



WEST DEAN PARISH COUNCIL

Jo Miles
Clerk to the Council

Phil Holland
Deputy Clerk

Parish Office
West Dean Centre
High Street
Bream
Glos.
GL15 6JW

Tel. Parish Office: 01594 564484 (9.00am – 4.00pm)

Email: admin@westdeanpc.org.uk

Web site: www.westdeanpc.org.uk

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Date of Meeting: 1st April 2025

Held At: 17:00 in the West Dean Centre

Present: Cllrs S Dunford & S Yeates

Clerks: J Miles & P Holland

		Actions
	Public Forum A member of the public was in attendance to discuss their concerns over application P0048/23/FUL – Land adjacent to Parkend Club (Lion Row) and they wished to bring their thoughts and concerns to the attention of the planning committee.	
1	Apologies Cllrs S Lewis, B Evans & A Grant	
2	Declaration of Interest Cllr Yeates declared his role as a Heritage Expert.	
3	Minutes of the last meeting These were held over to the next meeting as neither Cllr Dunford nor Yeates had attended the meeting of 18 th March 2025	
4a	4a) Bream Ward <i>Please note that for Bream planning applications the Parish Council policy is that for new developments consisting of two or more dwellings, a cattle (sheep) grid must be provided.</i> P0324/25/FUL – 15 Puzzle Close, Bream, Lydney – 14/4/25 <i>Variation of Condition 02 (approved plans) of planning permission P2132/20/FUL to allow for amendments to the roofline (retrospective)</i> West Dean Parish Council have no observations	Comment sent to FODDC 04/04/2025
4b	4b) Berry Hill Ward <i>Please note that planning applications for the Berry Hill and Christchurch wards must be compliant with the Neighbourhood Development Plan for the area.</i> P0327/25/FUL – 33 Park Road, Berry Hill, Coleford – 14/4/25	

	<i>Erection of a single storey front extension to provide ground floor sleeping accommodation for resident wheelchair user.</i> West Dean Parish Council are concerned that the consistency of the building line may be disrupted by this proposal and should be considered carefully. It is possible that the front extension will overshadow windows at the front of the neighbouring property reducing the availability of sunlight.	Comment sent to FODDC 04/04/2025
4c	Christchurch Ward <i>Please note that planning applications for the Berry Hill and Christchurch wards must be compliant with the Neighbourhood Development Plan for the area.</i>	
4d	Pillowell Ward <i>Please note that planning applications within the Pillowell Ward must be compliant with the Forest Edge South Neighbourhood Plan.</i> P0290/25/FUL – Brooklyn, Church Walk, Viney Hill – 9/4/25 <i>Erection of single and two storey extensions, with internal alterations to existing detached property.</i> West Dean Parish Council have no observations	Comment sent to FODDC 04/04/2025
4f	Sling & Ellwood Ward	
4g	Parkend Ward <i>Please note that planning applications within the Parkend Ward must be compliant with the Forest Edge South Neighbourhood Plan.</i> P0048/23/FUL – Land adjacent to Parkend Club, Castlemain, Parkend – 7/4/25 <i>Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) and Condition 6 (Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy) of planning permission P0983/20/FUL including the provision of offsite mitigation and enhancements. Regularisation of the development as built including amendments to fenestration, the alignment of the access road, boundary treatments, the red line, the extension of residential curtilage of plot 1, single storey extensions to plots 1 and 3, and associated works. Discharge of Condition 8 (coal mining risks) and Condition 11 (land contamination). (revised description).</i> P0048/23/FUL: Land Adjacent Parkend Club Castlemain Parkend Lydney Gloucestershire GL15 4JZ (Lion Row, Parkend.) Variance of Condition 2 and 6, Regularisation of the development as built including fenestration, alignment of access road, boundary treatments, the red line, extension of residential curtilage and single storey extensions to plots 1 and 3. Discharge of Conditions 8 and 11. West Dean Parish Council submit the following comments on this application. Variance of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) That this application has been given so many extensions of time over the past 2 years is a measure of the applicant's disregard of their obligations to meet all the requirements of the original planning approval (P0983/20/FUL) and their understanding of the nature of the village of Parkend in its Forest setting. The roughshod way in which the developer and his clients have ignored the concerns	

	of many residents and the concerns registered by the Parish Council since the beginning of this project is deplorable. Whilst we have to accept the Planning Decision was originally given the site but it should have been developed in accordance with those plans. On-site necessity to overcome unforeseen problems should have been correctly dealt with by variation of the permission – but at the same time enforcement action should have been taken at the correct time to prevent the blatant disregard of the planning system we have seen in this development. This ‘catch all’ Variation, if passed, lets the Developer have a total exemption from the conditions rightfully placed upon him in the initial approval. This we consider unacceptable. Under the ‘Regularisation Section’ we comment as follows: Fenestration – No comment Alignment of the Access Road - we appreciate the difficulties presented by the topography but have ongoing concerns over the final design and its safety. That Highways will not adopt the road as it seems not to comply with their standards raises questions as to the safety of the crossing as delineated by the angled drop kerbs and the poor splay. We also object to the fact that bollards have been placed on the original access path near the pavement at the village end which restricts the entry onto this throughway. Boundary Treatments – We object to the fencing now erected. It does not meet the original ecological aims of the conditioned planning permission, it is incorrectly erected (the norm being for the supporting posts and rails to be on the owner’s side), The many changed plans concerning hedges – now relegated to cosmetic purposes only does not meet the planning approval as granted . The original plan had fencing and hedging suitable to provide safe passage for wildlife and so this must be considered along with Condition 6. The Red Line and the extension of residential curtilage – there is confusion over this which needs a formal clarification. On property deeds the red line normally denotes ownership. However, with the taking of the triangle of land into Plot 1 with its fencing now in place, this parcel of land – which we believe to be Forest Waste and therefore Crown Property - will be to all intents and purposes confusingly considered to be part of the amenity land for Plot 1. The 1834 Park End Walk Encroachment Map (F17/133) shows much of this area as part of a large encroachment marked in green to the east of Parkend Iron Works. Green indicates that the land was released from the Forest Estates of the Crown for specific purposes. This covers the land to the south and to the north and west of the later British Lion Public House. The trackway that ran to Parkend club is marked on this map as a tram or railway line. The land attached to the British Lion Public House first occurs on the 1859 West Dean Township Map (F17/155), as a piece of land set within this area of land attached to Parkend Iron Works. The south and east boundaries are consistent with those boundaries that survive now. The boundaries to the north and west have seen considerable movement. The lower part of the lane or track to the west occurs on the 1859 map as part of a tram or railway line associated with Parkend Iron Works. The deeds on which the path is mentioned must have some former association with Parkend Iron Works, and it may still be in their keeping suggesting encroachment of another property by the developer. The OS maps of c. 1880, c. 1900, c. 1922 and c. 1947 all indicate that the land of the British Lion Public House and Lion Row remain the same. The area of land on which the environmental corridor lay is indicated as Forest Meend, and that Iron Works property has largely been resorted to the Forestry. The boundary is moved after 1950, on what grounds this is not determined. The triangle of land is not part of	
--	--	--

the developers land but must be forestry land, and it is possible that the north extension if done without Royal or Forestry consent is encroached Crown Land. We therefore object to this until it can be proved that the land so delineated does actually belong to the Developer and so able to be transferred to the owners of Plot 1. The single storey extensions to Plots 1 and 3 – These should have been varied properly before construction not as a retrospective. Condition 6: Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy. The proposal as submitted in this application cannot be supported by WDPC for the following reasons: 1) The pathway bordering the site is in daily use under the Forest’s ‘right to roam’ privileges linking the Woodland Rd and Woodland Rise housing area to the village centre as well as providing a safe route to school. Any further restriction on the width of this lane adjacent to the site by planting a cosmetic hedge (as per drg LAPC M01 (revised again)) should be conditioned to place the onus on the owners of the houses to keep it in good order. It is to be noted that the Deeds of houses onto the laneway place a requirement of the owners to maintain a 10ft wide pathway. The erection of the close boarded fencing (instead of that detailed in the original permission), in the wrong orientation, along with the electrical cabling it’s supporting has already reduced this width. This also has a link to Condition 6. 2) The wildlife corridor envisaged by the original permission has been ignored by the developers in the actual construction of these houses and their gardens. The latest drawing with its fence and cosmetic hedging totally ignores the important link that should have been maintained on the borders of this site to meet original aims of providing a wildlife link between the village environs and the woodland and grassland bordering the site. These latest proposals do nothing to enhance the connections in the village in its Forest setting. 3) Mitigation by providing a biodiversity area (as drawing T.1181.51A), albeit larger, in another village is not an acceptable solution. It will not replace the habitat loss in the village, it does not meet the requirements of the original Planning Permission and there will be no benefit for Parkend arising from such mitigation. WDPC object to the variance of Condition 6 submitted by this application. We request that enforcement action to be taken to return the works as constructed to that specified by the original Permission. Condition 8: Coal Mining Risks: WDPC have no comments on this mitigation action. Condition 11: Land Contamination: We trust that the officers of the Forest of Dean District Council are satisfied that the applicant has met all the legal requirements for the decontamination, transport and disposal of asbestos and any other contaminants from the site. This is especially true for Plot 2 where the topsoil was not removed, as can be seen in the Land Contamination Report Paragraph 2 on page 3 where it states that the soil was not removed because No2 didn’t want to have it done, but was instead covered by artificial grass and a concrete base to the summer house.	Comment sent to FODDC 04/04/2025 Request to call this application in to be sent to District Cllrs Llewellyn and Bruce
---	---

	WDPC fully support the officers of Forest of Dean District Council in ensuring all requirements for safe decontamination have been followed and will support their recommendations. P0264/25/FUL – Forest of Dean Cycle Centre, Cannop, Coleford – 8/4/25 <i>Erection of new steel frame structure to serve as bike workshop and retail unit with associated works.</i> West Dean Parish Council have no observations	Comment sent to FODDC 04/04/2025
5	Chairs Items Cllr Yeates had been made aware of several suspected Planning Breaches at Joyford which he brought to the Committees attention. • Joyford Barn – allowed on appeal is being used as an industrial unit. • Another barn with enforcement notice on – permitted as Air B&B may have a permanent tenant. • Katswell – which has enforcement notice on – Old hedge line taken down – this should have been protected. Item 25033.1i from Full Council :- The FoDDC planning departments implementation of legislation such as the CROW Act 2000, Hedgerow Regulations 1997 etc. and how the Parish Council can ensure that these legislative and regulatory implements are consistently applied during the planning process was discussed briefly. Which was passed to the Planning Committee to investigate was discussed. The Committee propose that Council be asked to submit the following FOI request:- West Dean Parish Council has spent a considerable length of time investigating the impact of Heritage and Bio-Diversity regulations and their implications of work within the Statutory Forest and beyond. We do have concerns that the requirements of the Acts are not being universally applied, therefore we would like to submit the following Freedom of Information Request:- West Dean Parish Council would like clarification on which Heritage and Bio-Diversity legislations Forest of Dean District Council Planning are implementing. Can FODDC provide a comprehensive list of Heritage and Bio-Diversity Legislation you use and also a list of planning applications which have taken due consideration of these Acts in the last 10 years.	Cllr Yeates will try to clarify tenancy. PH to look at Planning approvals for Katswell to see if permission was given to remove the hedge. Proposal to go to FC in April for FOI Request.
6	Next meeting: 5.00 pm, Tuesday 15th April 2025 - West Dean Centre, Bream.	