Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2026

by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6006659
18 Gainsborough Avenue, Broadwater, Worthing, West Sussex BN14 8QR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
- The appeal is made by Mr Kevan McLoughlin against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref AWDM/1018/25 was approved on 15 January 2026 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
- The development permitted is first floor rear extension and new first floor fenestration.
- The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that: 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.
- The reason given for the condition is: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Planning permission was granted for the erection of a first-floor rear extension and new first floor fenestration. The appellant is seeking the removal or variation of condition 3 set out in the banner heading above to remove the requirement that the development be completed to match the design and texture of the existing building. The condition was imposed 'in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan'.

3. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is whether condition 3 is necessary and reasonable with regard to the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey house in a residential area, lying between single storey garages and a bungalow. It faces Gainsborough Avenue, but there is a large gap between the house and neighbouring properties fronting Upper Brighton Road. The area is characterised by buildings with traditional brick and render wall finishes, some with hanging tile features. With cream rendered walls, the appeal dwelling is consistent with the prevailing character.

5. The plans indicate the use of contemporary coloured composite cladding on the proposed rear extension. Whilst its colour could match the rest of the house, the artificial texture and horizontal slatted form of the cladding would be starkly at odds with the render on the existing house and finishing materials on properties nearby.

6. The adjacent bungalow roof would largely screen the extension walls in northward views along the road. However, due to the open aspect between the appeal site and dwellings on Upper Brighton Road, these would be evident in the street scene above the garage roofs when travelling southbound along Gainsborough Avenue.

7. It is indicated that cladding would be more durable, easier to maintain and cost effective than render, and more suited to the proposed timber framed construction method. The appellant states that the natural movement of timber in the proposed extension caused by moisture and temperature changes could result in render deteriorating and cracking.

8. However, the use of composite cladding would be incongruous with wall materials prevalent locally. Thus, the condition requiring materials to match the design and texture of those on the existing house is necessary to ensure that the extension would appear in keeping with the dwelling and other buildings in the vicinity.

9. Policy DM5 of the Council's Local Plan 2020 - 2036 requires development to be of a high-quality design which respects the prevailing character of the area, including when considering materials. Further, the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or altering your home' (SPG) indicates that the facing materials of any extension should ideally match those used for the existing house. As such, the proposal without external materials to match the design and texture of the existing building would conflict with Policy DM5 and the guidance in the SPG.

10. Therefore, I conclude that condition 3 is necessary and reasonable to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant refers to discussions with the Council on the design and form of the extension, stating that the Council did not at that time raise issues relating to the finishing materials. Nevertheless, I have found that the condition requiring matching finishing materials is justified in this case.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR