
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2026

by **Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons), MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/25/3375723

6 Shepherds Walk, Chestfield, Kent CT5 3NB

- 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 Mr and Mrs Wescomb against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref is CA/25/00908.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey detached outbuilding for use as office and storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey detached outbuilding for use as office and storage at 6 Shepherds Walk, Chestfield, Kent CT5 3NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CA/25/00908, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers:

Site Location Plan	- 31203A CLA EX 00 PD A 0001
Proposed Block Plan	- 31203A CLA PR 00 PD A 0001
Proposed Outbuilding	- 31203A CLA PR GFZZ PD A 0001
Proposed Site Plan	- 31203A CLA PR 00 PD A 0002
 - 3) The use of the outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes incidental or ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 6 Shepherds Walk, Chestfield, Kent CT5 3NB.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the Chestfield Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Chestfield Conservation Area (CCA) is centred on Chestfield Road. Other areas of Chestfield are included, such that in places the conservation area extends well beyond Chestfield Road, most notably open areas of land to the east and west. Properties are generally set well back from site frontages and offer a mix of what appear to be largely twentieth century buildings. Together with grass verges and some large plots, the area has a verdant, low density character. In so far as it relates to this appeal, the significance of the CCA is in part derived from the aesthetic value of some of the properties but also the spacious, leafy character and attractive street scenes which are created.

4. The design approach for the outbuilding and the choice of external finishes reflect those of the main house. The Council do not object to the design per se and I see no reason to disagree. Nevertheless, as a consequence of its footprint and roof design, the building would be a sizable structure.
5. Despite its form and massing, it would not obscure views of the dwelling and a large front garden area would remain. It would to my mind, appear sufficiently subservient to the main dwelling and the plot as a whole.
6. Being located to the front of the plot, the proposed building would also be visible from outside of the site. However, the relative narrowness of Shepards Walk at this point together with the boundary enclosures and planting along the frontage of properties would ensure the proposed building would not be widely visible from public vantage points when viewed from the north of the site.
7. When viewed from the south of the site, the building would be visible despite the boundary enclosures and trees. However, by virtue of where the appeal site is located, the relative narrowness of Shepards Walk at this point and the position of neighbouring buildings, the vistas are reasonably enclosed. Thus, the building being to the front of the dwelling would not appear jarring or overly prominent. Furthermore, the front garden area would not be unduly cramped and thus would not appear unsympathetic to the spacious surroundings.
8. For the reasons above, I do not consider that the size, siting or design of the proposed outbuilding would represent an incongruous or a discordant feature. It would not be detrimental to the appearance of the host property or the character and appearance of the CCA. Overall, I find that the proposal would not harm the experience or appreciation of the significance of the Conservation Area.
9. The scheme would not conflict with Policies DEB3, HE1 and HE6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan 2017 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure developments are of a high quality and sympathetic to their surroundings and to heritage assets. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements for good design and protection of heritage assets.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.
11. To safeguard against use of the building as an independent unit of residential accommodation and thus protect the character and appearance of the CCA, I have also imposed a condition limiting the building's use to only be in connection with the primary domestic use of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the specified conditions.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR