Appeal Reference 6006559

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Address: 18 Gainsborough Ave, Broadwater, Worthing BN14 8QR

Local Planning Reference: AWDM/1018/25

Statement of Case of the Local Planning Authority

Permission was granted for “First floor rear extension and new first floor fenestration” on 15 January 2026. The decision included condition 3 as follows

“*03. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the external materials and finishes of the development hereby permitted shall, prior to commencement of use of the additional floorspace thereby created, be completed to match in design, colour and texture those of the existing building.*

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.”

This condition is the subject of this appeal.

As set out in the officer’s report, the proposed materials of composite horizontal cladding were not considered appropriate as they would have an adverse impact on the wider streetscene. Condition 3 was added to ensure the extension was built from a complementary material which matched the external appearance of the existing house. It was considered appropriate to grant permission, subject to the condition, as the rest of the application was considered acceptable.

The officer’s report referenced two appeals in Worthing from 2025 (APP/M3835/D/24/3356128 and APP/M3835/D/25/3373119 attached). These concerned the use of composite cladding. Both appeals were dismissed.

In one decision the Inspector highlighted the SPG’s text that states that “If identical materials are not available, the nearest possible alternative should be used and should match the originals in size, shape and texture“. The Inspector noted about that proposed development that “The cladding does not match the materials on the original dwelling, or reflect other materials in use locally, and thus it does not relate well to its context”.

In the second decision, the Inspector said that “The use of the grey coloured composite boarding for the gable end at roof level and for the rear dormer results in a stark and visually discordant addition to the house and draws attention to the roof level. The materials which are at odds with the materials used for the rest of the house make the roof changes appear top heavy and over dominant in relation to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The colour selected, which does

not match the colour palette for the rest of the house, exacerbates the harm I have found."

The decisions in these cases support the LPA's assessment that harm would be caused using composite cladding which would be out of character with the host property and the wider streetscene. The decisions are also contrary to the appellant's statement that composite cladding is an "accepted contemporary material treatment and has not resulted in any demonstrable harm to the character of nearby streets or the wider built environment". In both appeal cases cited, the use of cladding was retrospective and so the visual harm was readily apparent and resulted in dismissed appeals.

The appellant's statement notes that the cladding could be finished in a colour to match the dwelling. However, even if it were to be a similar colour it would not match in size, shape or colour the existing dwelling as set out in the SPG. And as outlined in one of the appeal decisions above, harm is caused by the use of the cladding itself, and the colour exacerbated the harm found. A complementary colour would therefore not be considered sufficient mitigation for the harm caused by the cladding itself.

The applicant has argued that the extension would not be highly visible in views from the street. The LPA disagrees as the property forms the last dwelling fronting Gainsborough Ave with neighbours to the north arranged perpendicular to the host property. To the north of the property is a single storey garage and neighbour's outbuilding with a gap of about 27 metres between the side wall of the property at first floor level and the rear wall of the corner property, 165 Upper Brighton Road.

The rear extension would be visible in views moving south along Gainsborough Ave from the intersection with the A27. A tree blocks some views when close to the A27 but this is in a neighbour's garden and cannot be relied upon to provide much screening as its retention is not in the applicant's control. As one moves further down the street the view over the garage and outbuilding becomes more apparent.

To the south is a single-storey bungalow, and views would be available over the roof of this dwelling to the proposed rear extension. It is recognised that the appearance may be less noticeable in these views due to the roof of the bungalow being of a similar height to the rendered sides. However, views will still be possible of some of the extension here above the roof and in views from between the buildings.

Therefore, it is considered that the bulk of the extension would be highly visible in views from the street, drawing attention to the rear of the building. The condition to use matching materials is necessary to ensure the development respects its context and provides a high quality development in line with policy DM5 of the Local Plan and the Council's Extending or Altering your home SPG.