

MINUTES  
OF A MEETING OF THE  
**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

held on 11 March 2025

Present:

Cllr L Lyons (Chair)  
Cllr G Cosnahan (Vice-Chair)

Cllr R Leach	Cllr J Pearce
Cllr C Martin	Cllr T Spenser
Cllr S Mukherjee	Cllr M Sullivan

Also Present: Councillor Steve Greentree

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Javaid, Jordan and Mukherjee.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

**3. MINUTES**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 11 February 2025 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

**4. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of Urgent Business.

**5. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS**

The Committee received a report on the planning appeals lodged and the appeal decisions.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

## 6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee determined the following applications subject to the conditions, informatives, reasons for refusal or authorisation of enforcement action which appear in the published report to the Committee or as detailed in these minutes.

### 6a. 2024/0685 21 Oak Tree Road, Knaphill

The Committee considered a retrospective application for variation of conditions 1 (approved plans), 6 (soft Landscaping), 7 (hard landscaping) and 8 (EV charging point) of planning permission (PLAN/2023/0792 (retrospective variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of PLAN/2022/057 (demolition of existing dwelling and erection dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling) to increase the height of the single story rear element, two-storey from projection and ridge height and alterations of fenestration. Alterations to landscaping and EV charger and addition of solar panels.

The chair reminds members to evaluate the application on its own merits, and evaluate the application as if it was not retrospective.

Councillor Greentree, the Ward Councillor, attended the meeting and provided members with a brief update on the history of the application. He noted that in 2022, the owner of No. 21 demolished the semi-detached house without any planning permission. Subsequently, a retrospective application for a new development was submitted and approved in 2023. The approved plans overstated the depth of the rear extension on No. 19 as 1.6m and failed the 45-degree test regarding the horizontal plane. Councillor Greentree expressed disappointment regarding the previous application, stating that there was neither full nor partial compliance and in some cases enforcement actions had been ignored. He also highlighted that the new development differed from the initially approved plans, stating that the developer showed “disregard” to the planning process.

A question was raised regarding the outstanding CIL payment. James Rodger explained that he was unsure of the reason and would follow up with the necessary departments to address this.

Following a query regarding the 45-degree test, the planning officer explained that the single-story side/rear element would fail the test in plan form but pass in elevation. The SPD states that *a significant loss of daylight will occur if the centre of the affected window (or a point 1.6m above the ground for floor-to-ceiling windows/patio doors) lies within a zone measured at 45-degrees in both plan and elevation*. The proposal is therefore not considered to result in a significant harmful loss of light impact to No. 19 and is acceptable in this regard. The proposal passed this test in both plan and elevation concerning No. 23 Oak Tree Road.

Following a query James Rodger explained to the committee that the validation of the planning application was delayed because officers ensured that the submitted plans were as accurate as possible. Minor inaccuracies, such as annotations on orientation, did not directly affect the determination of the planning application. He emphasised that there were nine planning conditions with strict timelines in place if the application was approved and reassured members that officers would manage these effectively.

In accordance with the Standing Order set out in the Constitution, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the recommendation to approve the application. The votes for and against approval of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllr L Lyons (The Chairman)

TOTAL: 1

Against: Cllrs M Sullivan, J Pearce and G Cosnahan.

TOTAL: 3

Present but not voting: Cllrs R Leach, C Martin and T Spenser

TOTAL: 3

The application was therefore not approved.

The Chair proposed and Vice Chair seconded a motion for enforcement action to be taken requiring the applicant to revert back to the previously approved plans. This was then voted upon and unanimously agreed.

The Chairman then started to move to the next item, however, Mr Rodger then advised the Chairman that the committee would also need to provide reason(s) for refusal for the planning application.

Mr Rodger then drew the Committees attention to the reasons the previous application on the site was refused, in particular the reason concerning the rear addition and its size and scale. Cllr Lyons stated he thought this was a reasonable approach, he asked the Committee if they agreed, which they did.

**[POST MEETING NOTE: Following the meeting a procedural irregularity was identified, and it was agreed that the application would be addressed by the Planning Committee at the meeting on 15 April 2025.]**

**6b. 2023/0594 65 Newsham Road, Woking**

The Committee considered a retrospective planning application for the erection of 2.4m high masonry boundary wall and single storey lean-to side extension.

Councillor Sullivan, the Ward Councillor, visited the site and confirmed that there was no reason to refuse the application. He believed that the proposal did not adversely affect the amenities of the neighbours, including considerations of light loss, overlooking, and overbearing impacts and therefore was in support of the application.

James Rodger, Head of Planning explained that the new boundary wall was constructed with concrete and had slightly encroached on the adjoining footpath. The current appearance of the boundary wall was considered completely out of keeping with the street scene and appearance of many parts of the Goldsworth Park estate. Furthermore, the proposed use of white render on the boundary wall would exacerbate the visual harm.

Following a query raised on the ownership of land adjacent to the wall, it was uncertain as to whether or not the land was owned by Woking Borough Council or Surrey County Council.

In accordance with the Standing Order set out in the Constitution, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the recommendation to refuse the application. The votes for and against refusal of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs R Leach, D Jordan, L Lyons (Chairman), G Cosnahan,  
J Pearce, C Martin and T Spenser

TOTAL: 7

Against: Cllr M Sullivan

TOTAL: 1

Present but not voting: None

TOTAL: 0

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be REFUSED and enforcement notice be issued.

**6c. 2024/0831 9 Lakeside Close, St Johns**

A planning application for the proposal for the erection of a single storey front extension was considered by the committee.

This application could not be considered under delegated powers as the application was a Council employee.

RESOLVED

That the planning application be APPROVED subject to conditions.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and ended at 7.47 pm

Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_