



Chipperfield Parish Council,
The Village Hall The Common, Chipperfield
Herts
WD4J 9BS
Tel : 01923 263 901

Email : parishclerk@chipperfield.org.uk
website: www.chipperfieldparishcouncil.gov.uk

Minutes of the meeting of the CPC Planning Committee held on Tuesday 2nd June 2026 at 7.15 pm at The Blackwells, The Common WD4 9BS

Councillors Present: Geoff Bryant **Chairman**, Cllr Kevan Cassidy, Cllr Eamonn Flynn, and Cllr M Paton.

Also present: Mrs U Kilich Proper Officer and two members of the public.

12/26 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building to be evacuated.

13/26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To accept and approve apologies for absence.

There were no apologies for absence to record.

Resolved, proposed by Cllr Cassidy, seconded by Cllr Flynn to approve the apologies for absence from Cllr Hinton and Cllr Foxall. Unanimously agreed. Apologies for absence also received from Borough Councillor P Walker.

14/26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any pecuniary interests relating to items on the agenda.

A member, when declaring their registrable pecuniary or significant interest in a matter must leave the meeting but may remain in the public room when the matter is being discussed.

There were no declarations of interest to record.

15/26 Public Participation

The Chair may at their discretion and at a convenient time in the transaction of business invite members of the public to speak in relation to the business to be transacted at the meeting. Speeches may not exceed three minutes. If several residents wish to make a statement on the same matter, it is suggested that they agree by prior arrangement to speak on their behalf. Anyone wishing to speak is invited to contact the Clerk prior to the start of the meeting and advise on which subject they wish to talk about. Alternatively, a short statement may be read out on the participant's behalf and in accordance with the above stipulations. Statements must be submitted to the Clerk before 12 noon on the day of the meeting.

16/26 MINUTES To approve the minutes of the meeting being held on 12 May 2026

Resolved, proposed by Cllr Cassidy, seconded by Cllr Paton to approve the minutes of 12th May 2026 as a true representation of the meeting. Unanimously agreed.

17/26 CHAIRS REPORT & CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

Correspondence received regarding an application for the Land Northwest of the Paddocks.

18/26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS To discuss and comment on the following.

Reference: 26/01010/FUL

Address: Land Northwest of The Paddocks And The Old Stables, Croft Lane, Chipperfield, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire

Proposal: Construction of 1 X 2 bed dwelling and 3 X 4 bed detached dwellings, with associated parking, refuse facilities, and hard and soft landscaping

CPC: OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

CPC strongly object to the proposed development and respectfully request that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out below.

1. Failure to Comply with Green Belt Policy CS6 – Limited Infilling Exception

The Applicant contends that the proposal falls within the Green Belt exception for "limited infilling in a village". However, the proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of adopted Core Strategy Policy CS6 and therefore constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Policy CS6 identifies specific circumstances where development may be acceptable within Selected Small Villages in the Green Belt. Under exception (b), the policy permits only:

"limited infilling with affordable housing for local people."

Paragraph 8.34 of the Core Strategy provides a clear definition of "limited infilling". It states that infilling must occur within a gap in a clearly identifiable built-up frontage and expressly excludes tandem development. Furthermore, the policy defines "limited" as development creating no more than two additional dwellings.

The proposal fails to satisfy these requirements for several reasons:

- The application site lies outside the defined settlement boundary of Chipperfield and therefore cannot reasonably be regarded as a gap with a clearly identifiable built-up frontage.
- The proposal seeks permission for four dwellings, exceeding the policy definition of "limited" development, which is restricted to a maximum of two additional dwellings.
- The proposed dwellings are not affordable housing for local people, directly conflicting with the specific requirements of Policy CS6(b).
- The layout introduces a form of tandem development expressly excluded by Paragraph 8.34, with dwellings positioned behind one another and orientated inconsistently with the established pattern of development.
- The proposed plot configuration and density appear out of character with the surrounding area and fails to respect the prevailing settlement form.

Accordingly, the development does not qualify for the Green Belt exception relied upon by the Applicant and is therefore inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

The NPPF is clear that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No such circumstances have been demonstrated.

2. Conflict with NPPF Paragraph 155

The proposal also fails to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The site is located outside the defined settlement boundary and occupies a location that is poorly served by sustainable transport options.

The nearest bus stops are situated in excess of 600 metres from the site and are served by limited and infrequent bus services. Given the rural nature of the location and the lack of realistic alternatives to private car use, future occupiers would be heavily dependent upon motor vehicles for access to employment, education, healthcare, retail facilities and other day-to-day services.

As such, the site cannot reasonably be regarded as a sustainable location for new residential development and fails to satisfy the sustainability objectives required by Paragraph 155(c) of the NPPF.

Consequently, the proposal does not benefit from the Green Belt exception relied upon by the Applicant and remains inappropriate development causing harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt.

3. Unsatisfactory Access Arrangements and Highway Safety Concerns

The proposed access arrangements raise significant concerns regarding highway safety, emergency access and the practical operation of the development.

The Applicant does not control the adjoining highway verges and therefore lacks the ability to deliver meaningful improvements to the existing access route. As a result, any highway mitigation proposed is unlikely to be deliverable.

Croft Lane is frequently constrained by parked vehicles. In practice, this creates a significant risk that construction vehicles, delivery vehicles, refuse collection vehicles and emergency service vehicles will be unable to safely access or manoeuvre within the site.

The sole means of access is via Public Footpath Chipperfield 013. The use of a public right of way as the primary construction and residential access route is highly problematic. Construction traffic would inevitably interfere with public use of the footpath, creating conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, resulting in safety concerns and potential damage to the route.

Furthermore, the introduction of vehicle movements associated with four additional dwellings along this constrained access route would generate ongoing maintenance, safety and operational issues that have not been adequately addressed by the Applicant.

The Local Planning Authority must be satisfied that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users throughout the lifetime of the development. Based on the information submitted, this has not been demonstrated.

4. Harm to the Character and Pattern of Development

The proposed development fails to reflect the established pattern of development in the area. The introduction of multiple dwellings in a tandem arrangement, with varying orientations and an intensive layout, would appear cramped and incongruous when viewed in the context of surrounding development.

The proposal would therefore erode the rural character of the area and introduce an urbanising form of development that is inconsistent with the character of the Green Belt and the prevailing settlement pattern.

5. Sewerage Issues

A statutory consultee, rightly in our view, has raised concerns over the management of drainage including foul sewerage material. The applicant has not supplied the detail of how foul sewer outflow is to be managed.

This consultee (Chipperfield PC) has recent experience (within circa 10 years) with other developments adding more dwellings to the sewer volume in this vicinity. The main foul sewer outflow runs under the rear gardens of dwellings to the west side of Croft Lane. Such rear gardens are regularly subjected to rear garden flooding of untreated human sewage/waste. Our MP has and is raising these issues with the CEO of Thames Water. A proposed solution is awaited. It is clear to CPC that any additional dwellings will add volume that the current waste network cannot absorb and without action will increase the frequency of unplanned sewage discharge to the rear gardens of Croft Lane.

Other recent examples include a small number of dwellings in Tulip Close which discharge to the same pipe network through the rear gardens of Croft Lane. In this instance within a few days of occupation of Tulip Close dwellings the pipework running through the Croft Lane rear gardens backed up causing raw sewage discharge via the ground/first floor WC's of at least one Tulip Close dwelling. In one case the discharge on the first floor WC caused an overflow to reach the staircase creating an overflow to ground floor via a 'waterfall' of human waste down the stairs.

On another recent development of mixed dwellings on former site of Garden Scene Nursery/garden centre during the planning application CPC, with others, pressurised Affinity Water & associated companies to propose a solution to eliminate any risk of raw sewage outflows. The scheme proposed by the water authorities proved not to achieve its promised aims. This application is for 4 dwellings for which it seems to us that unless the design is radically different, it will not cope.

CPC would urge DBC to require the applicant to come up with a revised foul sewer design which could include the use of in-ground package sewerage plant(s) such as Kingspan Klargestar, or similar.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal:

- Does not meet the definition of limited infilling.
- Fails to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS6
- Does not provide affordable housing for local people as required by Policy CS6(b).
- Fails to satisfy the relevant Green Belt exceptions contained within the NPPF.
- Represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and causes definitional harm.
- Occupies an unsustainable location reliant upon private car use.
- Raises serious concerns regarding access, highway safety and emergency vehicle access.
- Fails to respect the established character and pattern of development.

- Destroys public footpath Chipperfield 013

Taken cumulatively, these conflicts weigh heavily against the proposal. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate any very special circumstances capable of clearly outweighing the substantial harm identified.

Furthermore, CPC was not approached by the applicant to have pre-app discussions with CPC on this scheme. We actively promote such interaction and has proved successful both for the community and for the applicant in other applications.

Reference: 26/01116/FHA

Proposal: Single storey side extension with room in roof, single storey side extension & rear dormers to the above property.

Address: The Thatch Dunny Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DD

CPC: No objection, however, the material should fall in line with Village Design Statement.

Reference: 26/01126/FHA

Proposal: Demolition of Existing Garage and Construction of Replacement Garage

Address: Brambles The Common Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9BY

CPC: No comment

19/26 DECISIONS MADE BY THE PLANNING AUTHORITY

Reference: 26/00370/FUL

Address: The Boot , Tower Hill, Chipperfield, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire, WD4 9LN

Proposal: Retrospective application for the retention of Marquee

DBC: Refused (CPC: No grounds to object)

Reference: 26/00356/ROC

Address: The Cow Shed, Tenements Farm, Tower Hill, Chipperfield, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire

Proposal: Removal of condition 6 (Permitted development) attached to planning permission 25/00774/FUL

DBC: Granted (CPC: No comment)

Reference: 26/01060/TCA

Proposal: Works to trees

Address: The Old Nurses House Chapel Croft Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9EH

DBC: Granted (CPC: Refer to the Tree Officer)

**20/26 Planning Appeal Town & Country Planning Act 1990
Nothing to report**

21/26 Date of the next Development Management Committee (DMC) will be on 11 June 2026 at 7pm.

22/26 DATE OF NEXT MEETING 23 June 2026 at 7.15 pm at The Blackwells The Common Chipperfield WD4 9BS

The meeting concluded at 20.06