

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0724/26

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 29/06/2026 1:22 PM from Mr Andrew Fuller.

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 (retrospective).

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Fuller

Email:

Address: 42 Grafton Gardens Sompting West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Design

Comments: I wish to object to the proposed variation of Condition 3 relating to the external materials of the approved dwelling.

The original planning permission required that:

"The external materials and finishes of the development hereby permitted shall be completed to match in design, colour and texture those of the existing dwelling (29 Grafton Gardens) unless

otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority."

The reason given for imposing this condition was:

"In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan."

This demonstrates that the external appearance of the dwelling was not a minor detail but a key consideration in making the development acceptable. The current application seeks retrospective approval for a fundamentally different palette of materials and finishes from those originally approved.

The approved scheme proposed materials that reflected the established character of the existing terrace and surrounding neighbourhood, including hung tiles, brown brickwork and white window frames. These materials enabled the new dwelling to integrate with the appearance of the adjoining properties and maintain the visual continuity of the street scene.

The retrospective proposal instead replaces these materials with Midnight Black Hardie VL Plank composite cladding together with black uPVC windows, soffits, fascias and rainwater goods. This represents a significant departure from the approved design and, in my view, fails to achieve the objective of matching the design, colour and texture of No. 29 as originally required by Condition 3.

While there are examples of properties elsewhere in the surrounding area that incorporate areas of external cladding, these do not support the approach taken in this development. Those properties use cladding in a way that complements the prevailing architectural character and maintains a visual relationship with neighbouring dwellings through the use of sympathetic colours, materials and detailing. Indeed, the applicant's own reference images illustrate this point. One example shows a partially clad property immediately adjacent to a traditionally hung-tile dwelling, where both properties share a similar visual character despite using different materials. By contrast, the proposed combination of black composite cladding and black external detailing introduces a distinctly different architectural treatment that does not reflect the appearance of the existing terrace or the wider streetscape.

Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan requires development to respect and enhance the prevailing character of the area, make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, and give careful consideration to the choice of materials. Given that Condition 3 was imposed specifically to secure these objectives, I do not consider that the retrospective changes satisfy the design

principles that formed the basis of the original planning permission.

I would also draw the Local Planning Authority's attention to a further matter that appears to differ from the approved proposals. The covering letter accompanying the original planning application (AWDM/0303/23) stated that the substantial vegetation and mature trees along the eastern boundary would be retained to provide screening for the new dwelling. It now appears that this vegetation has largely been removed.

Although the current application relates to external materials, the loss of this vegetation is relevant because the original planning submission relied upon its retention to soften and screen the visual impact of the development. Without that established planting, the dwelling is more prominent within the street scene than was originally represented, increasing the importance of ensuring that its external appearance is sympathetic to the surrounding area. Furthermore, Policy 15 also requires development to respect existing natural features, including trees, where these contribute to the character of the site.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuses the proposed variation of Condition 3. The revised materials and colour palette represent a substantial departure from those originally approved and, in my view, fail to achieve the objectives of visual amenity and local character that Condition 3 was specifically imposed to protect in accordance with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan.

Kind regards