

The Round Hill Society

21 January 2026

Dear B&H Planning officers.

Having reviewed the revised plans, the Society maintains its objection to the creation of a window opening within an existing niche and the proposed rear dormer additions at the above property on the grounds that they would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Round Hill Conservation Area and conflict with the consistent application of adopted planning policy.

Revisions

We consider it irregular that, before the consultation period has elapsed and before all responses have been fully considered, the case officer has sought revisions to the scheme and to the description of development.

The representative of the Society that sits on the Conservation Area advisory Group has indicated he will take this back to the group because the propose niche to window conversion was not clearly indicated and the CAG is likely to object to this element.

Rear Dormers

Rear dormer additions within the Round Hill Conservation Area have generally been resisted in recent planning decisions unless there is a clearly established local pattern to justify such development. In this specific subsection of the terrace, no such pattern exists. While one or two rear dormers may be found elsewhere along the longer terrace, there are none within this coherent group of buildings. Moreover, several recent proposals for rear dormers in comparable circumstances have been refused, demonstrating a consistent and established policy approach to the protection of the roofscape in this area.

The roofscape of this part of Round Hill remains notably intact, and it is clear that policy has been applied consistently to resist rear dormers in order to preserve this uniformity and protect the wider views towards the conservation area specifically highlighted in the adopted conservation area statement. Any change to this approach would represent a material departure from established decision-making and should therefore be a matter for the Planning Committee, rather than an individual case officer assessing an application in isolation.

In this context, the preferred approach would be the installation of conservation-style rooflights to the rear. Such an intervention would respect the existing roof form, preserve the consistency of the terrace, and avoid harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

By contrast, the proposed double rear dormer arrangement would result in a significant alteration to the roof slope and massing, disrupting an otherwise consistent roofscape and risking the establishment of an unwelcome precedent for similar interventions along this terrace. Once introduced, such changes would be difficult to resist elsewhere, leading to cumulative harm.

Even if rear dormers were considered acceptable in principle, the proposals as shown appear oversized and bunched together so that in oblique views they will practically mask the entire rear roof plane.

The introduction of rear dormers would also have wider visual consequences. Individually and cumulatively, such additions would be visible in longer-distance views from surrounding elevated locations, including Bear Road and Racecourse Hill. These elevated views are specifically identified in the Round Hill Conservation Area Appraisal as sensitive and as making a positive contribution to the area's character. The proposals would detract from these views by interrupting the established roofscape and undermining the appreciation of the conservation area's distinctive form.

Introduction of a new window to the front elevation

The "as existing" drawings have not been amended to accurately reflect the presence of the existing blind window. While the revised proposed drawings show the cill and blocked features retained, this simply corrects inaccuracies in the original submission. Such corrections should not be regarded as an improvement to the scheme.

The fundamental objection remains unchanged. The introduction of a new window would disrupt the visual balance and symmetry of this coherent group of four houses, causing harm to the character and appearance of the terrace. On this basis, the proposal should be refused.

It is also notable that the additional window is not required to provide adequate daylight, as the room in question is already very well lit by the existing bay window.