



Planning Inspectorate
 Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ
 Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218 927
 Switchboard 0272-218811
 GTN 1374

RMP

DISMISSED

Mr and Mrs Brooks
 Roseville
 Chalk road
 Walpole St Peter
 WISBECH
 Norfolk PE14 7PN

Your reference

Our reference

- A. T/APP/V2635/A/89/117412/P8
- B. T/APP/V2635/A/89/119164/P8

Date 7 SEP 89



Sir and Madam

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
 APPLICATION NOS: 2/88/3359 AND 5146/0

1. As you know I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your appeals against the decisions of the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk to refuse outline planning permission for A - the erection of 8 dwellings and B - the erection of 4 dwellings on land adjoining Roseville on the west side of Chalk Road, Walpole St Peter, Norfolk. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by interested persons. I inspected the site on Tuesday 15 August 1989.
2. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings and from the representations that have been made I consider that the principal issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the form and character of the village, on the countryside and on the adequacy of the intended access road.
3. Appeal site A has a frontage to the west side of Chalk Road of some 120 m. B, omits a 40 m section from the centre of this frontage. The land which is level is overgrown and has some sheds to the rear of the field behind the site where some hardcore is stockpiled. Open agricultural land lies to the west and on the opposite side of the road. A house adjoins the northern boundary beyond which there is continuous development along this side of the road. Plot 3 of the housing for which you have permission is next to the southern end and when this is developed together with plots 1 and 2 will form a continuous frontage to the south.
4. I note that administratively the Parishes of Walpole St Andrew and Walpole St Peter were joined in 1988. In land use terms they have also been joined physically by the Chase housing scheme. This is recognised by the boundary for the single village shown in the guidelines that have been adopted for development control purposes. Whilst modern in context the new development creates a strong link between the 2 churches both of which are of outstanding visual merit. To my mind it has removed the uncertainty about the form of the village by creating a centre which is recognisable. Prior to this taking place housing has straggled along a number of roads in an incoherent way. This has weakened the character of the previously separate villages by creating ribbons of development along minor roads. This is particularly noticeable along Chalk Road where the only significant gap is the subject land and the field on the opposite side of the road.
5. The very large quantity of new housing that has taken place in the 2 villages together with the bridging development between them (The Chase) in my opinion demonstrates no lack of housing to sustain the community by maintaining local



services without the necessity to close the gap along Chalk Road. To do so would create further ribbon development that would not enhance the form and character of the village and would certainly detract from the appearance of the countryside which at this point is flat and open in aspect with uninterrupted views across it.

6. Even though the land appears to be in poor condition and has an untidy appearance it is a condition that can be remedied. Perhaps not in isolation, but it adjoins extensive agricultural land to the west with which it could be amalgamated.
7. The closing of this frontage with dwellings would remove a significant gap which serves to contain the housing which straggles along the road towards it from both directions. I do not attach any weight to your argument that because it is the only gap along this road it should be built on. The village guidelines have been drawn so that the identity of the village is now established even though in places its form is loose and difficult to appreciate where the village has been extended by simply building along road frontages.
8. The reduction of the length of the frontage proposed to be developed in your second application, by leaving a gap of some 40 m in the middle, does not overcome my objection set out above since the space is too small to form a significant break.
9. As to road safety it is a fact that whilst the narrow winding roads in the locality, running between tall hedges in many places provide an attractive environment they are not capable of satisfactorily accommodating present day traffic levels and serving as development roads as well. The weight of traffic in the vicinity is moderately heavy and I noticed that speeds along this section of road are high enough that if more houses were to be permitted there would be danger to road safety caused by turning movements and inconvenience through interference with free traffic flow.
10. I have taken into account all other matters raised in the representations but I find that they are insufficient to outweigh the considerations that have led to my decision.
11. For the above reasons and in exercise of the powers transferred to me I hereby dismiss both appeals A and B.

I am Sir and Madam
Your obedient Servant



P W RAWSON DiPTP FRTPI
Inspector