



W/518/65

H.C.C.  
Code No. W/1923/63

L.A.  
Ref. No. 5243

**ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY OF HERTFORD**

The Council of the ~~BOROUGH OF~~ .....  
~~URBAN DISTRICT OF~~ .....  
RURAL DISTRICT OF Hemel Hempstead.

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1962**

To Chipperfield Gun Club,  
The Windmill,  
Chipperfield.

Proposed occasional use of agricultural land as a clay  
pigeon shoot and the erection of a shelter  
at Game Farm, Bovington, Herts.  
(Part Parcel 133 on OS.HERTS.XXXV111 5 & 9)

Brief  
description  
and location  
of proposed  
development.

In pursuance of their delegated powers under the above-mentioned Act and the Orders and Regulations for the time being in force thereunder, the Council on behalf of the Local Planning Authority hereby refuse the development proposed by you in your application dated 19/8/63 and received with sufficient particulars on 20/8/63 and shewn on the plan(s) accompanying such application.

The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse permission for the development are:—

The noise particularly on Saturdays and Sundays during the last twelve months resulting from the use of the application site for clay pigeon shooting has had a serious effect upon the amenities of considerable areas of Bovington and Flaunden in the Hemel Hempstead rural district and in the Ley Hill area of the Parish of Ashley Green in the Amersham rural district and the use should be discontinued.

Dated 5th day of January 1965

*W. W. Shaw*  
Clerk/Surveyor of the Council.

NOTE.

(1) If the applicant wishes to have an explanation of the reasons for this refusal it will be given on request and a meeting arranged if necessary.

(2) If the Applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the local planning authority to refuse permission or approval for the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, he may by notice served within one month of receipt of this notice, appeal to the Minister of Housing and Local Government in accordance with Section 23 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962. The Minister has power to allow a longer period for the giving of a Notice of Appeal and he will exercise his power in cases where he is satisfied that the applicant has deferred the giving of notice because negotiations with the local planning authority in regard to the proposed development are in progress. The Minister is not, however, required to entertain such an appeal if it appears to him that permission for the proposed development could not have been granted by the local planning authority, or could not have been so granted otherwise than subject to the conditions imposed by them, having regard to the provision of Section 17(1), 18(1) and 38 of the Act and of the Development Order and to any directions given under the Order.

(3) If permission to develop land is refused, or granted subject to conditions, whether by the local planning authority or by the Minister of Housing and Local Government, and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, he may serve on the Council of the County District in which the land is situated a purchase notice requiring that Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with Section 129 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962.

(4) In certain circumstances, a claim may be made against the local planning authority or the Minister of Housing and Local Government for compensation, where permission is refused, or granted subject to conditions by the Minister on appeal or on a reference of the application to him. The circumstances in which such compensation is payable are set out in Section 123 and Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962.

H.C.C.  
Code No. W/518/65  
L.A.  
Ref. No. 5607

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY OF HERTFORD

The Council of the BOROUGH OF  
URBAN DISTRICT OF  
RURAL DISTRICT OF Hemel Hempstead.

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1962

To Chipperfield Gun Club,  
The Windmill,  
Windmill Hill,  
Chipperfield.

Use of land for Clay Pigeon shoot  
at Game Farm, Bovingdon, Herts.  
(Part Parcel 133 on OS.HERTS.XXXV111.5 & 1.)

Brief description and location of proposed development.

In pursuance of their delegated powers under the above-mentioned Act and the Orders and Regulations for the time being in force thereunder, the Council on behalf of the Local Planning Authority hereby refuse the development proposed by you in your application dated 7/12/64 and received with sufficient particulars on 19/2/65 and shewn on the plan(s) accompanying such application.

The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse permission for the development are:—

The noise, particularly on Saturdays and Sundays during the 12 months preceeding the application, resulting from the use of the application site for clay pigeon shooting has had a serious effect on the amenities of considerable areas of Bovingdon and Flaunden in the Hemel Hempstead Rural District and in the Ley Hill area of the Parish of Ashley Green in the Amerzham Rural District and the use should be discontinued.

Dated 20th day of July 1965

*S. A. F. [Signature]*  
Clerk/Surveyor of the Council.

NOTE.

(1) If the applicant wishes to have an explanation of the reasons for this refusal it will be given on request and a meeting arranged if necessary.

(2) If the Applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the local planning authority to refuse permission or approval for the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, he may by notice served within one month of receipt of this notice, appeal to the Minister of Housing and Local Government in accordance with Section 23 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962. The Minister has power to allow a longer period for the giving of a Notice of Appeal and he will exercise his power in cases where he is satisfied that the applicant has deferred the giving of notice because negotiations with the local planning authority in regard to the proposed development are in progress. The Minister is not, however, required to entertain such an appeal if it appears to him that permission for the proposed development could not have been granted by the local planning authority, or could not have been so granted otherwise than subject to the conditions imposed by them, having regard to the provision of Section 17(1), 18(1) and 38 of the Act and of the Development Order and to any directions given under the Order.

(3) If permission to develop land is refused, or granted subject to conditions, whether by the local planning authority or by the Minister of Housing and Local Government, and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, he may serve on the Council of the County District in which the land is situated a purchase notice requiring that Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with Section 129 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962.

(4) In certain circumstances, a claim may be made against the local planning authority or the Minister of Housing and Local Government for compensation, where permission is refused, or granted subject to conditions by the Minister on appeal or on a reference of the application to him. The circumstances in which such compensation is payable are set out in Section 123 and Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962.

H.C.C. Code No.	W/518/65
L.A. Ref. No.	5607

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY OF HERTFORD

The Council of the BOROUGH OF  
URBAN DISTRICT OF  
 RURAL DISTRICT OF Hemel Hempstead.

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1962

To  
 Chipperfield Gun Club,  
 The Windmill,  
 Windmill Hill,  
 Chipperfield.

Use of land for Clay Pigeon shoot  
 at Game Farm, Bovington, Herts.  
 (Part Parcel 133 on OS. HERTS. XXXV111.5 & 1.)

Brief  
 description  
 and location  
 of proposed  
 development.

In pursuance of their delegated powers under the above-mentioned Act and the Orders and Regulations for the time being in force thereunder, the Council on behalf of the Local Planning Authority hereby refuse the development proposed by you in your application dated 7/12/64 and received with sufficient particulars on 19/2/65 and shewn on the plan(s) accompanying such application.

The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse permission for the development are:—

The noise, particularly on Saturdays and Sundays during the 12 months preceding the application, resulting from the use of the application site for clay pigeon shooting has had a serious effect on the amenities of considerable areas of Bovington and Flaunden in the Hemel Hempstead Rural District and in the Ley Hill area of the Parish of Ashley Green in the Amerham Rural District and the use should be discontinued.

Dated 20th day of July 1965

*W.A.F. Long*  
 Clerk/Surveyor of the Council.

NOTE.

(1) If the applicant wishes to have an explanation of the reasons for this refusal it will be given on request and a meeting arranged if necessary.

(2) If the Applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the local planning authority to refuse permission or approval for the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, he may by notice served within one month of receipt of this notice, appeal to the Minister of Housing and Local Government in accordance with Section 23 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962. The Minister has power to allow a longer period for the giving of a Notice of Appeal and he will exercise his power in cases where he is satisfied that the applicant has deferred the giving of notice because negotiations with the local planning authority in regard to the proposed development are in progress. The Minister is not, however, required to entertain such an appeal if it appears to him that permission for the proposed development could not have been granted by the local planning authority, or could not have been so granted otherwise than subject to the conditions imposed by them, having regard to the provision of Section 17(1), 18(1) and 38 of the Act and of the Development Order and to any directions given under the Order.

(3) If permission to develop land is refused, or granted subject to conditions, whether by the local planning authority or by the Minister of Housing and Local Government, and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, he may serve on the Council of the County District in which the land is situated a purchase notice requiring that Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with Section 129 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962.

(4) In certain circumstances, a claim may be made against the local planning authority or the Minister of Housing and Local Government for compensation, where permission is refused, or granted subject to conditions by the Minister on appeal or on a reference of the application to him. The circumstances in which such compensation is payable are set out in Section 123 and Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962.

HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
HEMEL HEMPTSTEAD RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL

APPEAL

by

CHIPPERFIELD GUN CLUB

Inspector: K. M. Sargeant, M.A., F.R.I.C.S.  
Date of Inquiry: 9th February 1966.  
File No: APP/2142/A/13.

Whitehall,

London, S.W.1.

28th February 1966.

To The Right Honourable Richard Crossman, O.B.E., M.P.,  
Minister of Housing and Local Government.

Sir,

I have the honour to report that on Wednesday 9th February 1966 I held an inquiry at the Old Town Hall, Hemel Hempstead, into an appeal by the Chipperfield Gun Club under section 23 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1962, against the refusal of the Hemel Hempstead Rural District Council, acting on behalf of the Hertfordshire County Council, to permit the use of land as a clay pigeon shoot and the erection of a shelter at Game Farm, Bovington.

1. The Reasons for Refusal are:-

The noise, particularly on Saturdays and Sundays during the twelve months preceding the application, resulting from the use of the application site for clay pigeon shooting has had a serious effect on the amenities of considerable areas of Bovington and Flaunden in the Hemel Hempstead Rural District and in the Leyhill area of the parish of Ashley Green in the Amersham Rural District and the use should be discontinued.

2. This report includes a description of the appeal site and surroundings, the gist of the representations made at the inquiry, and my findings of fact, conclusions and recommendation. Lists of appearances, documents and plans are attached.

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

3. The site is in attractive, undulating, well-wooded countryside about 4 miles south-west of the centre of Hemel Hempstead. It comprises approximately 9 acres of pasture and lies a short distance south-east of the farmhouse and buildings of Game Farm. Four clay pigeon traps are spaced across the field from north-east to south-west, and an old vehicle body, used as a shelter, stands close to the western boundary. (Plan B).

4. The site is bounded on the east by woodland (Simon Dean's Wood) and elsewhere by agricultural land. It occupies a sloping, elevated position on the north-east side of a dry valley which winds in a general southerly direction towards Latimer, some 2 miles distant.

5. To the north of the site, the land rises to an extensive plateau, about 500 feet above sea level, on which is situated Bovington Airfield (R.A.F.). On the western side of the valley, opposite the site, the land rises steeply to Leyhill Common where there is a golf course.

6. Between  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile from the site, there are a number of scattered farmsteads and houses; these include groups of dwellings at Pudd's Cross to the north, in the vicinity of Shantock Hall to the north-east, along Long Lane to the east, and at



Hogspit to the south-east. The nearest villages are Leyhill about  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile to the west, Flaunden about 1 mile to the south-east, and Bovington about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles to the north-east. (Plan A).

7. Two narrow unmade tracks, each about 250 yards long, provide vehicular access to Game Farm: one leads south-eastwards off the Bovington - Leyhill road and the other leads south-westwards off a narrow lane which connects this road with Flaunden. A very rough, muddy track runs from the farmstead to the north-west corner of the appeal site.

#### CASE FOR THE APPELLANTS

The material points were:-

8. Mr. J. Smith, who represented the appellants at the inquiry, said he had first joined the club about six years ago when it had operated at Bedmond (in Watford rural district). Because of objections from nearby residents, the club had voluntarily moved to Flaunden chalk pit (about  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile east of the appeal site, plan A); their activities here had also been subject to local objections, which the club had again felt to be reasonable so, once more, they had moved, this time to the appeal site.

9. In December 1963, they had obtained temporary planning consent, expiring 31st December 1964, subject to a condition that there should be no shooting on Sunday afternoons; this condition had been discharged by the Minister (APP/2142A/79288). The application which was now under appeal was intended as a request for a renewal of planning permission for a further six years, i.e. until 31st December 1970. If the appeal were allowed, the club would wish to erect a permanent shelter to replace their existing temporary structure.

10. Recently, in an attempt to satisfy the local residents, the club had tried shooting on Saturdays instead of Sundays but their membership had dropped to about thirty four. Sunday shooting had now been resumed; shooting had never taken place on both Saturday and Sunday in the same weekend.

11. About seven or eight members came from London, and about the same number from Watford; the rest were fairly local people but only four came from Flaunden, Leyhill, Bovington and Hogspit. It was not intended to expand the membership beyond a maximum of forty. Normally, an attendance of fifteen was required at a meeting in order to cover expenses; the average attendance used to be fourteen but was now reduced to about six. Each man usually fired forty four shots.

12. The club had never had meetings on weekday evenings and any shots heard then must have been from illicit or authorised game shooting. During their occupation of Flaunden chalk pit, there had been no club shooting on Sunday mornings or evenings because of the proximity of Flaunden Church; they had continued this practice at their present site, purely out of respect. The hours of shooting were 2.30. to 4.30.p.m. except once a year, on open days, when it continued to 5.30.-6.00.p.m.; non-members were allowed to shoot on open days provided they brought their own guns.

13. The club wished to continue to shoot on Sunday afternoons and would like to have a practice shoot on a weekday evening, once a fortnight. If the Minister considered it necessary, however, the club would accept a condition restricting shooting solely to two hours a week, preferably on Sunday afternoons or, in the last resort, on Saturday afternoons.

14. The club had spent £70-£80 on the approach road to the site and about £100 on traps, since their previous successful appeal.

15. The appeal site was ideal from the point of view of public safety. It was out of range of people on the highway and there were no public footpaths in the vicinity. Shooting on the site did not affect its usefulness for agriculture. There had already been some loss of amenity in the area because nearby land (marked on plan A) was used for the disposal of cesspool sewage.

16. Regarding the effect of noise on residential amenities, the appellants relied on the conclusions of the inspector in the previous appeal, as given in paragraph 37 of his report. If the club had felt there was really a noise nuisance, they would not be fighting the present appeal.

17. On the Sunday afternoon before the present inquiry, Mr. Smith had toured the surrounding district while eight members had been shooting at the site, with the following results (places marked on plan A):-

Leyhill Common: shooting not heard from the crossroads and had not become audible until he had reached the golf course car-park from where the appeal site could be seen across the valley.

Flaunden chalk pit: no noise heard; wind light from the south-west.

Flaunden village crossroads: shooting noise apparent, sounding like the light clap of hands; thirty cars and two horses passed by during his ten-minute stop.

Maulden's Farm: in the path of the wind; noise apparent but no more than that often heard from other forms of shooting at weekends.

Shantock Hall: noise of shooting not heard.

The noise could not be heard to windward of the site and, counting the eight points of the compass, there was only one chance in eight of hearing the shooting at any one place.

18. Apart from the appellants' activities, there was a lot of other shooting in the area. Two organised shoots shot over the land on Saturdays and there was also some illicit shooting on the appeal site itself; the traps had not yet been securely locked and occasionally unauthorised persons used them after 4.30 p.m. A further noise nuisance arose on weekdays from the clatter of machinery at the chalk workings.

19. The multiple shots of up to five at a time, in the 4.30 p.m. extract of Mr. Franklin's tape recording (paragraph 30 below), were not understood; they were certainly not fired by members of the club and must have been the result of illicit shooting by non-members.

20. The club had tried to find an alternative site and had looked at two places at Bingham Park, on the far side of Hemel Hempstead. They would have tried harder in their search, if they had felt that the use of their present site really injured residential amenities.

21. Two local residents had written to the council in support of the club (document 3). There were some other local people who did not oppose the club but they had not been prepared to attend the inquiry for fear of being ostracised.

## CASE FOR THE COUNCIL

The material points were:-

22. The site had been used as a clay pigeon shoot by the appellants for some time prior to the submission of their original application in August 1963. In view of complaints then received, particularly regarding Sunday shooting, the council had granted a temporary consent in December 1963 for one year, subject to a condition prohibiting shooting between 2 and 5 p.m. on Sundays. The club had, however, appealed against this condition and the Minister had discharged it.

23. In December 1964, the club had applied for the renewal of their temporary permission but this had been refused by the council because of the large number of local objections. The club had appealed but, as their application had not been accompanied by a section 16 notice, the Minister had been unable to accept jurisdiction. The club had then submitted a new application together with the relevant section 16 notice; this had again been refused by the council, resulting in the present appeal.

24. The council considered that their decision to limit the original consent to one year had been sound in that it had allowed further thought to be given to the matter in the light of the experience gained during the first twelve months of the club's activities. As a result of these activities, the volume of protest by local residents had increased considerably since the first appeal; the protests were now not only against Sunday afternoon shooting but against shooting at any time.

25. The occupants of dwellings situated in the surrounding area were entitled to as much consideration as members of the club. The amenities of the area would be affected if residents were unable to enjoy quiet leisure and were forced to suffer the noise caused by the shooting. As a result of the experience gained during the period of temporary consent, the club should now find a more isolated area for their activities. The council's witness was unable to suggest a suitable alternative site in Hemel Hempstead rural district.

26. A greater number of local residents had been informed about the present appeal than the previous one. A total of twenty four letters had been received, twenty two objecting to the proposal and only two supporting it (documents 3, 4).

## CASE FOR THE LOCAL RESIDENTS OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSAL

The material points were:-

27. Representations were made on behalf of approximately 150 objectors (document 5), of whom about seventy were resident in Leyhill and the rest mainly in Flaunden, Bovington and Hogspit.

28. The previous inquiry had taken place when many local residents had been on holiday; there had been only two objectors. The present appeal had been given more publicity by the council and, in addition, a public meeting of local people had been organised (document 6). As a result of this meeting, a petition objecting to the renewal of the gun club's planning permission had been signed by about 150 residents (document 7). Two letters had been received from objectors who were unable to attend the inquiry (document 8).

29. The site was in a particularly attractive area of rural England which, though within the metropolitan green belt, contained many scattered houses and communities. The noise of the shooting had affected a great number of residents, some of whom were invalids, and had made it impossible for them to enjoy the peacefulness and quietness which they would otherwise have found in their gardens. During club meetings, the shooting continued at the rate of about ten shots a minute but it was the irregularity and sharpness of the reports which most residents found particularly distressing. This part of the Chilterns seemed to have unusual acoustic properties and noises travelled clearly for many miles; for instance, the main line railway trains at King's Langley, some five miles distant, could often be heard clearly. The contours of the area around the appeal site appeared to amplify the sound of the shooting rather than deaden it as had been suggested by the inspector in the previous appeal (report, paragraph 37).

30. Two extracts from a tape recording, made on Sunday 30th January 1966 by Mr. M. Franklin in the garden at Shantock Hall (about  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile east of the appeal site, plans A; C), were played at the inquiry; there had been a slight westerly wind at the time of the recording. The first extract, recorded about 4.30.p.m., comprised a series of single and multiple shots (up to five at a time) fired at frequent intervals; the other extract, recorded about 2.30.p.m., comprised a series of double shots at the same sort of frequency.

31. The following points were made by individual objectors:-

- (a) Mr. W. Williams of The Rosery, Hogspit (about  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile east-south-east of the appeal site, plans A, C) said that the noise of the shooting gave him a splitting headache and forced him to retire indoors; when meetings were taking place, he could even hear the calling of the clays.
- (b) Mr. M. Franklin, of Shantock Hall, said the noise was becoming increasingly intolerable; he could hear the clay pigeon shooting from inside his house as well as from his garden.
- (c) Mr. A. F. Ghysens, of Swyncombe, Long Lane (about  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile east of the site, plans A, C) had lived in his house for thirty five years and liked the area very much but would be forced to leave if the shooting were allowed to continue.
- (d) Mrs. M. Lloyd, of Frith Cottage, Flaunden (about 1 mile south-east of the site, plans A, C), said she worked in noisy surroundings during the week and had specifically taken her cottage in order to seek peace and quiet. The noise of shooting at weekends undermined the whole purpose of her living in the area; she found it impossible to relax, and waiting for the next shot made her feel all tensed up.
- (e) Mr. C. D. Lucas, of Tall Firs, Leyhill (about  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile west of the site, plans A, D), said the noise could be heard particularly loudly in Leyhill if there was an easterly wind.

32. Very few of the club members lived in the immediate vicinity and at least half came from London or Watford. The club's activities made no constructive contribution whatsoever to the national or local interest, to agriculture, or to the amenities and facilities of the area. If the appeal were allowed, club membership would rise and shooting would take place more frequently; this would not only increase the noise nuisance but also attract additional traffic to the narrow country lanes.

Furthermore, it was clear that the club was unable to control unauthorised shooting at the site, and this extra nuisance would also continue if the club remained. Any hardship suffered by the club in ceasing its activities would be minimal compared with that now suffered by local residents in the loss of residential amenity and financially in the lowering of property values which was bound to result from a continuation of the noise nuisance. All the objectors were agreed that no compromise was possible; no clay pigeon shooting whatsoever should be allowed at the appeal site and the club ought to move elsewhere to a more appropriate place.

33. In his book "Clay Pigeon Shooting" published in 1964, Mr. F. M. MacFarlane, an accepted authority on the subject, said that a whole day's game shooting could be concentrated into ten minutes of clay shooting (page 61); this gave an idea of the rate of shooting which could be expected of club members. In the same book on page 59, the author pointed out that no clay pigeon club could function well if its members felt their activities were likely to cause a nuisance.

34. It was hardly surprising that the appellants had found difficulty in obtaining an alternative site, but, even so, there were several possibilities they could consider. These included two existing gun club grounds near Northolt, a disused airfield at Leavesden (near Watford) which was now partly used for engine testing, and somewhere on the more remote fringe of Bovingdon airfield.

35. None of the objectors' witnesses thought that, if a local resident had supported the appellants at the inquiry, he would have been ostracised as had been suggested by Mr. Smith (paragraph 21 above).

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

36. I find the following facts:-

- (1) The site is in an undulating, rural area; within  $\frac{1}{4}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile radius of the site are a number of scattered dwellings including groups at Pudds Cross (to the north), Shantock Hall (to the north-east), along Long Lane (to the east), and at Hogspit (to the south-east).
- (2) The nearest villages are Leyhill (about  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile to the west), Flaunden (about 1 mile to the south-east), and Bovingdon (about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles to the north-east).
- (3) Temporary planning permission for a clay pigeon shoot was granted for twelve months in December 1963; a condition preventing shooting between 2 and 5 p.m. on Sundays was discharged by the Minister on appeal following an inquiry, held in July 1964, at which there were only two local objectors.
- (4) The appellants now wish to renew their permission for six years.
- (5) The appellants do not intend increasing the present club membership of thirty four beyond a limit of forty; about half the members live in the district and the rest in London and Watford; the attendance at shoots varies between about six and fourteen.
- (6) Since the previous appeal, shooting has taken place in the afternoons on Sundays or, less frequently, on Saturdays; each man usually fires forty four shots; there has been no shooting on weekdays.

- (7) Subject to the direction of the wind, the noise of shooting can be clearly heard from Leyhill, Flaunden and from the various scattered dwellings within a radius of  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile of the site.
- (8) The renewal of planning permission is strongly opposed by about 150 persons who mostly live within a mile of the site; of twenty four letters received by the council, two favour and twenty two oppose the renewal of consent.
- (9) The appellants are prepared to restrict future shooting to two hours a week, preferably on Sunday afternoons or, in the last resort, on Saturday afternoons.

#### CONCLUSIONS

37. Bearing in mind the above findings of fact, I have no doubt that, while the effect on the individual of the noise of shooting at the appeal site must obviously vary according to the nature and sensitiveness of the person concerned, a relatively large number of the local residents are seriously affected by it. The experience gained since the last inquiry, and the volume of the opposition at the present inquiry, make it quite clear in my opinion that it would not be in the general public interest to allow the use to continue. Even a restriction to not more than two hours shooting a week, whether it be on Saturdays or Sundays, would still result in considerable distress to those residents who are particularly sensitive to this sort of noise.

38. There seems no special reason why the gun club should be located on this particular site and it should not be impossible to find a better place where its activities will do less harm to residential amenity.

#### RECOMMENDATION

39. That the appeal be dismissed.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,  
Your obedient Servant,

K. M. Sargeant.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANTS

Mr. J. Smith

He called no witnesses.

FOR THE PLANNING AUTHORITY

Mr. W. A. F. Sharp

He called:

Mr. I. Wilson, B.Sc.,  
A.M.I.C.E., A.M.I.Min.E.

INTERESTED PERSONS

Mr. P. J. Purton, Solicitor

He called:

Mr. M. Franklin

Mr. A. F. Ghysens

Mrs. M. Lloyd

Mr. C. D. S. Lucas

Mr. W. Williams

- Safety Officer, Chipperfield  
Gun Club.

- Clerk to the district council.

- Engineer and Surveyor.

- of Messrs. Norton, Rose,  
Botterell and Roche, Kempson  
House, Camomile Street, E.C.3.  
representing approximately 150  
local objectors.

- of Shantock Hall, Bovingdon.

- of Swyncombe, Long Lane, Bovingdon.

- of Frith Cottage, Flaunden.

- of Tall Firs, Leyhill.

- of The Rosery, off Long Lane,  
Hogspit.

DOCUMENTS

- Document 1 - List of persons present at the inquiry.
- Document 2 - Notice of inquiry and list of addressees.
- Document 3 - Two letters from local residents, addressed to the council, supporting the appellant.
- Document 4 - Twenty two letters from local residents addressed to the council, objecting to the proposal.
- Document 5 - List of approximately 150 local residents, represented by Mr. Purton.
- Document 6 - Copy of circular sent to local residents by Mr. W. Williams.
- Document 7 - Petition, signed by approximately 150 residents, objecting to the proposal.
- Document 8 - Two letters from local residents, addressed to the objectors' solicitors, opposing the proposal.

PLANS

- PLAN A - Six-inch plan of site and surroundings.
- PLAN B - 1/2500 plan of site.
- PLANS C, D, E - 1/2,500 plans of area showing the properties of the objectors.



MINISTRY OF HOUSING & LOCAL GOVERNMENT

REF W/518-65  
APP/2142/A/13

27th April, 1966.



Sir,

Town and Country Planning Act 1962; Section 23  
Appeal by the Chipperfield Gun Club  
Land at Game Garm, Chipperfield

I am directed by the Minister of Housing and Local Government to say that consideration has been given to the report of his Inspector, Mr. K.M. Sargeant, M.A., F.R.I.C.S., who held a local inquiry into the appeal by Chipperfield Gun Club against the decision of the Hemel Hempstead Rural District Council, acting on behalf of the Hertfordshire County Council, to refuse planning permission for the use of the land described in the heading to this letter for a clay pigeon shoot and for the erection of a shelter.

2. The Inspector in his report, a copy of which is enclosed, said that he had no doubt that, while the effect on the individual of the noise of shooting at the appeal site must obviously vary according to the nature and sensitiveness of the person concerned, a relatively large number of the local residents were seriously affected by it. The experience gained since the previous inquiry, and the volume of the opposition at the present inquiry, made it quite clear that it would not be in the general public interest to allow the use to continue. Even a restriction to not more than two hours' shooting a week, whether it be on Saturdays or Sundays, would still result in considerable distress to those residents who were particularly sensitive to that sort of noise. There seemed to be no special reason why the gun club should be located on that particular site and it should not be impossible to find a better place where its activities would do less harm to residential amenity. The Inspector recommended that the appeal be dismissed.

3. The Minister agrees with the Inspector's conclusions and accepts his recommendation. Accordingly he hereby dismisses the appeal.

I am, Sir,  
Your obedient Servant,

(H. C. HOLLINGTON)

Authorised by the Minister  
to sign in that behalf.

E.J. Sellwood Esq.,  
The Moorings,  
Scatterdells Lane,  
CHIPPERFIELD,  
Herts.