Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2026

**by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24 June 2026**

**Appeal Ref: 6006139**
**Jetty opposite 31 and 33 Riverside Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, BN43 5RB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Simon Twiddy against the decision of Adur District Council.
- The application Ref is AWDM/1195/24.
- The development proposed is for the renovation of existing jetty and change of use from mooring of leisure craft boats to mooring of up to five residential houseboats.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the riverside and the visual amenities of the area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

## Reasons

*Character and appearance*

3. The appeal site is located along a stretch of Riverside Road that is characterised by detached and semi-detached bungalows and two storey dwellings. It is an area where the River Adur is flanked by a diverse range of commercial and residential developments. On the southern side of the river and a short distance to the west of the appeal site is a row of typically older houseboats. They are located immediately alongside Riverbank, where they are set back from the main route of the river.

4. Opposite the appeal site, on the north side of the river, is a row of modern houseboats. They occupy a recessed position between a boatyard and a commercial site and are seen against a large multi-storey modern commercial and residential development. To the front of these houseboats are several jetties that project into the river and which were used for the mooring of recreational boats at the time of the appeal site visit.

5. The appeal site occupies a ‘backland’ position to the rear of the gardens to three detached dwellings. There is a small parking/yard area immediately to the rear of two of the gardens and a long jetty beyond the parking area which projects into the river. There are similar projecting jetties on either side, as well as opposite the appeal site. Further to the east on both sides of the river are wharfs which

accommodate a range of older commercial sites, a modern housing development and a small marina. These developments create a more formal edge to the river that is quite distinct from the area in which the appeal site is located.

6. Amongst other things policy 11 of the Adur Local Plan 2017 (ALP) seeks to protect the setting of the River Adur and to support opportunities to improve public access to and along the river and open up views to it. New development adjacent to the river must respect its character and appearance. ALP Policy 15 expects proposals to respect and enhance the character of the site. They should make a positive contribution to the sense of space, local distinctiveness and character as well as the distinctiveness of the area.

7. With the proposal the existing jetty would be renovated and whilst few details regarding the proposed works are provided, this is a matter that could be satisfactorily dealt with by condition. The appellant has also indicated that the site would be tidied up and that stored materials would be removed. Again, this is a matter that could be dealt with by condition. Subject to such conditions, the renovation of the existing jetty and tidying up of the site would improve the quality and appearance of the appeal site, without compromising its modest character and appearance.

8. Unlike the existing houseboat moorings, the proposed houseboat moorings would be located on the outside of a slight bend and would project further into the river. As a consequence, the houseboats using the moorings would be highly prominent and would be seen as encroaching into the river. Due to their combined siting, size, design and appearance the houseboats would materially detract from the spacious and informal character of this part of the River Adur when viewed from the river and the surrounding area, including Brighton Road where it crosses the river. This harm would materially outweigh the benefits resulting from the renovation of the existing jetty.

9. For this reason, I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would undermine and unacceptably harm the prevailing character and appearance of this stretch of the River Adur. Accordingly, it would conflict with ALP Policies 11 and 15.

*Living conditions*

10. Together and amongst other things ALP Policies 15 ad 34 seek to ensure that proposals do not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent properties. New development should be located in areas most suitable to the use proposed and should avoid risks from noise or light pollution.

11. Access to the appeal site is via a narrow track between the bungalow at 31 Riverside Road (No.31) and the two storey house at 33 Riverside Road (No.33). The dwelling at No.31 projects up to the edge of the access track and includes two clear glazed habitable room windows in its side elevation which abuts the track. The dwelling at No.33 is sited close to the access track and there is a tall fence along the adjacent boundary with the track. There is a ground floor side widow in the wall facing the access track, although it is largely screened by the boundary fence. There is also a larger clear glazed window at first floor level which provides an outlook over the access track.

12. Currently the appeal site does not appear to be extensively used. This could change if the site and jetty were restored and fully used for the mooring of leisure crafts. This would be highly likely to increase current activity levels, with owners arriving and departing from the site when loading and unloading their boats. Having regard to the proximity of the dwellings and associated rear gardens at No.31 and No.33 to the access track, this would result in some noise and disturbance for the occupiers of those properties. However, as indicated in the council's delegated report a previous planning permission restricts the use of the site access for purposes associated with the loading and unloading of boats.

13. Conversely, the houseboats that would use the proposed moorings would be occupied for extended periods day and night. Collectively they would generate numerous daily pedestrian or vehicular movements, including during the evenings, at night and early in the morning. This, together with the day-to-day on-site activities of the occupiers, would result in a material level of activity, noise and light pollution.

14. Having regard to the quiet and unlit nature of this river front site, such activities would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.31and No.33 in particular and to a lesser extent No.35. The comings and goings along the access track would in particular be intrusive for the occupiers of No.31 and No.33. This is due to their close proximity to the access track and side facing windows. The occupies of the adjacent rooms would experience noise, disturbance, light pollution and loss of privacy.

15. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.31, No.33 and No.35 for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with ALP Policies 25 and 34.

*Other matters*

16. No parking or highway safety concerns have been raised by the council or the Highway Authority. Whilst I note the concerns raised by residents regarding pressure for on-street parking, having regard to the size and nature of the proposal, I am satisfied that the proposed parking area would be satisfactory to deal with the day-to-day needs of the occupiers of the proposed houseboats. From the information submitted and the comments set out in the council's delegated report I am satisfied that drainage and flood risk could be adequately dealt with by conditions.

17. Paragraphs 11, 34, 124 and 125 of the National planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework), state a presumption in favour of sustainable forms of development, making full and effective use of land and set out the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes. The houseboats that would use the proposed moorings would potentially provide five homes in an accessible location. The proposal would also make full use of a site that is currently under-used. In these respects, the proposal accords with current planning policies which promote new housing in accessible locations and making full and effective use of previously developed land.

18. However, paragraph 131 of the Framework states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 135 of the Framework seeks to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area. They should

be sympathetic to local character and history, including the built environment and landscape setting and create places which promote health and well-being.

19. In this instance the harm that would be caused both to the character and appearance of the riverside and the living conditions of various local residents would clearly outweigh the benefits stated in paragraphs 7, 16 and 17 of this decision. Further, this harm is not a matter that could be satisfactorily dealt with by the imposition of conditions.

**Conclusion**

20. Having regard to the conclusions on the main issues and all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*Elixabeth Lawrence*

INSPECTOR