

Planning App. No/Appeal No: 2019/2601 **Team:** DC - South **Method:** WR
Decision Date: 02/06/2020 **Planning Inspectorate Decision:** ALLOWED
Appeal Site: 1 The Rythe Copsem Lane Esher Surrey KT10 9HL
Appeal Development: Front pergola.

Non Determination? { N } **Officer Recommendation** { REF } **Delegated Decision** { REF } **Sub Committee Decision** { } **PLC Decision** { } **Full Council Decision** { }
Issues { The main issue is the effect of the oak pergola on the character and appearance of the area } **Inspector's Name:** { Robin Buchanan BA(Hons) MRTPI }
Costs Claimed { N } **Costs Awarded** { }
Monitoring Comments { The development would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area }

Planning App. No/Appeal No: 2019/2841 **Team:** DC - East **Method:** WR
Decision Date: 03/06/2020 **Planning Inspectorate Decision:** ALLOWED
Appeal Site: 53 Effingham Road Long Ditton Surbiton KT6 5LA
Appeal Development: Single-storey rear/side extension following partial demolition of existing dwelling and removal of chimney stack.

Non Determination? { N } **Officer Recommendation** { REF } **Delegated Decision** { REF } **Sub Committee Decision** { } **PLC Decision** { } **Full Council Decision** { }
Issues { The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 55 Effingham Road, with particular regard to light and outlook. } **Inspector's Name:** { O S Woodwards BA(Hons.) MA MRTPI }
Costs Claimed { N } **Costs Awarded** { }
Monitoring Comments { The proposal would not likely unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 55 in terms of loss of sunlight or daylight, and would not unacceptably worsen their outlook }

Planning App. No/Appeal No: 2019/0926 **Team:** DC - South **Method:** WR
Decision Date: 11/06/2020 **Planning Inspectorate Decision:** DISMISSED
Appeal Site: O/s Heath South Car Park Brooklands Road Weybridge Surrey KT13 0UN
Appeal Development: Prior Notification Telecom: 15m high monopole supporting 2 antennas and dishes, 3 equipment cabinets and ancillary works.

Non Determination? { N } **Officer Recommendation** { REF } **Delegated Decision** { REF } **Sub Committee Decision** { } **PLC Decision** { } **Full Council Decision** { }
Issues { The main issue is the effect of the siting and appearance of the proposed telecommunications equipment upon the character and appearance of the area. } **Inspector's Name:** { Paul T Hocking BA MSc MRTPI }
Costs Claimed { N } **Costs Awarded** { }
Monitoring Comments { The siting and appearance of the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area }