



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2025

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th of July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/W/25/3358713

Toilet Block, Beach Court Residential Park, Faversham Road, Seasalter, Whitstable CT5 4FE

- 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 Ms Yvette Love, South East Parks against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref is CA/24/01147.
 - The development proposed is Two-storey residential holiday accommodation following demolition of existing building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a single storey vacant, former public toilet block. It is located in a prominent position adjacent to the sweeping curve of this stretch of Faversham Road. Immediately to the north the land drops sharply to the beach, whilst large holiday parks with static caravans are located to the east of the appeal site, and on the opposite side of Faversham Road to the south.
4. The proposal's western elevation would have an excessively large gap between the eaves and the top of its ground floor windows. As a result of this the building would appear ungainly, with its upper level appearing top heavy and awkward in design terms. This would be particularly emphasised as the western elevation on the curve of the road would be very prominent in views of the proposal from Faversham Road.
5. There are nearby examples of taller properties including the Oyster Pearl public house and the Seasalter Shellfish building which is to the west of the site, facing the seafront. Further along Faversham Road, there are a mixture of residential properties, with significant variation in the height, bulk and forms of dwellings, which are eclectic in their design in a range of traditional and contemporary styles. The two storey building would be noticeably taller than the single storey, gently pitched roofs of the nearby caravans, however this would not be an unusual relationship within the area. Therefore, the combination of single storey and two storey building heights would conform with the surrounding character of the area.

Given the proposal's relatively small footprint, it would not significantly reduce the sense of spaciousness in the area.

6. The appellant indicates that the proposal would have a similar design to 418 Faversham Road (No. 418). However, it seems to me, that the design of No. 418's side elevation facing Faversham Road differs to the appeal proposal, and it therefore has a different visual effect. Notwithstanding this, each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
7. Whilst I have not found harm in relation to the scale and height of the dwelling, its detailed design would not create high quality design as required by Policy DBE3 of the Canterbury District Local Plan (2017) (CLP). Nor would the proposal comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) paragraph 135b) which requires development to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Other Matters

8. The site is within the zone of influence of the Thames, Medway and Swale Estuaries and Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Areas (SPAs). In combination with other development in Canterbury, the proposal has the potential to create recreational disturbance in those areas by increasing the resident population. There would therefore be a likely significant effect on the SPAs.
9. Policy SP6 of the CLP explains that in these circumstances new developments are expected to fund management and monitoring measures to mitigate these impacts. The appellant has indicated a willingness to sign up to the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring agreement as requested and has submitted a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the requisite contribution. However, given the harm that I have identified above and that I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter further as it would not alter my findings on the main issues.
10. The proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Nor would the proposal have harmful effects in relation to ecology, biodiversity and flood risk. However, the absence of harm or conflict with other relevant development plan policies is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
11. The proposal would support the promotion of tourism objectives outlined within the CLP. Be that as it may, this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR