

		Actions
	Public Forum There were no members of the public in attendance at this meeting.	
1	Apologies Cllr S Dunford and B Freshwater	
2	Declaration of Interest Cllr D Wheeler declared an interest; he is Chair of the Development Control Management Committee at FoDDC and would therefore not be providing comments on applications but would advise on procedural matters. Cllr Yeates declared his role as a Heritage Expert .	
3	Minutes of the last meeting The minutes from the meeting held on 2 nd September 2025 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by Cllr Wheeler.	
4a	<u>4a) Bream Ward</u> <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> P0966/25/FUL - Spar High Street Bream Erection of a single storey rear extension and widened front entrance doors. Revised plans/information have been submitted in respect of the above Planning Application you were recently consulted upon. – 24.09.25 West Dean Parish Council have no observations P0964/25/LBC - Ellwood Lodge , Little Drybrook, Clements End, Coleford. <i>Recorded as Sling & Ellwood Ward on the Agenda</i> Listed Building Consent to replace tiles and repairs to part of the roof and dormer window. – 01.10.25 West Dean Parish Council have no observation	Submitted on FoDDC portal 17.09.25 Submitted on FoDDC portal 17.09.25

4b	<u>4b) Berry Hill Ward</u> <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>	
4c	<u>4c) Christchurch Ward</u> <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> P0983/25/FUL - Vanstone Cottage, Hillersland Lane, Shortstanding, Coleford. Erection of double storey side extension. – 23.09.25 West Dean Parish Council have no observations P1081/25/FUL - Land Adjacent Bridewell Farm, Woodland Road, Christchurch, Coleford. Erection of a single self-build, single-storey dwelling – 01.10.25 West Dean Parish Council have no observations but under the CROW Act, section 85 – the site is located in the setting of the Wye Valley National Landscape. The design should be appropriate to its location and the protected status of the landscape; it is similar in appearance to another property within this area.	Submitted on FoDDC portal 17.09.25 Submitted on FoDDC portal 17.09.25
4d	<u>4d) Pillowell Ward</u> <i>Please note that planning applications within the Pillowell Ward must be compliant with the Forest Edge South Neighbourhood Plan.</i> P1390/24/FUL - Jurovan, Yorkley Slade, Yorkley, Gloucestershire. Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 2no. self-build two storey dwellings and associated works – 30.09.25 West Dean Parish Council regret the loss of a Bungalow and would prefer the new dwellings to be single storey, due to the need for such accommodation.	Submitted on FoDDC portal 17.09.25
4e	<u>4e) Sling & Ellwood Ward</u>	

4f	4f) 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 Parkend Club Castlemain Parkend Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) and Condition 6 (BiodiversityMitigation 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 the residential curtilage of plot 1, single storey side extensions to plots 1 and 3, and associated works. Discharge of Condition 8 (coal mining risks) and Condition 11 (land contamination). (revised description). – 29.09.25 West Dean Parish Council note that the access ramp to the pavement has now totally disappeared - a ramp must be installed for disabled access. Also, the roadway shows no drainage at it's lowest point, in fact there are no drains at all on the roadway. Drains need to be in place to prevent pooling and to prevent surface water migrating towards the premises situated to the west. West Dean Parish Council could find no agreed maintenance agreement for the hedge on the west side. A legal agreement needs to be in place that the hedge is cut at least twice a year to allow free pedestrian movement on the footpath. West Dean Parish Council could find no agreement on who maintains the land between the development and the main road nor an agreement of who maintains the access road between the gates and Yorkley Road. West Dean Parish Council note the owner of Le Pens has also objected on the point of no drainage on the land to the east of his property. None is shown on the plans and no mitigation stated to prevent surface water pooling behind his property. West Dean Parish Council note 'out of village bio mitigation', whilst allowable under the new regulations, it was not allowable when the original application was submitted. West Dean Parish Council strongly recommend that the original conditions should not be disregarded and that enforcement should take place. West Dean Parish Council reiterate all previous comments made as listed below. <u>Submitted February 25</u> Condition 6: Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy. That this application has been given so many extensions of time over the past 2 years It 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.	Submitted via e-mail to FoDDC 17.09.25

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 estate 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 hedge (as per drawing LAPC M01) any misalignment of the hedge/fence along with the proposed trees or will be detrimental to the regular users of the path. It is to be noted that the Deeds of adjacent houses place a requirement of the owners to maintain a 10-foot-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.
- 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. This now proposed and much reduced corridor does not meet the original aims of providing a wildlife link between the village environs and the woodland and grassland bordering the site and does 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. WDPC fully support the officers of Forest of Dean District Council in ensuring this has been met and will support their recommendations.

Submitted April 25

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 thoroughway.

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. 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. <u>Further Comment Submitted – April 25</u> West Dean Parish Council would like to add these further comments to our last submission. We are disappointed by the continual amendments being allowed to be presented by the applicant. We appreciate that late submissions are part of the process, but it makes it very difficult to respond properly when the goal posts keep changing. Regarding the additional planting of trees outside the site boundary - on land which ownership is questioned - does not mitigate for the loss of the wildlife protection that was permissioned in the original planning approval. This constant attempt to justify the actions taken during construction through such poor mitigation measures cannot be supported and our objections in our submission of the 4th April 2025 still stand. However, if the landowner is happy for trees to be planted and maintained in these locations we would welcome the additional screening these would eventually provide.	
5	Chairs Items - No Chairs Items at this meeting	
6	Next meeting: 5.00pm, Tuesday 7th October 2025 – West Dean Centre, Bream	