The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2024

by N Perrins BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3RD June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/24/3339336
31 Gaisford Road, Gaisford, Worthing, West Sussex BN14 7HW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Kevin West against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref: AWDM/1711/23.
- The development proposed is cladding to north and west elevations at first floor level.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice has a different description of development than the planning application form. I have used the Council's description in this decision as it more succinctly describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The external appearance of the dwelling comprises predominantly painted pebble dashing and hanging tiles with a small section of grey cladding on the front gable.

5. The appeal proposal comprises cladding on the property's 1st floor side elevation above the existing garage, and 1st floor rear elevation. Whilst there is a small section of existing grey cladding on the property at present and some isolated other examples elsewhere in the vicinity, cladding is not a prevailing characteristic of the area. Elevations of dwellings along Gaisford Road predominantly comprise render, pebble dashing, brick and hanging tiles. The introduction of cladding as proposed on the side and rear elevations would, therefore, not be consistent with the prevailing pattern of development in the vicinity.

6. The grey coloured cladding on the side elevation would be prominently visible when viewed from Gaisford Road, albeit mainly from short localised views. The visual impact of the cladding on the side elevation would be exacerbated by it being set back from the front elevation. This would create a discordant form of

development that would not integrate well with the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling within its specific context and localised views to it. A key prevailing characteristic of the area is the general uniformity of elevational treatment, which would be disrupted in this case by the proposed grey cladding and, in particular, its setting back on the side elevation. The appeal proposal would, therefore, result in the host dwelling appearing at odds with the prevailing built form in the area.

7. I have reviewed the examples provided by the appellant of cladding that has been installed elsewhere in the area. These examples are relatively few when compared with the number of dwellings in the area around the appeal site that are characterised with pebble dashing, tiles and brick materials. Moreover, these other examples all achieve a more cohesive and integrated relationship with their host dwellings than would be the case with the appeal proposal. Accordingly, I am not satisfied that these other examples are material considerations that justify the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.

8. I acknowledge that the appeal property's external render is in need of repair, which from the information before me would be resolved through the installation of the proposed cladding. The materials used would also be durable and have associated sustainability benefits. Whilst I acknowledge the benefit of repairing the property in this regard, I am not satisfied from the information before me that the proposal is the most appropriate and only option available, and therefore only give the benefit of repairing the property as proposed limited weight in this decision.

9. I have also considered the appellant's suggestion of attaching a condition requiring the exact colour to be agreed with the local planning authority. In this scenario, the colour would likely be required to be of a similar grey to that installed on the front gabled end otherwise a further variation in materials would occur. As I have found there to be harm to the character and appearance to the area from the proposed grey cladding, I am not persuaded that a condition in this regard would adequately ameliorate or justify the visual harm identified.

10. I also acknowledge that the appellant considers there could be a permitted development fall back in view of the cladding that exists on the front gable. Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) requires that materials match those used in the construction of the dwelling. Whilst there is cladding at the property, it is not clear whether it was used in the construction of the dwelling. Furthermore, the prevailing external materials in use are pebble dashing and hanging tiles. It is, therefore, not clear from the information before me whether a genuine and realistic permitted development fall back exists in this case, and I can only give this possibility very limited weight in this decision.

11. For the reasons set out, the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the main dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, the appeal proposal is contrary to DM5 (*Quality of the Built Environment*) of the Worthing Borough Council Local Plan 2020-2036, which requires development to be of a high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and prevailing character of the area, enhance the local environment by

way of its appearance and character and make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area. The proposal is also not consistent with the guidance in the Council's Extending or Altering Your Home Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) that advises that materials should ideally match those used in the existing house; Whilst it would match the small section of existing grey cladding, it would not match the prevailing materials in use on the front elevation.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal is not consistent with the policies of the development plan as a whole, due to its impact on the appearance of the appeal property and the character of the surrounding area, and there are no material considerations that would lead me to a different conclusion. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR