

## CHAPTER 11 - BREAM

### Policy (R)F.Bream 2 – Restriction on Development

#### Objections

258/52286	Mr Evans
297/52255	Mr Greenway
387/50190	Mr C Jones

#### Issues

- a. Degree of protection required for the Forest Fringe character of the Bream within the Forest Ring of settlements.
- b. Opportunities for sustainable infilling development, having regard to increased housing requirements and the provisions of PPG3.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

21.1 These objections are to the general application of policy (R)F.Bream 2 restricting development in the interest of conserving the spacious character substantial parts of the village. One refers specifically to an Important Open Area [IOA] also protected by policy (R)FBE.7 at Highfield House, Highfield Road.

#### Restriction on Development

- 21.2 On consideration of the Plan as a whole I have reached the conclusion, for reasons set out after policy (R)FBE.1 in Part 1 Chapter 6 of this report, that the Restriction on Development policies are inappropriate and that adequate protection can be accorded to the settlement areas concerned by policy (R)FBE.1 when read in conjunction with the descriptive text for each settlement in Part 2. I therefore recommend below the deletion of policy (R)F.Bream.1.
- 21.3 Objectors refer to the lack of housing allocations in Bream, notwithstanding that it is a substantial settlement with a considerable range of community facilities. I find merit in their argument that the village offers a comparatively sustainable location for small scale new development as an alternative to greenfield sites elsewhere. However the supporting text acknowledges this whilst at the same time referring to the historic development of the settlement in terms of its relationship to the Statutory Forest within the Forest Ring.
- 21.4 In my judgement this explanation sets down an appropriately balanced approach that contemplates small scale new or replacement development in certain circumstances, and thus duly supplements the provisions of policy (R)FBE.1. However, I consider that these provisions apply to all development, not only residential, and this section should be retitled Settlement Character and be moved above the heading Natural Environment. The text should be recast as I recommend below.

#### Important Open Area

21.5 As to the Important Open Area including the paddock at Highfield House, the area subject to objection is a livestock enclosure characteristic of the loose-grained Forest settlement pattern of this part of Bream. It is highly visible from within the village, especially over its frontage to Oakwood Road, whereby it contributes substantially to visual amenity in combination with a Forest Waste area immediately adjacent to the north. In my judgement this contribution, and the positive impact of the IOA as a

whole, would be unacceptably reduced if the land against the road were to be developed. The paddock therefore deserves to retain its IOA status in terms of the modified identifications criteria I recommend in connection with policy (R)FBE.7.

### **Recommendation**

- 21.6 **I recommend that Policy (R)F.Bream 2 be deleted.**
- 21.7 **I recommend that Paragraphs 11.15 and 11.16 be retitled ‘Settlement Character’ and repositioned above the heading ‘Natural Environment’ and modified to a single paragraph as follows:**
- Many areas within the north western and north eastern boundaries of the defined settlement of Bream developed originally from encroachment upon the woodland areas and Forest Waste surrounding much of the village. These developments include a series of blocks of housing set in areas of Forest Waste and coniferous plantation. The established character of the areas of Bream which lie within and adjacent to the forest margin, where large plots are a feature, should remain largely undisturbed. Poor access is also often a feature of these areas. Housing located along Parkend Road justifies inclusion for similar consideration because it shares the features of being an established area in attractive surroundings. The large plot sizes, which are also a characteristic of these dwellings, have the potential for further change; this would prove detrimental if carried out on a piece-meal basis. Any new development, including infilling and replacement buildings and uses, will be required to complement the characteristic open and sporadic pattern of the settlement.**
- 21.8 **I recommend that the Important Open Area designation be retained over the land at Highfield House.**

---

## **Policy (R)F.Bream 3 – Housing Allocation - Bream Woodside**

### **Objections**

61/50435	Mr E W Addis
82/50302	Mr & Mrs L Baker
83/50582	Mr W Baker
95/50629	Mr C Bath
151/50761	Mr D Brough
202/50468	Mr & Mrs D Cornock
206/50517	Mr S & Mrs L Crick
225/50833	Mr & Mrs C W Davison
226/50538	Mrs E Dawe
243/50770	Mr J Edey
259/50461	Mrs B Evans
260/50399	Mr & Mrs D Evans
322/50458	Mr & Mrs S A Harvey
334/53049	Cllr P J Hiett
334/53063	Cllr P J Hiett
336/50610	Mrs K Hoare
341/50462	Mrs W Hook
388/50826	Mrs O Jones
389/50752	Mr C I Jones
404/50491	Mr D A Kear

422/52697	West Dean Parish Council
424/50449	Mrs B Lewis
453/50863	Mrs M Meddings
454/50621	Mr & Mrs G Meek
459/50453	Mr & Mrs D C Miles
461/50472	Mr J J Miles
470/50843	Mr & Mrs P Morgan
477/50476	Miss T L Mountjoy
495/52704	Mr M Norris
525/50438	Mr B L Pickering
526/50442	Mrs S Pickering
550/50470	Mr P Remnant
552/50548	Ms C M Reynolds
556/50353	Mr D Richards
561/50455	Mrs A Robbins
562/50479	Mr & Mrs Roberts
563/50454	Mr J J & Mrs M A Roberts
568/50624	Mr & Mrs R J Ruck
582/50457	Mr M Seabourne
583/50596	Mrs L Seabourne
607/50600	Mrs M Smith
658/50766	Mr A Tolson
665/50460	Mr B J & Mrs S S Turner
667/50474	Mrs S A Tye
675/50466	Mr J Voss
678/50576	Mr A K Dime
680/50488	Mr A R Ward
685/50636	Mr & Mrs M Watkins
689/50855	Ms L Weldon
696/50606	Mrs L Wicks
722/50456	Mrs P Worgan

### Supporting Statements

206/70026	Mr S & Mrs L Crick
422/52696	West Dean Parish Council

### Issues

- a. Effect on the appearance and character of the area.
- b. Local housing requirements.
- c. Access and traffic.
- d. Capacity of community infrastructure.
- e. Disturbance to elderly residents.

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 21.9 Following substantial objection on grounds of access and urbanisation of an open greenfield area, the First Deposit allocation of land at Bream Woodside was deleted in the Revised Deposit version of the Plan. However, there is objection that the Revised Deposit version both omits the original housing allocation and fails to allocate additional land immediately to the east of the First Deposit site for further dwellings. By agreement with the Objector and the Council I therefore consider the whole of the land as Omission site OH11.2 below, taking into account all of the original objections to the First Deposit allocation.

21.10 I conclude there that policy (R)F.Bream 3 should be reinstated but expressly to provide for about 12 dwellings on 0.4ha.

### **Recommendation**

21.11 **I recommend that Policy (R)F.Bream 3 and Paragraph 11.17 be reinstated to provide for about 12 dwellings on 0.4ha.**

## **Policy (R)F.Bream 4 – Employment Allocation – Whitecroft Road**

### **Objections**

41/51103	Countryside Agency
394/70594	Mr & Mrs M J Jones
394/70714	Mr & Mrs M J Jones
414/51675	Forest of Dean Badger patrol
829/70765	Mr B L Fowler
833/70719	Mr & Mrs D Coe
834/70639	Mr B Whittington
834/70716	Mr B Whittington
835/70720	Mr R Smurthwaite
836/70721	Ms L Daniels
837/70677	Clearwell Caves
838/70718	Mr J W Hine
839/70717	Dean Forest Voice

### **Supporting Statement**

288/70289	Gloucestershire County Council
-----------	--------------------------------

### **Issues**

- a. Statutory Forest status.
- b. Visual impact on the landscape.
- c. Badger protection.

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

#### **Background**

21.12 At the Inquiry in January 2003, it was confirmed by the Council that ownership of the entire site had passed to the South West Regional Development Agency (SWRDA). Site clearance had commenced and full planning permission had been granted for the redevelopment of the land south of Whitecroft Road as industrial units. Since the Inquiry closed, eight of the industrial units have been completed there. However, in response to public concern about the proposed demolition of the former pithead baths, the SWRDA as landowner was at the close of the Inquiry continuing to give consideration to whether that building should instead be retained and re-used and had commissioned a feasibility study in that regard. I have no information before me as to the outcome of that study or the present intentions of the SWRDA. The building is still standing at the date of writing but is now vacant.

21.13 The land to the north of Whitecroft Road is stated in paras 11.22-23 also to have planning permission for redevelopment and a Development Brief [LPD4.22] mentions an unimplemented outline permission for workshops granted in September

1998 [4536/C]. There is no information before me as to whether this remains valid and capable of implementation and there is no more up-to-date development brief in LPD35.

### Statutory Forest

- 21.14 Bream has a large population, estimated in 2000 to be 2600. However local employment is relatively scarce and opportunities should be taken to provide more employment in order to reduce the need for village residents to travel long distances to work. As previously-developed land which formerly provided substantial employment and then became dilapidated and derelict, this is in principle a suitable location for such use.
- 21.15 Whether the transfer of ownership to the SWRDA without an exchange of land met the requirements of the Forestry Acts is not a matter for me to determine. Neither am I in a position to determine whether other forest legislation requires the demolition of all former colliery buildings and the return of the land to forestry use, as some objectors claim. My responsibility is to advise on the planning merits of the proposals in the light of the objections which have been submitted. However I have recommended elsewhere in the report that the boundary of the Statutory Forest should be shown on the Proposals Map and Inset Maps. It would be appropriate to refer in the text to the location of the site in the Statutory Forest in the context of the landscape impact of development.
- 21.16 Given the change in circumstances since the publication of the Revised Deposit Plan, including a change of ownership, the grant of planning permission and the substantial completion of redevelopment, the area which accommodates the new industrial units should now certainly be excluded from the allocation [Area A in the Plan]. The remaining Area B comprises the former colliery baths and the site north of Whitecroft Road, which includes the former colliery offices as well as open land.
- 21.17 I appreciate that the former baths are of some local historic interest as a rare surviving relic of large-scale coal mining within the Forest. They are also of some local architectural interest in respect of their modernist style and the use of local materials to make the bricks. They are not now screened from the road by mature trees as para 11.22 suggests and they have a striking presence in their prominent position beside the road on rising ground and backed by woodland. The former colliery offices north of Whitecroft Road are of more limited local historic or architectural interest. However neither building has been judged of listable quality in terms of national architectural or historic interest and they have no legal protection against demolition. Neither could the Local Plan provide such protection. Their future retention or demolition is thus now primarily a matter for the landowner. The retention and re-use of either or both buildings would to my mind be compatible with the character and appearance of their surroundings in the Statutory Forest, having regard to the intertwined local traditions of coal mining and forestry.
- 21.18 The continued allocation of Area B for employment in the Plan would serve little purpose if existing planning permissions were certain to be implemented. However this appears uncertain and I conclude that the allocation should be retained against the possibility that alternative new planning permissions are sought for development. The original use of the colliery baths will not return and a new use will be needed for this building or the former offices if one or both buildings are retained. Policy

(R)F.Bream.4, as currently drafted, would permit classes B1 [light industry/office/research], B2 [general industry] or B8 [storage] uses as an alternative to any lawful use rights which may already subsist on the site. However there may be other uses which would make a similar or greater contribution to local employment and the economy. Thus, before the final wording of the policy is adopted, I would recommend discussion between the Council and the landowner as to their current intentions for the site in the light of their recent studies.

- 21.19 The risk that there would be a legal impediment to the development of the site for employment appears slight. However, if that were the case, the Plan allocates sufficient land for employment use elsewhere to meet the overall needs identified in the Structure Plan. The main implications would be that the site would risk remaining derelict, to the detriment of the local environment, and that local people would continue to have to travel further to work.

#### Landscape

- 21.20 Objection 41/51103 was submitted at the First Deposit stage. I support the Council’s subsequent decision at the Revised Deposit stage to delete the Special Landscape Area designation and I have recommended the strengthening of Policy (R)FNE.2 which concerns the conservation and enhancement of the countryside landscape. At the Revised Deposit stage the Council strengthened the text of para 11.21 with regard to the landscape impact of development. However this appears to apply only to Area A and should be modified to apply to the residual area of the site.

#### Wildlife

- 21.21 A Revised Deposit amendment to Part 1 para 8.65 refers to the protection of badgers as a species and advises that developers will need to employ reputable consultants to provide the necessary specialist advice. In the absence of evidence that badger protection is a particular issue for this site, I do not consider that additional provision needs to be made here.

#### Recommendation

- 21.22 **I recommend that Policy (R)F.Bream 4 be modified to:**

**0.57 hectares of land adjacent to Whitecroft Road will be allocated for development in use classes B1, B2 and B8. Other employment uses of the former pithead buildings that would secure their restoration and would otherwise accord with Plan will also be permitted.**

- 21.23 **I recommend that Paragraphs 11.20 and 11.21 be deleted and that Paragraph 11.22 be modified to:**

**The allocation comprises two parcels of land, one either side of Whitecroft Road. To the south of Whitecroft Road is a vacant former colliery bathhouse stated to have last been used for storage and retail purposes. To the north of Whitecroft Road, the site includes a derelict former colliery office building together with open land bordered on three sides by mature woodland. The fourth side opens onto Whitecroft Road. This part of the site is currently derelict and shows signs of vandalism and fly-tipping. The plan will support proposals for the development of both parcels of land for classes B1, B2, and B8 use. Other uses of the former colliery buildings will also be permitted if these provide employment, would secure the restoration of the buildings, and would not conflict with other**

**policies of the Plan. Development will be required to provide appropriate landscaping along the frontage to Whitecroft Road. The area is within the Statutory Forest and within the Forest Ring of settlements and the development should be designed with regard to the character of the landscape. Careful consideration should be given to improving or enhancing the site and to ensuring that views of the development are mitigated. An electricity sub station is located in the north west corner of the site and should be protected within the development proposals.**

## **Omission Site OH11.1 – Land adjacent to the B4321 [Colliers Beech]**

### **Objection**

475/50615	Mr H Morse
475/50594	Mr H Morse
475/50614	Mr H Morse
475/50609	Mr H Morse

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 21.24 Bream is the sixth largest settlement in the District and benefits from a wide range of facilities and services. However there is relatively little employment in the settlement and many residents must travel to Lydney, Coleford or further afield to work.
- 21.25 The objection site comprises greenfield agricultural land and extends to approximately 1.5ha. The land is not in the same ownership as any agricultural holding but is available for rent for agricultural use. At the Inquiry the owner gave evidence that the agricultural use of the land is hindered by trespass, the dumping of rubbish and damage to fences – all matters which relate to its proximity to residential areas. However these conditions apply to many similar areas on the edge of settlements and would not themselves warrant releasing the land for development.
- 21.26 The land is bounded by residential estate development on two sides to the north east and north west. Additional physical containment is provided by a large individual dwelling to the south and a further individual dwelling across the B4321 to the west. This area of Bream lies outside the Statutory Forest and, unlike other parts of the settlement, it is not characterised by open areas of Forest Waste interposed with other development. The site is clearly visible from the main road, but most views are against a backdrop of housing development. The development of the site would thus not have a seriously adverse impact on the character or appearance of the countryside or landscape setting of the settlement.
- 21.27 The site was contemplated by the previous Local Plan Inspector for allocation in a subsequent plan review. He also drew attention to the potentially beneficial effect if a second access could be provided from the B4321 across the site to the Maypole and Highbury Estates to the rear, improving convenience and emergency access. However intervening land needed to join the roads appears to be in separate ownership from the objection site.
- 21.28 The site is close to an intensive poultry farm to the south east. There has been a history of odour problems associated with that site. However evidence at the Inquiry suggests that these are now better controlled and that the greatest emissions occur on

only a few days a year. Prevailing south-westerly winds would usually carry most emissions away from the area. In the absence of further evidence of serious emission problems, the proximity to the poultry unit would not of itself warrant the continued exclusion of the site from housing development.

- 21.29 Nevertheless this is a large greenfield site which would be capable of accommodating at least 45 dwellings at the minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare endorsed at Part 1 Paragraph 2.40. Its development would significantly increase the number of people travelling out of the village to work elsewhere and these are likely to rely heavily on travel by car. There is no statistical or other evidence to show that the development would be necessary to the continued viability of local shops and services. The need for affordable housing in this part of the District can be met by other development, including that proposed at Lydney. I conclude that development of this site and at this scale is not needed to meet the Plan’s objectives and that the site should not be allocated for housing development or included within the Defined Settlement Boundary.

### **Recommendation**

- 21.30 **I recommend that the Land adjacent to the B4321 [Colliers Beech] be not included in the Defined Settlement Boundary of Bream nor allocated for residential development.**

---

## **Omission Site OH11.2 – Land at Bream Woodside**

### **Objection**

95/50617

Mr C Bath

### **Issues**

- a. Effect on the appearance and character of the area.
- b. Local housing requirements.
- c. Access and traffic.
- d. Capacity of community infrastructure.
- e. Disturbance to elderly residents.

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 21.31 I deal together with the deletion of the First Deposit allocation under policy (R)F.Bream 3 and the omission land to its north east. The original allocation although for 0.9ha appears on Inset Map 11 to have a net development area of about 0.4ha, equivalent to approximately 12 dwellings. The site is relatively contained within fields inside the Defined Settlement Boundary, whereas the omission land comprises part a further 0.4ha of the adjacent field without defined boundaries to the east or south. The whole area is exposed to views from the west.
- 21.32 In my opinion the development of the omission land would form an unwarranted expansion of the settlement into highly visible open countryside with no defensible boundary. This would compromise the characteristic relationship of the settlement with the surrounding area within the Forest Ring, to which I refer also in connection

with policy (R)F.Bream 2 above. I find no overriding justification for residential development in such circumstances.

- 21.33 The development of the original allocation site would not, by comparison, have such an unacceptable impact, with new dwellings seen against a backdrop of existing buildings. Although also elevated and visible, it would be better integrated within the boundary of the settlement. At the same time it would consolidate the edge of the built area over greenfield land. I consider that this too would be unacceptable unless there is a defined need for a specific allocation in Bream and no previously developed or otherwise preferable alternative were available.
- 21.34 Turning briefly to the other issues raised on this site; I have not seen substantial evidence that, even if the whole of the land were developed, there would be undue disturbance to any existing residents or pressure on community infrastructure as a result. I recognise that the land would front both sides of an existing access from the north, and note that access could also be provided from the west. In either event, I am not concerned that any insurmountable traffic problems would arise. My recommendations are therefore based on local character and housing requirements.
- 21.35 Whilst in connection with Chapters 1 and 2 of Part 1 of the Plan I conclude that the overall strategic approach of the Plan is appropriate, I identify a need for some additional allocations in the larger villages.
- 21.36 Bream has experienced a fairly high rate of new housing development in recent years, despite overall restraint, and there remains a significant amount of land in its committed supply. In addition, there is scope for infilling, including over the original Bream Woodside site, under policy (R)F.Bream 4. In the circumstances, and taking into account potential contribution from other omission sites in Bream, I reach the overall conclusion that policy (R)F.Bream 3 should be reinstated to allocate 0.4ha for about 12 dwellings.

### **Recommendation**

- 21.37 **I recommend that Policy (R)F.Bream 3 and Paragraph 11.17 be reinstated to provide for about 12 dwellings on 0.4ha.**

---

## **Omission Sites OH11.3 - Lands at, and adjacent to, the Sawmills**

### **Objections**

95/50627	Mr C Bath
297/52256	Mr Greenway

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 21.38 The objectors have respective interests in a storage and former sawmills site and attached residential land outside but bordering the Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB] north of the western arm of Bream. The sawmills site itself was the subject of a recent appeal that was, unsurprisingly, dismissed on grounds of intrusion into the countryside, being separated from the DSB by the intervening residential land now also the subject of objection. However, the DSB is now properly subject to reassessment on the strength of these objections. It is clear to me that these sites are both undisputedly previously developed, and are contiguous with the established

settlement. The sawmills site is occupied by a derelict building which detracts from the character and appearance of its surroundings. The adjacent residential land is similar to other residential land nearby within the DSB. I consider that together the two sites would form a logical extension to the DSB.

- 21.39 If included within the DSB, the combined site might then be considered for a low density redevelopment that would complement or enhance the local character of the area in accordance with other Plan provisions, particularly policy (R)FH.4 which applies to Bream as whole. However, given the dispersed Forest Fringe nature of the existing development in the area, I do not consider that a specific allocation is appropriate here. In reaching this view, I have regard also to the fact that the sawmills site may be subject to the employment protection provisions of policy (R)FH.4. I note too the planning status of The Tufts to the north, where permission was granted for a permanent dwelling following a long period of temporary residential use. In my opinion though, such further development of The Tufts does not lead to such additional consolidation of built development in the locality as to affect the desirability of specifically allocating the omission lands. Accordingly I propose no more than a simple extension of the DSB.

### Recommendation

- 21.40 **I recommend that the Land at the Sawmills and the Land adjacent to the Sawmills as defined in Document FOD/P6.12 Annexes 6 and 10 be included within the Defined Settlement Boundary of Bream.**

---

## Omission Site OH11.4 – Land adjacent to Bream Court Farm

### Objection

95/50628	Mr C Bath
172/53006	Mr J Chadderton

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 21.41 The objector proposes that land north of the realigned B4321, including an area of playing fields between New Road and High Street, and be taken into the Defined Settlement Boundary to recognise the main road as a defensible boundary and allow development of omission land at Bream Court Farm within it.
- 21.42 However, I share the Council’s view of the land in question as a prominent green wedge, to be appreciated by travellers passing on the B4321 as well as those living in the area. As such it is important to the forest fringe character of Bream as part of the Forest Ring of settlements, notwithstanding the absence of any special landscape designation.
- 21.43 Even though, in connection with Part Chapters 1 and 2, I have identified a need for allocating additional housing sites in larger villages such as Bream, I see no overriding justification for including the area proposed within the settlement.
- 21.44 Nor do I consider that the omission site at Bream Court Farm should be allocated for housing as I think this would over consolidate the present development fronting the

main road, contrary to its dispersed rural character. That is even taking into account a recent change of use affecting the curtilage of Court cottage.

### Recommendation

21.45 **I recommend that the Land adjacent to Bream Court Farm be not included in the defined Settlement Boundary of Bream nor allocated for residential development.**

## Omission Site OH11.5 – Land off Whitecroft Road

### Objections

387/50191 Mr C Jones

### Reasoning and Conclusions

21.46 This land was the subject of an unsuccessful appeal for a dwelling in 2001, when the design of that particular proposal was found to be unacceptable in the context of the Restriction on Development in the surrounding area. That restriction was carried forward in Revised Deposit policy (R)F.Bream 2 which I find above to be unjustified in principle. However, I have recommended that the text continue to describe aspects of the settlement character in the area for consideration in the design of any development with reference to infilling policy (R)FH.4 that applies to Bream as a whole. In my opinion, if the land enjoys any redevelopment potential, it should be realised in that modified policy context.

### Recommendation

21.47 **I recommend that the Land off Whitecroft Road be not allocated for development.**

## Inset Map 11 - Bream

### Objections

57/50554	Mr G Adams
82/50306	Mr & Mrs L Baker
83/50588	Mr W Baker
95/50628	Mr C Bath
151/50765	Mr D Brough
172/53006	Mr J Chadderton
206/50522	Mr S & Mrs L Crick
225/50840	Mr & Mrs C W Davison
226/50542	Mrs E Dawe
243/50792	Mr J Edey
260/50403	Mr & Mrs D Evans
297/52256	Mr Greenway
334/53065	Cllr P J Hiett
336/50616	Mrs K Hoare
387/50191	Mr C Jones
388/50831	Mrs O Jones
389/50756	Mr C I Jones
453/50865	Mrs M Meddings

---

454/50623	Mr & Mrs G Meek
470/50849	Mr & Mrs P Morgan
475/50615	Mr H Morse
495/52709	Mr M Norris
552/50551	Ms C M Reynolds
556/50355	Mr D Richards
568/50626	Mr & Mrs R J Ruck
583/50598	Mrs L Seabourne
607/50605	Mrs M Smith
658/50768	Mr A Tolson
678/50579	Mr A K Dime
685/50659	Mr & Mrs M Watkins
689/50860	Ms L Weldon
696/50608	Mrs L Wicks

### Issues

These objections relate to the application of area policies, site-specific matters or omission sites, all of which are covered above.

### Reasoning and Conclusions

21.48 I confine myself to co-ordinating a number of proposed consequential modifications to Inset Map 11.

### Recommendations

- 21.49 **I recommend that Inset Map 11 be modified by deleting reference to policy (R)F.Bream 2.**
- 21.50 **I recommend that Inset Map 11 be modified by the reinstatement of the annotation relating to Policy (R)F.Bream 3 [Bream Woodside]**
- 21.51 **I recommend that Inset Map 11 be modified by the deletion of Area A from the notation for Policy (R)F.Bream 4.**
- 21.52 **I recommend that Inset Map 11 be modified by the extension of the Defined Settlement Boundary to include the Land at the Sawmills and the Land adjacent to the Sawmills [Omission Site OH11.3] as defined in Document FOD/P6.12 Annexes 6 and 10.**
-

## CHAPTER 12 - BRIERLEY

### General

#### Objections

394/70595                      Mr & Mrs M J Jones  
834/70640                      Mr B Whittington

#### Issue

Statutory Forest Status

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

22.1 Elsewhere in this report I recommend that the boundary of the Statutory Forest be shown on the Proposals Map. The village of Brierley lies within that boundary and Policy (R)FBE.8, with recommended modification, will set out the planning policy for the change of use of Forest Waste or other Crown Land within the Statutory Forest. Whether other legislation would affect the use or development of land within the Statutory Forest is considered elsewhere. Para 12.1 already refers to the location of Brierley within the Statutory Forest. It is not a matter which it would be necessary or appropriate to address by the modification of this chapter.

#### Recommendation

22.2 **I recommend no modification in response to these objections.**

---

### Inset Map 12 – Brierley

#### Omission Site OH12.1 – Land East of the Playing Field

#### Objection

103/51791                      Mr R Beard

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

22.3 The site consists of a small, irregularly shaped quadrilateral of land, slightly to the north of the long ribbon of development along the A4136 that forms Brierley. It lies at the north eastern corner of the village recreation ground and is reached over an unmade road running along the eastern side of the ground. The site is currently overgrown with bracken and appears to be in no productive use. Immediately to the south of the site is a small bungalow, in relatively large grounds and to the south of that a new two-storey house is under construction. Both these properties front the unmade road and face westwards towards the recreation ground. To the west is another unmade road with a row of mainly two-storey houses facing east over the recreation ground. Rising to the north is the broad expanse of the Forest. South of the recreation ground is another unmade road that gives access to the garages and back gardens of houses fronting the A4136.

22.4 Brierley is listed under Policy FH.5 that allows very limited development that must respect the form and character of the settlement within the DSB. As the village has relatively limited services and is in an environmentally sensitive area being surrounded by the Forest, I consider that this listing is appropriate. The Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB] includes the recreation ground, existing houses to the

east and west of the ground and the unmade road fronting the omission site. In effect, the omission site appears to be cut out of the corner of the DSB, whereas the corner of the recreation ground and the end of the unmade road define the extent of the built settlement. To include the site would thus not cause a significant extension into open land to the north of the site. Similarly there would be no extension beyond the line of the rear gardens of the adjacent properties within the village. Moreover, the development of the site for housing would be symmetrical with the housing on the western side of the recreation ground, whereby the inclusion of this site would result in a logical rounding off to the DSB. I do not consider that the development of the site would seriously prejudice views of the Forest to the north and east, or affect views of the village from the north.

- 22.5 For these reasons I do not concur with the Council’s view that the extension of the DSB to include the site would be contrary to the Plan’s objectives. Nor would it consolidate sporadic development. Development of the site subject to policy (R)FH.5 would not materially effect demand for local services, yet would help to satisfy local needs for additional housing.

### **Recommendation**

- 22.6 **I recommend that Inset Map 12 be modified by the amendment of the Defined Settlement Boundary to include the Land East of the Playing Field as defined in Annex 1 to Document FOD/P7.2.**
-

## CHAPTER 13 - BROCKWEIR

### General

#### Objections

180/52474	Hewelsfield & Brockweir Parish Council
353/51616	CPRW

#### Supporting Statements

353/51618	CPRW
682/51342	The Ramblers Association

#### Issue

- a. The promotion of recreation is not an objective of AONB designation, whilst quiet enjoyment can be in keeping with the AONB.
- b. Correction required - Brockweir does not have a Post Office

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 23.1 The promotion of recreation is not one of the aims and purposes of AONBs, which are clearly set out in PPG 7. However I do not consider that there is anything in the text of this Chapter that contradicts these national policy aims and I can see no necessity for the Chapter to repeat this national policy guidance. Similarly there is no necessity for the Chapter to restate that quiet enjoyment can be in keeping with the AONB.
- 23.2 I note that the Plan incorrectly refers to the presence of a Post Office in the village. This omission has been acknowledged by the Council, and for accuracy the reference to a Post Office in the Chapter should be removed.

#### Recommendation

- 23.3 **I recommend that paragraph 13.2 be modified by removing the reference to a Post Office from the list of village services.**

## CHAPTER 15 - CLEARWELL

### General

#### Objections

307/52522                      Mr J Gunter  
394/70596                      Mr & Mrs M J Jones

#### Issues

- a.        Statutory Forest Status
- b.        Extent of Defined Settlement with respect to development at Castle Farm.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 25.1    Elsewhere in my report I recommend that the boundary of the Statutory Forest be shown on the Proposals Map. The village of Clearwell lies within that boundary and Policy (R)FBE.8, modified as I recommend, will set out the planning policy for the change of use of Forest Waste or other Crown Land within the Statutory Forest. Whether other legislation would affect the use or development of land within the Statutory Forest is considered elsewhere in this report, and is not a matter that it would be necessary or appropriate to address by the modification of this chapter, save for the minor textual amendment below.
- 25.2    I deal with the extent of the Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB] in connection with Omission Site OH15.1 below.

#### Recommendation

- 25.3    **I recommend that Paragraph 15.1 be modified by inserting after the third word: in the Statutory Forest’**

---

### Omission Site OH15.1 – Castle Farm

#### Objection

307/52522                      Mr J Gunter

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 25.4    Clearwell is an attractive village that is laid out in an approximate tee shape, formed by the High Street and Church Street. [I note that Church Street is so marked on maps but that the street sign reads Church Road]. The dense village core, consisting mainly of short groups of cottages, is centred around the junction of the two roads, with St Peter’s Church and the village primary school on opposite sides of Church Street to the south.
- 25.5    The objector has suggested that the village DSB be extended to the south along Church Street to include the buildings of Castle Farm and a group of large detached residential properties. Part of the objection site lies within the Clearwell Conservation Area which also includes the adjacent Clearwell Castle to the west.
- 25.6    The objection site is separated from the rest of the village by open land which forms a significant gap. On the western side of the street, this is fronted by the high stone

wall around the Clearwell Castle Estate which also surrounds the Castle Farm buildings. On the eastern side is a sloping grassy bank above a stone retaining wall. .

- 25.7 It is the stated object of Defined Settlement Boundaries to encompass the extent of the built up area on the basis that in most cases there is a marked transition to open countryside. Here the suggested extension to the DSB is visually very different from the rest of the village that lies within it and there is a visual separation between the two areas. Most of Castle Farm is concealed behind the high wall which is characteristic of those found around country estates in open countryside. The detached houses and the agricultural buildings also lack the dense settlement form that exists within the DSB and have a more dispersed appearance contributes to the character of the conservation area and which would be vulnerable to harmful change from infill development. I conclude that the area should not be included within the DSB. Whilst I appreciate that this conclusion has implications for the conversion of surplus buildings at Castle Farm, I consider that other Plan policies provide adequate scope for the re-use of buildings in the countryside.

### **Recommendation**

- 25.8 **I recommend no modification to the Defined Settlement Boundary of Clearwell in respect of the area around Castle Farm.**

- 
- 25.9 The objector has suggested that the village DSB be extended to include Castle Farm and surrounding properties to the east of Church Street. Clearwell is an attractive village that is laid out in an approximate tee shape, formed at the Stone Cross by the High Street and Church Street. The village core has a dense form, consisting mainly of short groups of cottages and is centred around the T-junction, with St Peter’s Church and the village primary school on opposite sides of Church Street a little to the south.
- 25.10 The development of Castle Farm lies to the south of the School and the Church and consists of an irregularly shaped parcel of land that includes the Farm buildings to the west of Church Street and large detached residential properties to the east. Further west lie the grounds of Clearwell Castle. The objection site is separated from the rest of the village by a sloping, grassy bank on the western side of the road that runs between the garden of the large detached house Dunraven and the School. Between St Peters Church and Castle Farm is a high stone wall that leads down to the entrance to Clearwell Castle. The entrance to the Castle is set back from Church Street and is separated from the road by a triangular grass area and a short driveway. Part of the area of concern lies within the wider Clearwell Conservation Area.
- 25.11 The suggested extension to the Defined Settlement is visually very different from the rest of the village that lies within it. Most of Castle Farm is concealed behind a high wall and the dispersed agricultural buildings that are visible do not have the same dense form that exists within the DSB. Similarly, the detached residential properties on the eastern side of the road are differ in appearance from the village core from which they area separated by the sloping field on the western side of Church Street.
- 25.12 It is the stated object of Defined Settlement Boundaries to encompass the extent of the built up area on the basis that in most cases there is a marked transition to open countryside. In this case, I admit that the transition is not clear-cut. However, the

area of detached housing to the east of Church Street is visually separated from the main village area by the grassy bank to the south of the School. Given this gap and the dispersed appearance of the properties on this side of the road, it cannot be said to be an integral part of the built up area of the village and I do accept that this area should be included within the DSB. As regards the western side of the road, a large proportion of Castle Farm is hidden behind high stone walls, the rough appearance of which is neither typically urban nor rural.

- 25.13 Furthermore, the area around the entrance to Clearwell Castle provides a degree of separation between the main village core and Castle Farm. I therefore see the area as a transition between the dense, almost urban, form of the village within the DSB and more open countryside beyond. As such, I regard it as important to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and I do not consider that it can be included as part of the Defined Settlement. Whilst I appreciate that this conclusion has implications for the conversion of surplus buildings in Castle Farm, I consider that this issue is adequately addressed by other Plan policies.

### **Recommendation**

- 25.14 **I recommend no modification to the Defined Settlement Boundary of Clearwell in respect of the development at Castle Farm.**

---

## **Inset Map 15 – Clearwell**

### **Omission site OH15.2 – Land adjacent to the Wyndham Arms PH**

#### **Objection**

621/51087

Mr J Stanford

#### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 25.15 The objection site consists of a small, narrow parcel of land directly behind the Wyndham Arms Hotel and adjacent properties in Church Street, Clearwell, and comprises steeply sloping, open ground and an overflow car park for the Hotel. The site boundaries to the north, south and west are formed by the gardens of properties on Church Street, whereas the eastern boundary of the site is not clearly defined. Apart from the car park, the land is mainly grassed over and has the appearance of being used as an extension to gardens either for properties in Church Street and the Wyndham Arms or other isolated properties to the east. The village Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB] runs along the rear of gardens in Church Street before taking in St Peter’s Church and grounds to the south. The omission land lies within the wider Clearwell Conservation Area.
- 25.16 I consider that, being drawn tightly around the built settlement, the DSB correctly reflects the extent of the village. Although there is the possibility that there may be a need to identify additional sites for housing in order to meet the Plan’s housing land supply requirements, these additional sites must be justified in terms of sustainability and protection of the open countryside. I have not detected a level of housing land undersupply to justify a general extension to village DSBs to increase any windfall contribution. Such an approach would, in many instances, lead to development contrary to the sequential approach found in PPG3.

- 25.17 Clearwell is listed under Policy FH.4, where it is considered that infilling, small groups of dwellings and single dwellings will be acceptable within the village DSB. Given the nature of services available in the village I consider that this listing is reasonable and complies with government policy concerning the location of development. As the objector suggests that only one dwelling would come forward, this would be acceptable in terms of this Policy, were the site to be included in the DSB. However, I find that the raised nature of the site would mean that any housing, and associated domestic activity would be visually prominent and intrude into the attractive glimpses of open land that are apparent from the gaps between buildings on Church Street. I would also have some concerns about the detrimental effects to amenity caused by the effect of overlooking and overshadowing the rear gardens and living rooms of properties on Church Street from the site. Therefore, whilst I recognise that the detailed design of such a dwelling would be constrained by the Conservation Area policies that apply in Clearwell, I consider that extending the village to take in the entire site would be an unacceptable extension of the DSB.
- 25.18 I accept that there would be some benefit in sustainability terms to reduce the distance travelled by the owners of the Wyndham Arms who are promoting the site, but I do not consider that this is sufficient justification for upholding their objection. Whilst in some circumstances personal permissions have occasionally been used in the manner suggested by the objector to overcome particular planning constraints, that is a development control matter beyond the scope of this report.

### **Recommendation**

- 25.19 **I recommend no modification to the Clearwell Defined Settlement Boundary in respect of the land adjacent to the Wyndham Arms PH.**
-

## CHAPTER 16 - DRYBROOK AND HARROW HILL

### General

#### Objections

394/70597	Mr & Mrs M J Jones
834/70642	Mr B Whittington
837/70680	Clearwell Caves

#### Issues

Statutory Forest status

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

26.1 I consider elsewhere whether other legislation would affect the use or development of land within the Statutory Forest and I recommend generally that the boundary of the Statutory Forest be shown on the Proposals Map. This is not a matter which it would be necessary or appropriate to address by the modification of this chapter, given that the text refers to the location of the village with respect to the Statutory Forest in any event.

#### Recommendation

26.2 **I recommend no modification in response to these objections.**

## Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 1 – Cinderford Linear Park Extension

### Objection

8/52942	Drybrook Parish Council
---------	-------------------------

#### Issues

Significance of the Linear Park to Drybrook.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

26.3 This objection does not appear to have been pursued at the Inquiry and I agree with the Council that the designation of the Linear Park northward from Cinderford is likely to bring recreational benefit to Drybrook. I find no reason to vary this policy.

#### Recommendation

26.4 **I recommend no modification to Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 1.**

## Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 2 – Housing Allocation- Drybrook Road

### Objections

8/52938	Drybrook Parish Council
36/52008	Three Counties Planning Consultancy
41/51154	Countryside Agency
42/50244	Collier & Brain Ltd
159/52112	Mr & Mrs Burford
159/52115	Mr & Mrs Burford

159/52116	Mr & Mrs Burford
159/52119	Mr & Mrs Burford
288/51046	Gloucestershire County Council
471/50060	Mr C R Morman
687/52344	Mr A J & Mrs V A Watts

## Issues

- a. Local need for the development, including with respect to out-commuting.
- b. Loss of employment land.
- c. Loss of greenfield land.
- d. Visual impact on the rural landscape.
- e. Traffic generation, congestion and road safety.
- f. Public transport, cycle and pedestrian links.
- g. Developer contributions and affordable housing.
- h. Flooding and drainage.

## Reasoning and Conclusions

- 26.5 I conclude in respect of the strategic approach set out in Chapter 1, Part 1 that the distribution of new development in the Plan to meet overall requirements is broadly appropriate. I further conclude in Chapter 2 Part 1 that a total of about 286 dwellings need to be provided in larger villages, 55 more than provided in Revised Deposit policy (R)FH.3. Drybrook is one of the larger villages, having a substantial range of community facilities and good road access to the A4136 and the main town of Cinderford, a comparatively short distance away. Accordingly it is suitable in principle for a housing allocation subject to local planning considerations.
- 26.6 Having regard to the major initiatives in the Plan to increase employment opportunities in nearby Cinderford but with only limited potential for house building there, I consider it relatively unlikely that the development of the Drybrook Farm site would contribute to a significant increase in work commuting outside the Forest.
- 26.7 The Revised Deposit allocation encompasses established employment premises, originally seen as providing the main access to the site. However, in response to representations by the landowners, the Council conceded at the Inquiry that satisfactory access could be provided off High Street alone, to serve as many as 25 dwellings. That is, only 5 less than the Revised Deposit allocation, but all within that part of the land not currently in use by local employers. I recognise that most of this housing would thereby occupy greenfield land, but on the evidence there is no alternative that is previously developed and better located in relation to the village centre.
- 26.8 I recognise that development of the allocation land, behind the existing southern built frontage of High Street, would intrude into the attractive, rural area between Drybrook and the elevated area of Harrow Hill to the south. However, there is no reason why the character of High Street frontage could not be respected in any design, and proposals would include strategic landscaping. I consider that the development would thus be satisfactorily integrated into the settlement, and its visual impact acceptably mitigated.

- 26.9 Given properly designed access and parking arrangements, I am not persuaded that the development would cause the degree of congestion and danger that local people fear, even though public transport links are not good, and the level of car use by new residents might be comparatively high. The requirement to contribute to improved pedestrian and cycle links to the nearest employment areas is therefore justified to minimise car traffic.
- 26.10 As to the required appropriate contribution toward affordable housing, this should remain negotiable in terms of the relevant policies of Chapter 2 Part 1.
- 26.11 I have not seen overriding evidence of flooding or drainage problems to substantiate objection on this ground, and this is a matter to be addressed in any future application.
- 26.12 Overall I take the view that the allocation should remain, for the reduced number of 25 dwellings over the smaller area indicated on the plan attached to Document 159A, excluding the current employment land, subject also to uncontroversial, minor rationalisation of the site boundaries proposed by the Council.
- 26.13 I appreciate the strong local feelings, voiced by the Parish Council and others against this policy. However, I believe the rationalisations brought about by the Inquiry process serve to overcome the objections to the extent that the need for additional housing in suitable locations is left as the dominant factor.

### Recommendation

- 26.14 **I recommend that Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 2 be modified to provide for approximately 25 dwellings and with respect to the area of the allocation after deletion of the employment area and rationalisation of the site boundaries. boundaries, as shown on the plan attached to Document 159A.**
- 26.15 **I recommend that Criterion 1 of Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 2 be deleted and replaced by ‘Provide sole vehicular access from High Street’.**

---

## Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 3 – Housing - Woodland Road

### Objections

41/51156	Countryside Agency
273/80038	Mr R Freshwater
394/70598	Mr & Mrs M J Jones
834/70643	Mr B Whittington
837/70681	Clearwell Caves

### Supporting Statement

847/70768	Mr J Kendrick
-----------	---------------

### Issues

- a. Statutory Forest status.
- b. Landscape Impact.

## Reasoning and Conclusions

- 26.16 I deal with the question of the Statutory Forest above and elsewhere. I assess this policy on its strict planning merits.
- 26.17 I consider that the Revised Deposit textual amendment to para 16.17 satisfactorily addresses the material interest of landscape impact in relation to this allocation.

## Recommendation

- 26.18 **I recommend no modification to Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 3 or its supporting text.**

---

## Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 4 Harrow Hill Restriction on Development

### Objections

36/52037	Three Counties Planning Consultancy
490/51092	Mr & Mrs Niblett
394/70599	Mr & Mrs M J Jones
834/70644	Mr B Whittington
837/70682	Clearwell Caves

### Issues

- a. Statutory Forest status
- b. General and site-specific objections to the restriction.

## Reasoning and Conclusions

- 26.19 I deal with the question of Statutory Forest status above and elsewhere. I assess this policy on its strict planning merits.
- 26.20 As to the justification for the continued restriction on development in Harrow Hill; on consideration of the Plan as a whole I have reached the conclusion, for reasons set out after policy (R)FBE.1 in Part 1 Chapter 6 of this report, that the Restriction on Development policies are inappropriate and that due protection is accorded the settlement areas concerned by policy (R)FBE.1 when read in conjunction with the descriptive text for each settlement in Part 2. I therefore recommend below the deletion of policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 4. I here address terms of the supporting paragraphs.
- 26.21 Objectors refer to the linked settlements of Drybrook and Harrow Hill as a substantial settlement with a considerable range of community facilities, arguing that the village offers a comparatively sustainable location for small scale new development as an alternative to greenfield sites elsewhere. I recognise the distinctive nature the elevated, mainly residential area of Harrow Hill, which is physically separated from the centre of Drybrook and its community facilities. The relationship of Harrow Hill with the surrounding Forest is notable due to the spacious character of its comparatively random development pattern, incorporating significant open areas of Forest waste. I consider that any development in the area must respect this character.
- 26.22 In my opinion text para 16.18 sets down an appropriately balanced approach to these considerations that contemplates small scale new development within these areas in

certain circumstances, and thus duly supplements the provisions of policy (R)FBE.1. However this should refer to all new development and not only residential. The text should therefore be retitled Settlement Character and moved above the section on Natural Environment. The text should be recast as I recommend below.

- 26.23 With regard to the specific site at Trinity Road, nominated by an objector, it seems to me that the foregoing sufficiently addresses this interest, given the terms of the objection which stop short of seeking a specific site allocation.

### **Recommendation**

- 26.24 **I recommend that Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill be deleted.**

- 26.25 **I recommend that Paragraph 16.18 be retitled ‘Settlement Character’ and repositioned above the heading ‘Natural Environment’ and modified to:**

*para* **Harrow Hill is set within an attractive landscape on an elevated hillside. [retain present wording of para 16.18 from ‘It has the characteristic ...[ to ] ... avoid the loss of important open areas’]. Any new development, including residential infilling, will be required to complement the characteristic open and sporadic pattern of the locality.**

---

## **Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 5 – Employment Redevelopment**

### **Objections**

42/50266

Collier & Brain Ltd

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 26.26 The sole objection to this policy appears to have been founded on a misunderstanding of its purpose. There is no question of any local employer, whether on this site or any other, being coerced into redeveloping their own land for occupation by others. The policy and its text merely contemplates, quite properly in my view, improving local employment opportunities by way of suitable redevelopment of the defined area north of the A4136 at Nailbridge, should such proposals come forward.

### **Recommendation**

- 26.27 **I recommend no modification to Policy (R)F.Drybrook 5.**
-

## Omission Site OH16.1 – Land at Hawthorns Road

### Objections

183/52121

Mr and Mrs M Clarke

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 26.28 The omission site is detached from the defined Drybrook settlement in a scatter of rural buildings where new residential development, as proposed by the objector, is to be resisted in the interest of protecting the countryside beyond the urban village. This is the overriding consideration and militates against inclusion of the land as part of the settlement.
- 26.29 I note that certain planning permissions have been granted nearby, but any proposal for residential development of the omission land would fall to be considered on its merits, taking into account any material factors in its favour.

### Recommendation

- 26.30 **I recommend that the land at Hawthorns Road be not included within the Defined Settlement Boundary of Drybrook, nor allocated for development.**
- 

## Omission Site OH16.2 – Land off Hazel Hill Road

### Objections

515/50679

Mrs E Peglar

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 26.31 The omission site, described by the Council as adjacent to Hillside Road, is detached from the defined Drybrook settlement in a scatter of rural buildings where new residential development, as proposed by the objector, is to be resisted in the interest of protecting the countryside beyond the urban village. This is the overriding consideration and militates against inclusion of the land as part of the settlement.
- 26.32 I note that permission was granted some years ago resulting in one dwelling already occupying part of the land, and that certain development has taken place in the area since. However, that is not to say further development of the site would amount to justifiable infilling as contended by the objector, and any further proposal for residential development should remain to be determined on its merits, taking into account any material factors in its favour.

### Recommendation

- 26.33 **I recommend that the land off Hazel Hill [adjacent to Hillside Road] be not included within the Defined Settlement Boundary of Drybrook, nor allocated for development.**
-

---

## **Inset Map 16 - Drybrook/Harrow Hill**

### **Objections**

8/52940	Drybrook Parish Council
8/52943	Drybrook Parish Council
183/52121	Mr & Mrs M Clarke
471/50062	Mr C R Morman
490/51093	Mr & Mrs Niblett
515/50679	Mrs E Peglar
687/52353	Mr A J & Mrs V A Watts

### **Supporting Statement**

159/52114	Mr & Mrs Burford
-----------	------------------

### **Issues**

These objections raise site-specific issues covered in connection with the policies or omission sites elsewhere in Chapter 16.

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

26.34 I here confine myself to setting out recommended modifications to Inset Map 16 consequent upon my considerations above.

### **Recommendation**

26.35 **I recommend that Inset Map 16 be modified consistent with my recommendation to modify the allocation boundary of Policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 2.**

26.36 **I recommend that Inset Map 16 be modified by deleting reference to policy (R)F.Drybrook/Harrow Hill 4.**

---

## CHAPTER 17 - DYMOCK

### Omission Site OH17.1 – Land at Bayfield Gardens

#### Objection

7/51727

P B Investments

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 27.1 Dymock is located in the North Forest area and is listed under Policy (R)FH.4 which allows for the provision of infilling, small groups of dwellings and single dwellings within the Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB]. Policy (R)F.Strategy 7 seeks to restrict the amount of development in the North Forest to achieve a more sustainable pattern of development by limiting travel demand. The village possesses only a small range of services and there is little employment provision. Newent is relatively close and can be reached by public transport. There are also public transport links to Gloucester. However, I consider that the majority of trips from Dymock are likely to be made by private car. I therefore consider that the listing of the village under Policy F.Strategy 7 and Policy FH.4 is reasonable and compliant with Government policy concerning the sustainable location of development.
- 27.2 This omission site is greenfield agricultural land to the north west of the village. The roughly square site adjoins residential development in Bayfield Gardens to the east within the DSB and the village primary school to the south. To the north and west of the site are open agricultural fields. The site lacks a highway frontage and access is currently via a footpath.
- 27.3 The DSB has been drawn tightly around the settlement and I consider that it correctly identifies the extent of its developed form. I have not detected any level of housing land undersupply to justify a general extension to village DSBs to increase the contribution of windfall housing development. Such an approach would risk excessive greenfield development, intrusive in the countryside and with relatively poor accessibility to employment, services and facilities by means other than the car.
- 27.4 I conclude that development of the omission land would constitute a significant intrusion into the open countryside, especially as viewed from the school and Bayfield Gardens. This would be contrary to both Plan policy (R)FNE.1 and national countryside policy in PPG 7. Furthermore the potential capacity of the site is over 15 dwellings at the densities advised in PPG 3. That would exceed the scale of infilling or small groups contemplated for the settlement by policy (R)FH.4. I consider that this level of housing would lead to a significant increase in reliance on journeys by private car. For these reasons the site should not be allocated for housing or included within the DSB.

#### Recommendation

- 27.5 **I recommend that the Land at Bayfield Gardens be not allocated for development nor included within the Defined Settlement Boundary of Dymock.**

## Omission Site OH 17.2 – Land at Station Terrace

### Objection

353/51705

Mr A Perry

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 27.6 This greenfield land abuts the Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB] at the south western edge of the village. It lies to the south of houses in Station Road opposite the primary school. The site consists of a large rectangular field, currently in agricultural use, west of a minor road running roughly south from a humped back bridge over the disused railway line. The southern site boundary is marked by a mature hedgerow including some tall trees. The site slopes up westward towards a ridge that roughly corresponds with the far extent of the Station Road housing. Open fields lie to the south and west of the site.
- 27.7 The minor road east of the land forms a significant and clearly defined development boundary to this part of Dymock. Any breach of this boundary would form a significant intrusion into open countryside. I recognise that housing in Station Road already intrudes onto this slope but the level of visual intrusion would be greatly accentuated by the development now proposed. Therefore the inclusion of the land within the DSB would be contrary to both Plan Policy (R)FNE.1 and national guidance on countryside protection in PPG 7.
- 27.8 The objector has not estimated the amount of housing that the objection site could provide but I consider that it could accommodate a significant development of at least 50 houses. For the reasons set out in connection with Omission Site OH17.1 above, Dymock is correctly listed under policies (R)F.Strategy 7 and (R)FH.4, both of which limit the extent of development in the settlement for reasons of sustainability, in compliance with PPG3 and PPG13. Therefore I do not consider it likely that housing on the site would be sustainable in terms of local or national policies. Although the development of the site might help to support services in Newent, it would generate significant car travel to the town, and I do not consider that any benefit to Newent would overcome other objections to the allocation of the site.

### Recommendation

- 27.9 **I recommend that the Land at Station Terrace be not allocated for development nor included within the Defined Settlement Boundary of Dymock.**

---

## Omission Site OH17.3 – Land at the rear of Well House Garage

### Objection

737/51682

AGS Development Consultants

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 27.10 This site lies between the two developed parts of the village and their respective Defined Settlement Boundaries [DSBs] and within the Dymock Conservation Area. Most of the site is currently well-maintained grassland and it is part of an Important Open Area [IOA], designated under policy (R)FBE.7 and encompassing other land to

the north. The site is located between the disused railway line to the west, part of which has been redeveloped as a children’s play area and, to the east, the backs of houses fronting the B4215 Stoneberrow Road, that are within the DSB.

- 27.11 The site approximately follows the line of the former disused railway cutting and visually is strongly linked the rest of the IOA to the north. The site forms part of a visually significant gap that runs through the centre of the village and makes a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. To permit development of the omission site would result in substantial part closure of that gap, harming the form and character of the village and the Conservation Area. Therefore I conclude that the land should not be included within the DSB for development, but should retain its IOA status.

### Recommendation

- 27.12 **I recommend that the Land at the rear of Well House Garage be not included with the Defined Settlement Boundary of Dymock and that it retain its designation as an Important Open Area.**

---

## Inset Map 17 - Dymock

### Objection

7/51727	P B Investments
353/51705	Mr A Perry
519/51798	Mr D Penny
737/51682	AGS Development Consultants

### Issues

- a. Omissions of lands from the Defined Settlement Boundary.
- b. Designation of the entire line of the canal.

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 27.13 I deal with the three omission sites above, where I conclude that none should be allocated.
- 27.14 As regards the issue of the canal; for reasons I have given in my conclusions on Chapter 4 of Part 1 on Recreation and Leisure, I consider that policy (R)FTRL.6 provides sufficient protection for the line of the canal and any possible diversions to overcome obstacles on its former route. The Proposals Map shows the old line of the canal but as proposals for the restoration of the canal in the village are not currently at an advanced stage and there has been no firm decision on a possible route for diversion, I do not consider that it would be reasonable for the village Inset Map to safeguard any putative diversion route.

### Recommendation

- 27.15 **I recommend no modification to Inset Map 17 - Dymock.**
-

## CHAPTER 18 - EDGE END

### General

#### Objections

394/70600	Mr & Mrs M J Jones
833/70615	Mr & Mrs D Coe
834/70645	Mr B Whittington
837/70683	Clearwell Caves

#### Supporting Statement

422/52765	West Dean Parish Council
-----------	--------------------------

#### Issues

Statutory Forest Status.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

28.1 Elsewhere in this report I recommend that the boundary of the Statutory Forest be shown on the Proposals Map. The village of Edge End lies within that boundary and Policy (R)FBE.8, modified as I recommend, will set out the planning policy for the change of use of Forest Waste or other Crown Land within the Statutory Forest. Whether other legislation would affect the use or development of land within the Statutory Forest is considered elsewhere in this report and is not a matter which it would be necessary or appropriate to address by the modification of this chapter, aside from the small textual addition set out below.

#### Recommendation

28.2 **I recommend that Paragraph 18.1 be modified by the addition after the second sentence of the following new paragraph:**

**The village lies within the boundary of the Statutory Forest as shown on the Proposals Map and Policy (R)FBE.8 would apply to proposals for the change of use of Forest Waste and other Crown Land within the Statutory Forest.**

---

### Inset Map 18 - Edge End

#### Objections

826/70441	Mr B Wittington
-----------	-----------------

#### Issues

Protection of Edge End as a Forest settlement.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

28.3 Edge End is a small settlement located on high ground at the Forest edge, north of Coleford. Whilst its elevated position increases the vulnerability of the settlement to the detrimental visual impact of development, the Plan affords the settlement sufficient protection by virtue of a very tightly Defined Settlement Boundary, as well as by the designation under policy (R)FBE.7 of Important Open Areas within the village. Furthermore, on the broader issue of environmental and habitat protection, the policies of Part 1 Chapter 8 on the Natural Environment sufficient cover in the

absence of evidence of any particular interest. Any further protection is therefore unnecessary.

**Recommendation**

28.4 **I recommend no modification to Inset Map 18 – Edge End, in respect of this objection.**

---

## CHAPTER 19 - ELLWOOD

### General

#### Objections

394/70601	Mr & Mrs M J Jones
833/70616	Mr & Mrs D Coe
834/70646	Mr B Whittington
837/70684	Clearwell Caves

#### Supporting Statement

422/52771	West Dean Parish Council
-----------	--------------------------

#### Issues

Statutory Forest Status.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

29.1 I recommend elsewhere that the boundary of the Statutory Forest be shown on the Proposals Map. The village of Ellwood lies within that boundary and Policy (R)FBE.8, once modified, will set out the planning policy for the change of use of Forest Waste or other Crown Land within the Statutory Forest. Whether other legislation would affect the use or development of land within the Statutory Forest is also considered elsewhere in this report and is not a matter which it would be necessary or appropriate to address by the modification of this chapter, given para 19.1 refers to the location of Ellwood within the statutory Forest.

#### Recommendation

29.2 **I recommend no modification in response to these objections.**

---

## Policy (R)F.Ellwood 1 – Restriction on Development

### Objection

542/50644	Mr T Randall
-----------	--------------

#### Issues

- a. Justification for the restriction.
- b. Omission of land for development.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

29.3 On consideration of the Plan as a whole I have reached the conclusion, for reasons set out after policy (R)FBE.1 in Part 1 Chapter 6 of this report, that the Restriction on Development policies are inappropriate and that due protection is accorded the settlement areas concerned by policy (R)FBE.1 when read in conjunction with the descriptive text for each settlement in Part 2. I therefore recommend below the deletion of policy (R)F.Ellwood 1 and the modification of the text accordingly to refer to all development and not only housing.

29.4 Policy (R)F.Ellwood 1 would apply to two areas north east of the Bromley Road that have a relatively open character but differ only marginally from the slightly more

dense form of housing found elsewhere in the village. Except for identified Important Open Areas [IOAs], which are already protected under Policy FBE.7, I do not consider that there are any specific characteristics in these areas that merit additional protection.

- 29.5 Ellwood is listed under Policy FH.5 as suitable for very limited development of one or two houses within the DSB, provided it can be integrated within the settlement framework compatible its form and character. I consider that this designation is appropriate for the village given the limited nature of services and its vulnerable position on the Forest edge.
- 29.6 The particular site subject to this objection is located in the centre of a flat area of high open ground to the north of Bromley Road. It is within the Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB] in the north east of the village. I make no judgement on the merits of any proposal to develop that land, as this would require a detailed application, involving an assessment of design considerations and factors such as access.

### Recommendation

- 29.7 **I recommend that the heading ‘Housing’ and Policy (R)F.Ellwood 1 be deleted.**
- 29.8 **I recommend that Paragraph 19.8 be modified to:**

**The two areas of Ellwood north east of Bromley Road particularly exhibit the open informal nature of the Forest Ring. They contain large undeveloped areas often served by forest tracks and the character of these areas should be maintained. They are extremely vulnerable to the cumulative effects of intrusive new development, especially residential infilling. Any new development, including residential infilling and replacement buildings and uses will be required to complement the characteristic open and sporadic pattern of the settlement, or result in significant improvement to the built environment and enhance the amenity of the area.**

---

## Omission Site OH19.1

### Important Open Area within the South East of Ellwood

#### Objection

375/52480

Mrs M G Jenkins

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 29.9 The omission site is at the south eastern end of the village close to the Forest Fringe and within a designated Important Open Area [IOA]. It lies between the garden of Stoneleigh and two unmade roads to the north and east and Bromley Road to the west. The land slopes steeply south and is close to the dense forest that bounds the south and east of the village. The site is largely enclosed by hedge banking and stone walls. Some dispersed housing lies to the west of Bromley Road and along Holly Lane. As part of the IOA extending between Stoneleigh and Bromley, the site is protected by policy (R)FBE.7
- 29.10 This end of the village exhibits a relatively loose form, typical of the forest fringe, with small pockets of development interposed with open areas and woodlands. The

location of the IOA on a prominent slope, helps to frame the southern end of the village and I consider that it makes an important contribution to the character and setting of the village. Allowing even the very limited development that would be permitted under Policy FH.5 would disrupt the pattern of development in a manner detrimental to the form and character of the village. Whilst policies exist in the Plan to protect open countryside, as the site is included within the Defined Settlement Boundary, these policies would not apply and the protection of the site under policy FBE.7 is in this case, entirely justified

### **Recommendation**

29.11 **I recommend that the Important Open Area over land in the south east of Ellwood be retained and that none of the land within it be allocated for development.**

---

## **Inset Map 19 - Ellwood**

### **Objections**

375/52480

Mrs M G Jenkins

542/50646

Mr T Randall

### **Issues**

- a. Justification for policy (R)F.Ellwood 1 with respect to identified land.
- b. Objection to including land in an Important Open Area [IOA], with reference to its contribution to the form, character and setting of the settlement.

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

29.12 I have dealt with policy (R)F.Ellwood 1 above and make a consequential recommendation here.

29.13 I have considered the omission of land in the IOA above.

### **Recommendation**

29.14 **I recommend that Inset Map 19 be modified by deletion of reference to Policy (R)F.Ellwood 1.**

## CHAPTER 20 - ENGLISH BICKNOR

### Omission Site OH20.1 – Land and Barn at The Laurels

#### Objections

664/52803                      Mrs P Turk  
664/52811                      Mrs P Turk

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 30.1 I deal with these two objections together. The first relates to a paddock in front The Laurels and other properties, south east of the church and medieval earthworks ancient monument and east of Chapel Lane. The second concerns a barn at the western end of the paddock. Whilst The Laurels and its neighbours are inside the Defined Settlement Boundary and the Conservation Area of English Bicknor, the paddock and barn are in the open countryside of the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty outside the settlement.
- 30.2 Whilst I recognise that the built settlement has been extended outside the Conservation Area by the dwellings of nearby Churchill Close, I nevertheless regard the paddock as contributing, in both near and distant views, to the hilltop setting English Bicknor and thus to the quality of the AONB. I think that even a few domestic properties erected there, as proposed, would intrude unacceptably into the countryside and damage the character of this part of the village, its surroundings and the Conservation Area as a whole. I conclude that the land should not be allocated for residential development as proposed.
- 30.3 As for the barn; this is very small and would require major work to convert it to residential accommodation. However, it could be considered on merit under rural conversion policies, but I see no justification for bringing it within the Defined Settlement Boundary in any event.

#### Recommendation

- 30.4 **I recommend that neither the Land nor the barn at The Laurels be allocated for development nor included within the Defined Settlement Boundary of English Bicknor.**

---

### Omission Site OH20.2 – Land adjacent to Yew Tree Cottage

#### Objections

659/51788                      Mr A Toomer

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 30.5 The land is outside the village boundary in use associated with agriculture. Much of its south and east boundaries abut open agricultural land and the site is thus part of the rural landscape of the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I consider, notwithstanding other development that has taken place in the area, to extend the built settlement to encompass this land would amount to an unwarranted and damaging urban intrusion into the AONB. I note the objector’s assertion that new development

is needed to support the very limited local community facilities, but the objection I have identified is the overriding consideration in my judgement.

### **Recommendation**

30.6 **I recommend that the Land adjacent to Yew Tree Cottage be not allocated for development.**

---

## **Inset Map 20 - English Bicknor**

### **Objections**

659/51788	Mr A Toomer
664/52803	Mrs P Turk
664/52811	Mrs P Turk

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

30.7 These objections relate to the two omission sites considered above.

### **Recommendation**

30.8 **I recommend no modification to Inset Map 20.**

---

## CHAPTER 21 - HARTPURY

### General

#### Objections

55/51779	G Holtham Will Trust
216/52417	Environment Agency
512/52652	Mr M R Payne
573/50409	Mr B Ryan

#### Issues

- a. Confusion over terminology with respect to the Defined Settlement Boundary.
- b. Planning strategy for Hartpury College.
- c. Approach to new development in the village.
- d. Omission of certain sites for housing.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 31.1 It is understandable that some confusion has arisen between references to the village as distinct from the areas inside the Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB]. That is a shortcoming of the Plan being divided between two volumes of very detailed text. Read as a whole the general sections of Part 1 and the settlement chapters of Part 2 indicate the significance and purpose of the DSB round the built up parts of the villages. I do not propose any specific modification in this connection.
- 31.2 With reference to Hartpury College, it appears to me that the inclusion of Revised Deposit policy (R)FE.2a meets concern expressed regarding a planning strategy for this important educational and employment site, by supporting and controlling future development, including with regard to its rural location. When addressing the Employment Chapter in Part 1 of this report, I have recommended that policy (R)FE.2a and its supporting text be moved to the Hartpury Chapter.
- 31.3 Before turning to individual sites, I would reiterate generally that I have found, in dealing with the Chapters 1 and 2 of Part 1, that the broad strategic approach of the Plan to the distribution of new development is appropriate in relation to relevant national and regional planning guidance and Structure Plan policy. In that context I consider that Chapter 21 strikes a reasonable overall balance between the restriction of development in the North Forest area to serve local needs, and recognition of Hartpury as a comparatively large village where a degree of new development is appropriate. I consider the merits of the individual omission sites below, in the light of this overall assessment.

#### Recommendation

- 31.4 **I recommend no modification consequent upon any of the above objections.**
- 31.5 **I recommend that Paragraphs 3.35a-d and Policy (R)FE.2a be deleted from Part 1 Chapter 3 and relocated in Part 2 Chapter 21.**

## Policy (R)F.Hartpury 1 – Land off Over Old Road

### Objections

6/70379	Barratt Bristol
521/70484	Mr A Perry
720/70153	Mr A Witts
845/70302	The Evans Jones Partnership

### Issues

- a. Requirements for developer contribution for affordable housing and a new village hall.
- b. Effect on settlement pattern and surrounding rural area.

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 31.6 In dealing with this allocation I take into account the proposal arising from a First Deposit objection to include additional land adjacent to the north. The same considerations would apply to the land omitted as to the allocated site.
- 31.7 Policy (R)F.Hartpury 1 was included at the Revised Deposit stage. It specifies developer contributions to affordable housing according to the lower [5 dwelling] threshold for small villages of policy (R)FH.13, and also links the development to the provision of a new village hall, on adjacent land to be encompassed within the Settlement Boundary along with the housing site itself. The latter policy requirement, read with text para 21.6, appears to necessitate the cession of land for the village hall. This implies a planning gain beyond that which is properly related to the development. I consider this provision inappropriate for inclusion in a policy.
- 31.8 As to the principle of the allocation in relation to the settlement pattern and surrounding area, the established primary school has already extended the built settlement across Over Old Road toward the open countryside. The impact of new houses on the allocation site would thus, to some degree, be mitigated. Nevertheless, I consider that the development would amount to an uncharacteristic consolidation of urban development at the edge of the village, departing from its essentially linear pattern.
- 31.9 The foregoing considerations do not preclude the Council from favouring an application for the development contemplated in this allocation as an exception to Plan policy in the light of particular circumstances related to local needs for a new village hall as well as for affordable housing. However, I am not persuaded that either the allocation or the associated extension of the Defined Settlement in this Plan are justified.

### Recommendation

**I recommend that Policy (R)F.Hartpury 1 and Paragraph 21.6 be deleted and Paragraph 21.5 be modified by deleting the third sentence.**

## Omission Site OH21.1 – Land adjacent to Daverlea

### Objection

347/52129

Mr W J Houldey

### Reasoning and Conclusions

31.10 Residential and community development on this extensive area, as proposed in the objection, would have the effect of expanding the village beyond its present limits into orchard and farmland. I accept that the land is partly screened by vegetation and visually not especially prominent, whilst at the same time being accessible to both the community facilities of the village and urban centres including Gloucester. I nevertheless consider that such development would amount to unwarranted use of greenfield land in the absence of reasoned evidence to justify it.

### Recommendation

31.11 **I recommend that the Land adjacent to Daverlea be not allocated for development.**

---

## Omission Site OH21.2 – Land North of Corsend Road

### Objection

573/50407

Mr B Ryan

### Reasoning and Conclusions

31.12 Unlike the open land of Omission site OH21.1 to the north east, much of the land of interest to this objector is in fact largely indistinguishable from the rest of the built settlement to the south. Whilst I accept that the Defined Settlement Boundary has been drawn tightly round the most densely developed area, as a matter of judgement it would be logical to extend it to encompass continuous frontage properties on the main road [including the garage/workshop at Saleta] as far as the clear break just to the north of Summerfield on the west side of the A417 and Daverlea on the east side. That would include the land between the houses at Yew Tree Cottage and Jenarson but I do not consider that the most westerly paddock area, north of Nos 4 and 6 Corsend Road should form part of the settlement, for this appears clearly rural.

31.13 Such an adjustment would allow a certain amount of infilling under policy (R)FH.4, subject to compliance with all other relevant provisions of the Plan, including the requirements of policies (R)FBE.1 and (R)FT.2 for good design and satisfactory access. However, given that additional scope for possible new infill development, I am not persuaded that a specific allocation is desirable.

### Recommendation

31.14 **I recommend that the Land North of Corsend Road be not allocated for development but that it be in part included within the Defined Settlement Boundary in accordance with my recommended modification to Inset Map 21 below.**

## Omission Site OH21.3 – Land South of Corsend Road

### Objection

720/51349

Mr A Witts

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 31.15 This objection refers to land at No 15 Corsend Road with a considerable planning history including the dismissal of an appeal for residential development in 2001. That decision was made on the basis of the currently adopted Local Plan wherein the land south of Corsend Road is excluded from the Defined Settlement Boundary, as it is in the Revised Deposit Plan now before me. I give limited weight to that appeal decision and make a fresh assessment of the Defined Settlement Boundary on the basis of current circumstances and evidence.
- 31.16 The Defined Settlement Boundary has been tightly but logically drawn around the denser development of Corsend Road. It thus encompasses the relatively closely spaced dwellings on the north side but leaves the properties to the south as part of the rural area outside the village, recognising their very dispersed nature with large gaps between buildings. I recognise that the omission land can be regarded as in part previously developed as domestic curtilage and that it is currently relatively unobtrusive and well-screened by vegetation. I also note that the adjacent outlying area has no special landscape or environmental designation. However, I consider that to develop the omission land as proposed would unduly consolidate built development in this fringe area, harming local character.
- 31.17 I accept that Corsend Road is well connected, including by non-car transport modes, to the considerable range of village services and facilities of Hartpury and the College, as well as to employment areas and the Cty of Gloucester. In my judgement however, the objection on grounds of harm to local character remains the overriding consideration.

### Recommendation

- 31.18 **I recommend that the Land South of Corsend Road be not allocated for development nor included within the Defined Settlement Boundary of Hartpury.**

---

## Omission Site OH21.4 – Land to the North East of Foley Rise

### Objection

743/52897-8

Evans Jones pp Mrs J Povey and Mr and Mrs E J Keyse

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 31.19 In dealing with this objection I disregard any matters that have been raised concerning whether the land is available and base my assessment on planning considerations.
- 31.20 Development of the site would form a logical extension to Foley Rise, close to the village centre with its range of services and community facilities. I acknowledge that the land is partly screened by vegetation and was previously used as domestic gardens. Nevertheless, the land is essentially part of the open countryside outside the built settlement where new development would impinge on the rural character of the

surrounding area, and depart markedly from the existing mainly linear settlement pattern. I have not seen evidence sufficient to persuade me that such an urban extension is justified by local need for general market housing. The Council intimates that it might be considered as an exception site for affordable housing under policy (R)FH.14 [Document FOD/6.42 para 5.8.1], but by definition that does not justify a specific Plan allocation.

### Recommendation

31.21 **I recommend that the Land to the North East of Foley Rise be not allocated for development.**

## Omission Site OH21.5 – Important Open Area West of Foley Rise

### Objection

55/51778                      G Holtham Will Trust

### Reasoning and Conclusions

31.22 I consider that the Important Open Area as designated makes a highly visible, positive contribution to the amenity and linear character of Hartpury whether seen from the properties on Foley Rise or from the main A417 as it passes through the village. Infilling there would heavily consolidate the built form of this part of the settlement, and would thus be detrimental to that character.

### Recommendation

31.23 **I recommend that the Important Open Area west of Foley Rise be retained and that the land be not allocated for development.**

## Inset Map 21 - Hartpury

### Objections

55/51778	G Holtham Will Trust
347/52129	Mr W J Houldey
512/52691	Mr M R Payne
573/50407	Mr B Ryan
720/51349	Mr A Witts
720/70154	Mr A Witts
742/52840	Ian Murray Associates
743/52897	Evans Jones
743/52898	Evans Jones
799/70245	Mr B E Russell

### Supporting Statements

153/53009	Mr I M Brown
596/52329	Mr G Siddle

### Issues

- a. Rationale of the Defined Settlement Boundary behind Corsend Stores

## CHAPTER 22 - HEWELSFIELD

### General

#### Objections

353/51619	CPRW
353/51621	CPRW

#### Issues

- a. Location of Hewelsfield within the Wye Valley AONB.
- b. Approach to preservation or enhancement of the Conservation Area and degree of improvement needed.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

32.1 The Council has agreed to alternative wording which, I consider, meets both these objections regarding the location of Hewelsfield with respect to the Wye Valley AONB and more correctly reflects the Council’s duties towards the Conservation Area.

#### Recommendation

32.2 **I recommend that the first sentence of Paragraph 22.1 modified to:**

**Hewelsfield is situated approximately 8 kilometres south of Coleford on the undulating plateau that forms part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.**

32.3 **I recommend that the last sentence of Paragraph 22.4 modified to:**

**The Plan will continue to support the preservation and, where necessary, the enhancement of the Conservation Area, as shown on Inset Map 22, together with the protection of the attractive landscape in and surrounding Hewelsfield.**

## CHAPTER 23 - HUNTLEY

### General

#### Objection

6/70385	Barratt Bristol
6/51724	Barratt Bristol
6/51731	Barratt Bristol

#### Issue

- a. Potential for housing allocation in Huntley under Policy (R)FH.3 as well as (R)FH.4.
- b. Consideration of a site for a replacement school off Byfords Road.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

##### Inclusion of Huntley in Policy (R)FH.3

- 33.1 The Revised Deposit Plan includes Huntley only under Policy (R)FH.4 which would allow infilling, small groups of dwellings or single dwellings within the Defined Settlement Boundary. [Small groups of dwellings are defined in the supporting text as groups of 12 or less].
- 33.2 The objector seeks the additional designation of the settlement under Policy (R)FH.3 which lists housing allocations in the villages. Such allocations may exceed 12 dwellings. Whether Huntley should be so listed depends in part on whether more housing is needed in the District as a whole, in part on whether Huntley is a suitable location for more housing development and finally on whether a suitable site exists for allocation. I consider below a number of omissions sites which have been proposed by objectors for allocation for housing development.
- 33.3 Huntley is a relatively large village with a population in 1995 of 840 persons. With little subsequent development, it is likely that the village population is declining as household sizes decrease in line with national trends. Huntley benefits from a reasonable range of services and community facilities. Although there is some local employment, it is likely that a high proportion of residents commute to work in other settlements and especially to Gloucester. In this location, a high proportion of the residents of any new housing development would also be likely to commute to Gloucester. This would risk undermining the Plan’s strategy to improve the balance between local employment and housing. However there is a frequent bus service as an alternative to the car and the distance travelled to Gloucester would be less than from other settlements in the District.
- 33.4 Table 3 of the Housing Chapter records an identified net affordable housing need in Huntley and the smaller settlement of Churcham of 14 dwellings. I have supported the Council’s conclusion that this represents the need for only about 5 years from the date of the Housing Needs Survey and that additional needs would be likely to arise in the subsequent 5 years up to the end of the Local Plan period. That could double the overall need. There are also high levels of recorded need across the northern part of the District as a whole. However the Revised Deposit Plan refers to a lack of outstanding housing commitments in the village. Also much of the village comprises modern closely built-up housing estates and there are few opportunities for infill

development or for other windfall development that would exceed the Plan’s 5-dwelling/0.2ha threshold for the provision of affordable housing on the negotiated share basis set out in Policy (R)FH.13. Without a substantial housing allocation, the only prospect of addressing affordable housing needs in Huntley would thus be as an exceptions site outside the Defined Settlement Boundary under Policy (R)FH.14. Such provision is uncertain as it would require both a landowner willing to make a site available at a low value and a probable need for significant public subsidy. Even if an exceptions development were to be secured, it would be unlikely to meet the entire need.

- 33.5 I have concluded in Part 1 Chapters 1 and 2 that there is a need for some additional housing allocations in villages under policy (R)FH.3 if suitable sites can be identified. I conclude that Huntley would be a suitable location and that a housing allocation including affordable housing would help to meet a local need for such housing and would help to arrest the population decline and thereby support the continued provision of local services.

#### School Site Allocation

- 33.6 The Plan should only include proposals which are likely to be implemented within the life of the Plan period. According to the Responses to Objections Document (LPD.39) at page 157, the County Council has not included a replacement school at Huntley in its programme. In these circumstances, and without any other evidence that such a development is likely to come forward, it would be inappropriate to allocate a site for such a development. It is not necessary for the Plan to set out reasons why it does not include particular development proposals.

#### Recommendation

- 33.7 **I recommend no modification to Paragraph 23.4.**

### **(R)F.Huntley 1 – Restriction on Built Development**

#### Objections

6/51749	Barratt Bristol
63/50650	Mr G Ackerman

#### Issues

- a. Policy justification.
- b. Proposed exclusion site between Horseshoe Cottage and Trewett from the policy.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 33.8 Policy (R)F.Huntley 1 seeks to restrict residential development [including infilling] to the south of the A40. The policy allows for exceptions where development would result in significant improvements to the built environment or to the amenity of the area. This was qualified by the addition of text to paragraph 23.9 at the Revised Deposit stage. The policy area lies within the Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB] for Huntley, where housing development is otherwise subject to Policy (R)FH.4. That policy allows for infilling or small groups of dwellings subject to criteria which

- include a requirement that development would be compatible with the form and character of the settlement. Other policies would allow for non-residential built development within the defined settlement boundary.
- 33.9 The policy area comprises a ribbon of frontage development along the A40 together with a further ribbon of frontage development along a lane to the south. There is one significant gap which is the subject of Objection 63/50650. A second gap in the frontage is excluded from the policy area and from the DSB. The frontages are otherwise closely built up except at the western end of the area where there are some detached residences with larger curtilages. Several of these are listed buildings. Much of the rest of the settlement outside the policy area comprises modern housing estates and there are few opportunities for infill development.
- 33.10 I consider Policy (R)F.Huntley 1 to be unsatisfactory for several reasons. Firstly it is unclear in its objectives which paragraph 23.9 only describes as to retain the area’s ‘quiet charm and character, enhanced by the presence of several listed buildings’. Secondly it applies only to residential development when other forms of built development could have an equivalent or greater impact. Thirdly it has loosely defined exceptions which are highly subjective and would invite dispute as to the meaning of terms such as ‘amenity of the area’. Fourthly it unreasonably seeks to go further even than Conservation Area designation in that the exceptions require a positive enhancement in all circumstances where residential development is to be permitted. Preserving the area’s present character would fail the policy test. Finally it is unnecessary in that Policy (R)FH.4 already requires that, to be permitted, residential development must be ‘compatible with the form and character of the settlement’ and there is a separate statutory obligation to have regard to the setting of a listed building when determining a planning application. It is for these reasons that I find in Part 1 Chapter 6 after policy (R)FBE.1 that all such policies should be deleted and appropriate textual modifications made to be read in conjunction with general protective policies.
- 33.11 The Council’s apparent objective of protecting the area’s character would be secured by properly defining in the Plan the particular characteristics of this part of Huntley which should be taken into account when applying Policy (R)FH.4 and any other relevant policies including (R)FE.4 on employment and (R)FTRL.2 on tourism, recreation and leisure. Moreover, if the subject area has a character or appearance which merits designation as a Conservation Area, then the Council should consider such a measure which would then be material to the consideration of all development proposals.
- 33.12 I conclude that Policy (R)F.Huntley 1 should be deleted and that paragraph 23.9 should be reworded to define those characteristics of the area which are to be protected when considering all new development. I proposed commensurate modification of Inset Map 23.

### **Recommendation**

33.13 **I recommend that Policy (R)F.Huntley 1 be deleted.**

33.14 **I recommend that paragraph 23.9 be modified to:**

**The area to the south of the A40 has experienced little significant development for many years. It is characterised by attractive frontage development in a variety of traditional styles with occasional open gaps which all contribute to the**

**area’s established rural character. The area also includes several listed buildings, the setting of which needs to be respected.**

---

## **Omission Site OH23.1 – Land East of Huntley**

### **Objection**

6/51754

Barratt Bristol

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

#### Defined Settlement Boundary

- 33.15 The omission site originally included an area of 7.9ha comprising a golf course and associated land in the same ownership. At the Inquiry the Objector’s representative confirmed that the objection is only to be pursued in respect of a smaller area of about 1.9ha fronting the A40. The Objector considers that this would have an estimated capacity of about 60 dwellings and 1 shop. If that were not supported, then a still smaller area of about 1ha should be considered fronting the A40 to the west of the existing access road. In either of these circumstances the associated golf course would continue to operate on land to the rear.
- 33.16 The 1.9ha site was formerly part of the golf course and includes a small disused parking area, grassland and some tree planting. However it now contains no buildings and I do not consider that it can be defined as previously developed land on the basis of being within the curtilage of the golf club buildings as these are too far away. The site is thus more appropriately defined as greenfield. However, this does not exclude the site from consideration for development as there is no evidence that suitable previously-developed land is available for a development of this scale within the current Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB]. Using the RPG10 definitions, the site is within walking distance of the bus service and of all the village services except the primary school which is 1.3km away but a similar distance from most existing housing.
- 33.17 The site is bounded to the west by allotment gardens within the DSB. To the east, part of the site would adjoin the golf course and part would adjoin the curtilage of low-density residential development outside the DSB. The site faces similar low-density development across the A40 to the south. To the north, part would adjoin the golf course and part a relatively high-density housing estate development which is within the DSB. Built development would be clearly seen in the usual public view from the A40. It would contrast with the open or low-density development to the west, east and south. However the site and its surroundings are generally flat and suburban and I do not consider that a suitably-designed housing development need be out of character with its surroundings.
- 33.18 Nevertheless, I consider that a development of the full 1.9ha would exceed the need for housing development in the area. It would link the settlement to a ribbon of low-density development to the east, greatly enlarging the apparent visual scale of the settlement and urbanising the area. In contrast, a more modest development of the western 1ha area would extend no further east than the existing housing estate to its north, and would maintain a gap on the eastern side. It would thus appear logically to round off the settlement. As there are no obvious physical constraints to

development, there would be a reasonable prospect of securing the maximum 40% provision of affordable housing. With an overall density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare that should secure at least 12 affordable dwellings which would account for most of the currently identified need in Huntley and Churcham.

- 33.19 I do not consider that it is necessary to include provision for a shop in the allocation. That would be likely to either undermine the viability of the existing village shops providing for day-to-day needs or alternatively would risk attracting an occupier providing specialist goods or services to a much wider area than the village, thereby increasing travel, especially by car.
- 33.20 Overall I conclude that the reduced 1ha site should be included for about 30 dwellings and propose commensurate modifications to Inset Map 23 and policy (R)FH.3.

### **Recommendation**

- 33.21 **I recommend that Chapter 23 be modified by the addition of the following policy:**

#### **Housing Allocation - Land fronting the A40 East of Huntley**

##### **Policy (R)F.Huntley 2**

**1ha of land immediately to the east of the allotment gardens and fronting the A40 in Huntley will be allocated for the development of 30 dwellings. The development will be required to:**

- 1. Provide an appropriate number of affordable housing units.**
- 2. Provide an appropriate contribution to educational provision for future occupiers of the site.**
- 3. Provide for safe access to the A40.**

- 33.22 **I recommend that the Plan be modified by the addition of the following paragraph 23.10.**

**The allocated site comprises a level area of land which was formerly in use as part of a golf course but is no longer needed for that use which continues on adjacent land. The allocation will address falling population in the village and will help to support local services. Some of the dwellings will help to meet an identified local need for affordable housing. The development will need to address any necessary improvements to the existing access from the A40 and any deficiency in educational provision necessary to meet the needs of the occupiers. Any other necessary contributions to meet infrastructure requirements will be addressed under other Plan policies.**

## Omission Site OH23.2 – Land to the West of Solomon’s Tump Lane

### Objection

9/52433                      Studio Azzurro Limited

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 33.23 The omission site is greenfield land in agricultural use. There is low-density residential development across Solomon’s Tump Lane to the east and a ribbon of low-density residential development runs from the site towards the main village. The site and the neighbouring development all lie outside the DSB.
- 33.24 The Plan follows the sequential approach of PPG3 in selecting sites so as to prioritise the development of urban brownfield land mainly in the towns with previously-developed sites, and where greenfield sites are more accessible by means other than the car. Only limited development is proposed in some of the larger villages to meet local needs. With the exception of a filling station which includes a small shop, all other village services in Huntley are more than 800m away and thus beyond the maximum walking distances advised by Annex A of RPG 10. The site is thus poorly located in relation to access to services and facilities by means other than the car and a more suitable site is available on the A40 east of the village [see Omission site OH23.1 above].
- 33.25 Development on this omission site would consolidate development in the open countryside and thereby urbanise the landscape to the detriment of its character. Moreover, to develop both sites would exceed local needs. I conclude that the site is not appropriate for inclusion within the DSB for development.

### Recommendation

- 33.26 **I recommend that the Land West of Solomon’s Tump Lane be not allocated for development nor included in the Defined Settlement Boundary.**

---

## Omission Site OH23.3 – Land West of Huntley

### Objection

29/51293                      Diocese of Gloucester

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 33.27 This site is a large area of agricultural land which fronts the north side of the A40 and is divided by a side road from the western edge of the built up area and the Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB]. This is a greenfield site and has not previously been developed.
- 33.28 The Plan follows the sequential approach of PPG3 in selecting sites so as to prioritise the development of urban brownfield land mainly in the towns with previously-developed sites, and where greenfield sites are more accessible by means other than the car. Only limited development is proposed in some of the larger villages to meet local needs. The site would be within walking distance of village services and facilities and is closer to the village school than is most of the built-up area. However the scale of the site would allow for development far in excess of the small groups of

dwellings which Policy (R)FH.4 would permit if the land were included in the DSB. If the site were allocated for development and developed at the densities advised by PPG3 and endorsed by other Plan policies, the total development would far exceed local needs and would be likely to draw occupiers from the towns, increasing commuting and undermining the Plan’s sustainable development objectives. Development here would also intrude into an attractive open landscape. The site would not readily be divisible to provide a smaller adequately contained development and there is a superior site with better containment elsewhere in the village [see Omission Site OH23.1 above]. I therefore that the DSB should not be modified as proposed.

### **Recommendation**

**33.29 I recommend that the Land West of Huntley be not allocated for development nor included in the Defined Settlement Boundary of Huntley.**

---

## **Omission Site OH23.4 – Land within Rear Gardens along Byfords Road**

### **Objection**

29/51305

Diocese of Gloucester

### **Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 33.30 The objection site comprises part of the rear gardens of a row of detached modern houses on the northern outskirts of the village. The Defined Settlement Boundary [DSB] has been drawn to include the houses, together with what appears to be their original garden as built, but excludes the rest of the long gardens which appear to have been added at a later date. As is typical with long domestic gardens, planting has been allowed to grow higher at a distance from the house and this attractively softens the edge of the settlement as seen from the countryside and local footpaths.
- 33.31 The objector has not suggested that the land be formally allocated for housing development. However, were the site to be included within the DSB it would become open to consideration for the development of a group of up to 12 dwellings under the provisions of Policy (R)FH.4. In practice, the arrangement of the site with multiple ownership, limited access possibilities, and potential intrusion into the outlook from the existing dwellings and the privacy of their occupiers would all be likely to severely limit the development potential. To minimise such problems, any new dwellings and access roads would be likely to be placed towards the northern edge of the site where they would intrude into views of the settlement and provide a harder edge to the village.
- 33.32 There is no evidence of support for the objection from landowners other than the objector and it may be in practice that development would only be sought at the western end of the row where the objector is the freeholder. That site is itself traversed by a public footpath. Development there would extend built development along a country lane to the detriment of the landscape setting of the village. I conclude that no modification should be made to the DSB.

## Recommendation

- 33.33 **I recommend that the Land within Rear Gardens along Byfords Road be not included in the Defined Settlement Boundary of Huntley.**

## Omission Site OH23.5 – Land South of the A40

### Objection

63/50647                      Mr G Ackerman

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 33.34 The objector is evidently seeking a residential development on this site. The site is too small to be considered as a housing allocation. However I have recommended above that Policy (R)F.Huntley 1 be deleted. Any planning application for housing development within the Defined Settlement Boundary would fall to be considered under other Plan policies which would, amongst other criteria, require consideration of the effect of the development on the character of its surroundings and whether suitable access is available. No further modification of the Plan is necessary in direct response to this objection.

### Recommendation

- 33.35 **I recommend no modification in response to this objection.**

## Inset Map 23 - Huntley

### Objections

6/51754	Barratt Bristol
9/52433	Studio Azzurro Limited
29/51293	Diocese of Gloucester
29/51305	Diocese of Gloucester
63/50647	Mr G Ackerman

### Issue

See Policy (R)F.Huntley 1 and Omission Sites above.

### Recommendation

- 33.36 **I recommend that Inset Map 23 be modified by deletion of reference to Policy (R)F.Huntley 1.**
- 33.37 **I recommend that Insert Map 23 be modified by the extension of the DSB and indication of the housing allocation recommended in connection with Omission site OH23.1 above.**

## CHAPTER 24 - KEMPLEY GREEN

### Inset Map 24 Kempley Green

#### Objection

235/52456

Kempley Parish Council

#### Issues

Development density having regard to past infilling.

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 34.1 Kempley Green is a small village that is listed under Policy (R)FH.5, allowing for very limited infill development provided the form and character of the village would not be affected. Given the very limited nature of services in the village and its relative isolation, I consider that this listing is appropriate. I note that the Defined Settlement Boundary has been drawn very tightly around the main developed village core and therefore the opportunity for further development is restricted. I do not therefore consider that development controlled by policy FH.5 would cause a detrimental increase in the density of the village and I propose no modification to this chapter.

#### Recommendation

- 34.2 **I recommend no modification to the Chapter 24 - Kempley Green.**
-

## CHAPTER 25 - LITTLEDEAN

### General

#### Objections

119/50332	Mr J Birtle
744/53001	Holyer Purchase Design
744/53002	Holyer Purchase Design

#### Issues

These objections are site-specific and I deal with them in connection with the omission sites below.

---

### Policy (R)F.Littledean 1 – Court Farm Garage Employment Site Omission Site OH25.1 – Littledean

#### Objections

641/51584	Messrs Taylor & Thorpe
-----------	------------------------

#### Supporting Statements

786/70174	A & S Motor Services
-----------	----------------------

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 35.1 This existing employment site lies within the Littledean Conservation Area at the north western edge of the Defined Settlement Boundary. Its retention for employment under this policy is supported by the Council and others. However, it evidently has potential, as previously developed land, for sustainable mixed development that could enhance the Conservation Area.
- 35.2 I have concluded in relation to the strategic and general housing policies of Part 1 of the Plan that the broad distribution of development throughout the settlements of the District is appropriate, albeit identifying a need for some additional housing sites in larger villages. Littledean, population around 750, is identified in policy (R)FH.4 as a village where residential infilling is appropriate and there is some ongoing housing development. However, there few employment opportunities, save for the relatively low-key provision on the Court Farm site itself. I therefore see no pressing need for a specific residential allocation in Littledean at the expense of employment.
- 35.3 In any event, alternative mixed residential and employment uses, as proposed by the objector, might be considered under policy (R)FE.3 if the site were to become underused, or new mixed development would use the site more efficiently. For that policy to act, the protection of policy (R)F.Littledean 1 would need to be removed. That would not inevitably lead to its loss to employment but would open up the potential for the land to find its optimum use. In the circumstances I consider the preferable option to be the simple deletion of policy (R)F.Littledean 1; that is without converting it to the housing or mixed use allocation sought in the objection.

#### Recommendation

- 35.4 **I recommend that Policy (R)F.Littledean 1 be deleted.**

---

## Omission Site OH25.2 – Land at Littledean Hill Road

### Objection

333/52149

Mr P Hicks

### Reasoning and Conclusions

35.5 The land rises prominently outside the settlement boundary and is part of the essentially rural setting of the Littledean Conservation Area. I consider that to incorporate it within the Defined Settlement Boundary for development would be unacceptably harmful to the appearance and character of the locality.

### Recommendation

35.6 **I recommend that the land at Littledean Hill be not included within the Defined Settlement Boundary nor allocated for development.**

---

## Omission Site OH25.3 – Land West of Silver Street

### Objection

119/50331

Mr J Birtle

### Reasoning and Conclusions

35.7 The land has no clear means of access and lies in a highly visible open area outside the built settlement. If new development could be achieved it would consolidate the urban edge of the village, contrary to the linear settlement pattern within the Littledean Conservation Area, harming the appearance and character of the locality. In the absence of an overriding need for additional housing allocations in the village, this greenfield land should remain outside the Defined Settlement Boundary.

### Recommendation

35.8 **I recommend that the land West of Silver Street be not included within the Defined Settlement Boundary nor allocated for development.**

---

## Omission Site OH25.4 – Land at Church Farm

### Objection

744/52999

Holyer Purchase Design

### Reasoning and Conclusions

35.9 Currently in agricultural use and prominently visible outside the built settlement, this land is not strictly to be regarded as previously developed in the terms of PPG3 and, in the absence of a clear need for an urban extension to Littledean, it is unsuitable for housing.

### Recommendation

35.10 **I recommend that the Land at Church Farm be not included within the Defined Settlement Boundary nor allocated for development.**

## Omission Site OH 25.5 – Land off Oakway

### Objection

744/53000 Holyer Purchase Design

### Reasoning and Conclusions

35.11 This site comprises over 5ha of agricultural grazing land outside the village north of the Folders development, with potential capacity for some 150 dwellings. It might be seen as potentially offering a logical extension to that development if it were needed. On the contrary though, I have concluded elsewhere that there is no such need identified. Accordingly it would not be appropriate to allocate this land as a major greenfield urban extension to the comparatively small village of Littledean, especially as it contributes prominently to the rustic surroundings of this attractive settlement.

### Recommendation

35.12 **I recommend that the Land off Oakway be not included within the Defined Settlement Boundary nor allocated for development.**

## Inset Map 25 - Littledean

### Objections

119/50331	Mr J Birtle
333/52149	Mr P Hicks
641/51584	Messrs Taylor & Thorpe
715/52807	Littledean Parish Council
744/52999	Holyer Purchase Design
744/53000	Holyer Purchase Design

### Supporting Statement

131/70143 Mr B L & Mrs A Boseley

### Reasoning and Conclusions

35.13 These objections are covered in connection with policy (R)F.Littledean 1 and Omission Sites OH25.1-5 above.

35.14 I make a single recommendation in consequence.

### Recommendation

35.15 **I recommend that Inset Map 25 be modified by deleting reference to policy (R)F.Littledean 1.**