



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3366372

20 Latchmere Road, Kingston upon Thames KT2 5TW

- 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 Daniel Zhang against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/01908/HOU.
 - The development is described as “remove 2 chimneys and internal chimney breast to the rear and mid of the property but to retain the front chimney to maintain existing appearance and local context. Fully rebuilt damaged main roof in continuous ridge with same interlocking tiles to match existing appearance”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure & Preliminary Matter

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
3. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. I am however satisfied that, whilst lengthy and contains superfluous detail, it sufficiently describes the proposal. Works have been completed and therefore the appeal seeks retrospective planning permission.

Background & Main Issue

4. The Council raised no objections to the replacement of the roof covering, and I have no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the removal of the two chimneys and specifically whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Richmond Road Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a detached dwelling that fronts the highway. There is a level of uniformity between the dwellings which are generally detached and are described in the CA Plan as late Victorian residential development of distinct groups of red brick houses. The buildings and chimneys along the street are relatively unchanged with any instances of removal or change not the prevailing character. The aforementioned chimneys have a positive influence demonstrating the age, architectural and historic significance of the buildings as both examples of their type and as a group. These traditional design elements and general consistency contribute positively to the significance of the CA.

6. The removal works leaves one remaining visible from the highway. The loss detracts from the pleasant and historic consistency of the dwelling and how it relates to its contemporaries. It stands out as being at odds with the wider street scene and the collective consistent and cohesive feel to period buildings. The loss is visible to both the front and rear of the dwelling and sufficiently viewed on the street scene to warrant their importance and therefore their contribution. Resultantly, the loss of the chimneys adversely affects the significance of the CA.
7. I have not been provided any further details of removal works that have taken place elsewhere. Or indeed whether they required or sought express planning permission. Moreover, the reference to Number 26 Latchmere Road's recent planning permission still only provides limited detail and whilst shows the removal of one chimney, I am unaware of the circumstances which prevailed at the time of granting that permission. Overall, I am not sufficiently convinced that there is a precedent which has been set which would lead me to recommend the appeal be allowed.
8. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing. Nationally speaking, paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) places emphasis on great weight being given to an asset's conservation. Given the above assessment, the proposal neither preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the CA. Due to the scale of the development in context, the harm is less than substantial. As directed by paragraph 215 of the Framework, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The Council have implied that the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm, and the retention of the chimneys would have still allowed for the benefits posed. The appellant has provided a number of public benefits which include compliance with the clean air act, energy efficiency of the building and support for sustainable living. Whilst I commend the applicant for their attempts, I am not convinced that the removal of the chimneys was required to achieve these aims. I appreciate that the roof needed structural repairs to which I would give limited weight. Collectively, the benefits provided can carry only moderate weight.
10. It is sufficiently clear, given the above, that the public benefits would not outweigh the great weight given to the harm to the CA. Therefore, there would be conflict with Policies HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies CS8, DM10 and DM12 of Core Strategy Local Development Framework 2012 and the relevant paragraphs of the Framework. Together, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and conserve the historic environment, amongst other things.

Other Matters

11. Concerns the appellant has with the Council during the handling and consideration of the appeal scheme prior to and during the planning application process are for the main parties to establish and resolve outside of appeal proceedings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into

account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR