

Development and Planning Applications Committee

14TH November 2024

Supplementary Agenda

Modifications Sheet.

ITEM 5 10 Pitt Crescent

Amendment to para 7.3.3

The mass of the outbuilding has resulted in a change in outlook for neighbouring properties, notably no. 12 which lies adjacent to the west. However, outbuildings are common feature in the area and the scale the building would not be unduly visually intrusive when seen from neighbouring gardens or windows. Officers acknowledge there is some increased intervisibility between the patio doors of the outbuilding and rear windows of no. 6 and no. 12 Pitt Crescent. There could also be a perceived sense of activity associated with the outbuilding given it would be ancillary to the main dwellinghouse rather than incidental. As the building would contain principle living accommodation there could potentially be more movement between the outbuilding and the main dwellinghouse. However, these impacts are not considered harmful. In planning terms it's generally accepted that the ancillary use of an outbuilding in garden contexts like this do not result in harmful impacts on neighbouring amenity in terms of noise and privacy. Overlooking is mitigated to an acceptable degree by boundary fencing. Furthermore Officers note there are curtains installed in the outbuilding. A recent appeal at no 38 Tudor Drive supports this judgement for which the inspector concluded an ancillary outbuilding had an acceptable impact on neighbours in similar site circumstances (see planning appeal for 21/P0279).

ITEM 5 and 6 (8 Pitt Crescent, and 10 Pitt Crescent)

To be inserted on page 4 of the officer report for both items

A representation was received from Councillor Jill Hall objecting to the proposed development. The objection is set out in full below:

I would like to state my opposition to this application for garden buildings to the rear of nos 8 & 10 Pitt Crescent. These buildings constitute overdevelopment and are far too big for the garden plots in which they are located. They were built as garden offices but have been designed, built and utilised as selfcontained living accommodation in breach of planning rules. The houses in Pitt Crescent were designed as family homes and some have had kitchen extensions and loft extensions. There is rarely an objection to this as families grow and require more space. Property in Wimbledon is so expensive it is much more cost

effective to extend rather than move. However, extensions should be proportionate to the original building and should not extend the property beyond what is reasonable. I have no objection to small garden buildings provided they conform with planning law and are used for the purpose for which they were built. However, if a garden building fills a garden, it damages the amenity of the property and has a poor effect on the environment. Together with paved gardens this can lead to more problems with flooding. Research has shown that people need green space to enable them to breathe freely and that the sight of green areas can lift people's spirits and can help improve mental health. It should be a principle that the Council upholds to preserve green spaces wherever possible, and this includes front and back gardens. Unfortunately, if property owners decide to overdevelop a single property it can affect the amenity of that property and this may lead to it changing the character of the area, making it too heavily developed. We all benefit from having a green space to relax in and the importance of gardens should not be overlooked. The over-development of properties like this can set a precedent and more homeowners may be tempted to similarly over-develop their homes and add an oversized building to their garden. We need to avoid this level of over-development and loss of amenity. We must stop this setting a precedent for more unacceptably large buildings being built in back gardens.