Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2026

by Megan Thomas KC Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2026

Appeal Ref: 6014501
101 Farnaby Road, Bromley BR1 4BN

- 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 Polina Revzina against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley.
- The application ref. is 26/01134/HP.
- The development sought is part retention of front porch, single storey side extensions, hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and rooflights, and elevational alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front porch extension and the side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear dormer structure and hip-to- gable roof extension and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer structure and hip-to-gable roof extension at 101 Farnaby Road, Bromley BR1 4BN in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. 26/01134/HP, subject to the following condition:

    1) Within 42 days of the date of this decision, the rear dormer structure cladding shall be painted in a brown colour which matches the colour of the rear roof tiles. The rear dormer structure and hip-to-gable roof extension hereby permitted shall be demolished and all materials resulting from the demolition shall be removed from the site within 90 days of the date of failure to paint the rear dormer structure cladding as set out above. In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

Procedural Matters

2. The development sought is in part retrospective, having partially taken place already. I have nevertheless determined the appeal on its merits and the fact that development has already taken place has not affected my approach to the decision-making process.

3. After the appeal was made, the Government issued a revised National Planning Policy Framework (on 17 August 2026). Both main parties were given the opportunity to make any comments on the revised NPPF insofar as it was relevant to the appeal. Where comments were made, I have taken them into account in coming to my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the side and front porch extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene, and the effect of the side extension glazing on the living conditions of the occupants of no.99 Farnaby Road in relation to privacy.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached residential dwelling located on the western side of Farnaby Road within the London Borough of Bromley. The property forms part of an established residential streetscape characterised predominantly by two-storey semi-detached dwellings with pitched roofs and similar architectural appearance. The dwelling's semi pair to the north is 103 Farnaby Road and the dwelling to its south is 99 Farnaby Road. The site lies adjacent to land designated as Metropolitan Open Land. However the existing property is located within a built up residential area, and the proposed development does not extend towards the Metropolitan Open Land boundary. The appeal does not raise planning issues relating to the Metropolitan Open Land in my view.

6. The development includes the retention of a hip-to-gable loft conversion with a rear dormer and front rooflights, a single storey front porch extension and a single storey side extension.

7. The loft conversion incorporates a hip-to-gable alteration and rear dormer extension which is set below the ridge and contained within the rear roof slope. The dormer is visually subservient to the host roof and is not prominent within the street scene. The existing grey composite cladding to the dormer is unsympathetic to the host dwelling and jars with the roof tiles and results in the host dwelling appearing unduly top heavy and the dormer appearing unduly prominent. However, I have come to the view that a planning condition requiring the grey cladding to be painted brown to match the colour of the existing roof tiles would overcome this harm and improve the appearance and character of the rear dormer structure. For that reason, I have imposed a condition securing this.

8. Three rooflights (two of which appear to be better described as sunpipes) are located on the front roof slope. There are a number of front rooflights in the dwellings in the immediate area and their insertion is not uncharacteristic. The sunpipes do look different from a traditional rooflight and these two are positioned low down on the front roof slope. However, they are not unduly large or eye-catching or poorly positioned and I have come to the view that the three 'rooflights' do not materially harm the host dwelling or the streetscene.

9. In relation to the loft conversion, rear dormer and rooflights, I conclude that those elements of the proposal would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the streetscene and would not be in conflict with policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 or policies 6 or 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (adopted 2019).

Character and appearance -front porch and single storey side extension

10. The front extension and the side extension (which is described in the Design and Access Statement and plans as a side conservatory) have metal frames and glass (or

similar) panels. Both are in place. The submitted drawings show that some brick panels and roof tiles are proposed to be fixed to parts of the front extension and parts of the side extension.

11. The front porch extension is a large enclosed structure which extends the width of the front elevation between the protruding front double gable element and the southern flank wall of the appeal dwelling. It has a double pitched roof above the central front door, and it stands forward of the front double gable element approximately in line with the bay window in that gable element. Its size renders it prominent both in relation to the host dwelling and from the street. When lights within it are switched on after dark, its prominence increases. Its size, materials and design jars with its context, both in terms of the host dwelling itself and the wider character of the area. In respect of the latter, the porches in the area are typically in proportion in size to their hosts, typically traditional in design and made of materials which respect and reflect the materials used in the main dwelling.

12. Whilst the side extension does not exceed either the front elevation or the main rear elevation, it is a tall and long structure, and it almost fills the gap between the appeal dwellings southern flank wall and the common boundary fence with no.99 Farnaby Road. I do not agree with the Council's description of it as modest in size. On my site visit I was able to confirm that its eastern end and much of its length are visible in the streetscene. Its proximity to the common boundary contributes to the appearance of the appeal dwelling as being overdeveloped and squeezed into the available plot. The proposed addition of a brick panel (matching in colour to the house brick) and some roof tiles on the lean-to glass roof would look both incongruous and artificial to the detriment of the host dwelling's appearance and the streetscene.

13. Turning back to the front porch extension, the proposed brick panels and roof tiles would similarly appear incongruous and artificial. In relation to both the site extension and the front porch the panels and tiles would not disguise or reduce the perceived scale of the structures. I conclude that both unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene and the proposed additions would not overcome this harm. Both structures are in conflict with policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (adopted 2019).

Living conditions of occupants of 99 Farnaby Road

14. No.99 Farnaby Road is broadly to the south of the appeal site and the side extension at the appeal site runs along part of their common boundary. There is a timber fence which is about 1.8m high which sits on the common boundary. Consequently, when an occupier of no.101 is inside the side extension the views towards no.99 are generally of its northern flank wall above ground floor level. There is a window at ground floor level, first floor level and at second floor/roofspace level in the northern flank wall of no.99, however, it is difficult to see into any of those windows from the side extension at no.101. The two upper floor windows can be seen because the side extension is glazed like a conservatory, but I do not consider that the occupants of no.99 experience a loss of privacy or the perception of a loss of privacy as a result of the side extension. My site visit included access to the inside of the side extension, and I was able to confirm these factors.

15. On this second main issue, I conclude that the side extension does not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupants of no.99 Farnaby Road in respect of undue overlooking or loss of privacy. In these respects, there is no conflict with the relevant parts of policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 or policy 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (adopted 2019). This finding does not affect the finding that I have made above that the side extension harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.

NPPF policy -front porch and side extension

16. NPPF policy S4(1) sets out a presumption of approval for development proposals within settlements but S4(2) says that the circumstances in which benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include situations where the development proposal would fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances. DP3(1) & (3) of the NPPF indicate that in this situation, where the front porch extension and side extension do not respond to their context or integrate well with and enhance its surroundings, they should be refused. L2(d) about creating additional floorspace within settlements is not met as the proposal conflicts with (i) of L2(d).

17. In this case, I have borne in mind the benefits from having additional living space in the house and the past economic benefits flowing from construction investment. I have taken into account the personal circumstances relating to a family member and the extent to which the additional space would benefit them and other family members. Pursuant to the public sector equality duty and the need to recognise protected characteristics such as age and disability, I have factored these favourable considerations into the planning balance. However, taken cumulatively the benefits of the proposal would be substantially outweighed by the adverse impacts I have identified above, when assessed against the national decision-making policies.

Conclusion

18. I have concluded that a split decision is appropriate in this case because the rear dormer structure and hip-to-gable loft conversion is an element of the development that clearly functions separately from, and is not physically linked to, or dependant on, the side extension or the front porch extension.

19. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front porch extension and the side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear dormer structure and hip-to-gable roof extension.

Megan Thomas KC

INSPECTOR