

APP/14/00632 - 4 Marina Close, Emsworth

I note this proposal has been the subject of a pre-application enquiry GEN/13/01126. I had no input to this but note the contents.

The current buildings are of no architectural distinction. They comprise the main two storey terrace running parallel to the shoreline with modest two storey flat roofed front projections to accommodate the first floor bathroom. This arrangement is common to all the properties in the terrace and provides a degree of punctuation and gentle rhythm to the composition.

- (1) I have no objection to the proposed ground floor infill extension. It will have little impact outside the immediate confines of the site.
- (2) The proposed first floor addition is poorly designed and will have a marked detrimental impact. The flat roofed addition will be the dominant element breaking up the existing distinct rhythmic pattern apparent in the present terrace. The modulation of form which exists is replaced by an incongruous bland addition. This detracts from the character of the current building, wider terrace and conservation area. The applicant was advised the addition was unlikely to be acceptable at pre-app., an assessment I fully endorse. OBJECT.
- (3) The general roofscape is unbroken by dormer windows. The shallow roof slope means practical use of the roofspace requires a roof extension resulting in the large structure illustrated.. I note what was stated at pre-app. There is no practical means of lowering the dormer because of the headroom issue. I find the dormer an unfortunate addition and therefore would not have been so encouraging. If the dormer is accepted a poor precedent will have been set for similar alterations.

Unfortunately, the applicants expectations appear in my opinion to far exceed what can reasonably be obtained within the scope of a well considered appropriate design. The poor design is a direct result of the compromises made to achieve this. I find neither the dormer nor front extension particularly characteristic of the local area and must question the desirability of both in visual terms. If one had to choose, the front extension fails on all counts and merits rejection on this element alone.

As the application stands. OBJECT. Recommend REFUSAL. It fails to meet national or local policy in terms of design. Fails to meet the key test of preserving or enhancing the character of the conservation area.

John Townsend
Conservation Consultant
11/07/14