile hanging but maintains a rendered brick finish below and around the ground-floor window. The other is a wholly different style of property with a clad end gable and rear dormer, which again crucially retains a more traditional rendered brick finish to the lower floor. Neither example sets a precedent for the stark, full-elevation black cladding proposed here.

3. Conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The proposed material palette is in direct conflict with Chapter 12 of the NPPF (Achieving well-designed and beautiful places). Specifically:

Paragraph 135(c) states that developments should be "sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting." The stark contrast of Midnight Black cladding against traditional brown brick and hung tiles is the antithesis of sympathetic design.

Paragraph 139 states that "development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and

government guidance on design." The applicant's claim that the black cladding "simplifies the composition" is subjective and ignores the objective harm caused by severing the property aesthetically from its immediate neighbors.

4. Unacceptable Visual Harm

The applicant claims the changes "do not give rise to undue visual harm." I strongly dispute this. A high-contrast, modern material palette (black composite and black uPVC) sitting mid-terrace or end-of-terrace against traditional brick and tile creates a jarring, piecemeal appearance. It degrades the collective street scene and sets a dangerous precedent for the gradual erosion of the terrace's unified character.

The original condition tying the materials to number 29 was applied for a sound planning reason: to protect the integrity of the terrace. The applicant has provided no valid planning justification for abandoning this condition, relying instead on irrelevant references to unrelated, part-clad buildings.

The Council must now ask itself: why did it apply the original condition? If the answer is anything other than an error, then this variation should be rejected. To allow a developer to breach a plain English condition and subsequently apply for retrospective permission undermines the strength and enforceability of planning conditions on future applications within the district. I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this variation and uphold the original material condition to protect our local street scene.

Kind regards