



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3371056

20 Frizlands Lane, Dagenham RM10 7YH

- 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 Narinder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 25/00537/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “demolish existing out building and construct a 2 storey side extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of a part two storey part single storey side extension at 20 Frizlands Lane, Dagenham RM10 7YH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00537/HSE, and the plans submitted with it, 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 nos 1152_PL01 Location and Block Plan, 1152_PL04 Proposed Floor Plans and 1152_PL05 Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises the demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of a part two storey part single storey side extension. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.
3. The Council does not object to the demolition of the existing outbuilding. Based on the plans before me and my observations on site, I have no reason to disagree with those findings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Frizlands Lane and Sedgemoor Drive. The immediate surroundings of the appeal site comprise mainly 2 storey dwellings, with a mixture of semi-detached and terraced properties. There is a wide variety of styles present in the surrounding streets with limited uniformity.
6. The Council raises concerns regarding the impact the proposed extension would have on the existing symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. However, I observed on site that changes including the addition of an enclosed porch at the appeal site and changes to window styles have already diminished the overall symmetrical appearance.
7. Although the proposed extension would represent a sizeable addition to the existing dwelling, its design is in line with the guidance provided within section 5.4.3 of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted 2012) in that the first floor is set back from the main front wall of the house. As a result of this, it would appear subservient to the existing dwelling.
8. The use of materials to match the existing building and a roofline which is of the same style as that of the existing building would result in the extension reflecting the design and character of the host dwelling.
9. The Council outline that extensions of a scale and size comparable to the proposal are not a common feature in the immediate area and that, consequently, the extension would not sit comfortably with the existing pattern of development. In response, the appellant has pointed to several examples of change in the local area, including extensions which are suggested to be of a comparable nature. I have not been provided with full details of these cases and, in any event, each proposal will have been determined based on its own individual circumstances, as I have done with this appeal. Nevertheless, I observed on site that a number of nearby properties have been altered, including through side extensions. These are broadly comparable to the appeal proposal.
10. I accept that the proposed extension would be visible from public vantage points due to the appeal site's location at the junction of Frizlands Lane and Sedgemoor Drive. However, when viewed alongside buildings on Frizlands Lane, the proposal would be seen in the context of the variety of existing roof forms and buildings. These are set back from the road by varying distances. This results in a staggered pattern of development. As such, the proposed extension would not appear incongruous in the street scene.
11. Taking account of the above, I conclude that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. The proposed extension would therefore accord with the relevant provisions of Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD5 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Local Plan 2037 and Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021. Among other matters, these policies seek extensions which are sympathetic and subordinate to the design of original dwelling with regards to scale, form, materials and detailing, relate to their local context and avoid harm to local character.

Conditions

12. To meet legislative requirements, I have imposed a condition to address the period for commencement. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans is also necessary for reasons of certainty. A further condition requiring the materials to match those of the existing building is necessary, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR