



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2026

by **F Leung BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/25/3376259

9 Baldwin Crescent, Guildford, Surrey GU4 7XW

- 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 Naser Pashazadeh against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/00456.
 - The development proposed is described on the application as “loft conversion”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 a roof enlargement with rear dormer window including a Juliette balcony and rooflights on the front and rear roof slopes. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I. I also note that the appellant used this description of development on their appeal form.
3. The application form indicates that the development has already been carried out. During my site visit I saw that a dormer extension has been erected. However, the development does not appear to correspond fully with the submitted plans. For clarity, my assessment is based on the plans before me, rather than what has been constructed to date. Any works carried out not in accordance with those plans would be a matter between the Council and appellant.
4. It has been suggested that, had permitted development rights for the existing house not been removed by a condition on the original permission, the rear dormer might have constituted permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (the GPDO). The appellant also challenges the appropriateness of that condition. However, I have only limited information on the original permission before me, and it is not within my remit to determine whether alterations or extensions would comply with the GPDO, or to reassess the original planning consent for the wider development. I have determined the appeal based on the plans before me.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is located within a residential cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac consists predominantly of two-storey detached houses of complementary design, featuring consistent dark timber-style detailing set against red and buff brickwork, and casement windows with dark-coloured frames and leaded-glass patterns. The roof forms are, generally, either hipped or gabled, and there are no other visible front or rear dormer windows. The properties in this context display consistency in materials and style.
7. The dormer extension sits only marginally below the ridge line of the original rear roofs slope and extends across almost the full width of the property. Its large, flat-roofed box form, which is highly visible from within the cul-de-sac and from the footpath to the rear, dominates the rear roof slope, substantially altering the roofline and creating a bulky, top-heavy appearance. Moreover, the differing window style, sizes and placement within the dormer extension, particularly the Juliette balcony, would appear discordant.
8. The development fails to appropriately reflect the proportions of the host building and is at odds with the prevailing character of the surrounding area, in which properties generally do not feature roof level additions. I am not of the view that weathering over time would minimise its overall impact.
9. In making my decision, I have had regard to the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (the SPD). Regarding dormer roof extensions, the SPD states that their size and design should be sympathetic to the existing and neighbouring properties. For the reasons set out above, I find that the development fails to accord with a number of the SPD's general principles, including avoiding flat roofs, respecting the roof pitch and window proportions, and maintaining subservience.
10. Overall, I conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies H4 and D4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2023), and Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034, which together require that the design, scale and massing of new development relates well to and respects the appearance and character of existing and adjacent buildings and the wider area.

Other Matters

11. It has been put to me that the development causes less harm than a previously approved (but unbuilt) upward and rear extension to the host building. However, that scheme involved a different form of extension, and the circumstances of that case are not directly comparable to those before me.
12. I understand that the appellant's intention is to provide additional living space within the roof space of existing property. However, this private benefit does not outweigh the harm identified.
13. The Council has raised no objection regarding the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in respect of outlook and privacy, and I see no basis on the evidence before me to reach a different conclusion. I acknowledge that the site is not located within a conservation area or within the setting of listed building.

Nevertheless, the lack of harm in these respects is effectively neutral in my determination of the appeal and do not weigh in its favour. I also note the frustration of the appellant in respect of delays. This matter has not altered my conclusion on the main issue, relating to character and appearance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and that there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

F Leung

INSPECTOR