



Norfolk County Council

Norfolk County Council Comments on the: King’s Lynn and West Norfolk Gypsy and Traveller Proposed Sites and Policy 21 June 2024

1. Overview

1.1. Thank you for consulting the County Council of the above consultation. Please see below the Highway Authority comments. Response from the LLFA to follow.

2. Highway Authority

General Comment

2.1. The Highway Authority (HA) has considered each of the potential Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeoples’ (GTTS) sites put forward in this round of consultation on the King’s Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan. The HA views expressed have considered the nature of the proposed uses and the focus of the response is the adequacy of the access and local highway network given existing uses.

2.2. It is recognised that, in many cases, the proposed Local Plan site-specific allocations are being made retrospectively to accommodate growth in existing resident families.

2.3. The suitability of the proposed site allocations have been assessed against the technical criteria of the Highway Authority for new allocations and development proposals as they have no formal planning status.

Highway Authority Detailed Comments

Ref	HA Comment
GT 14	Local highway network is not of sufficient standard to support further development and it is not considered highways impacts upon Blunts Drove could be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 10 additional pitches on this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.
GT17	Local highway network is not of sufficient standard to support further development, and it is not considered highways impacts upon Small Lode could be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 9 additional pitches at this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.

Ref	HA Comment
GT18	<p>Local highway network is not of sufficient standard to support further development and it is not considered highways impacts upon Small Lode could be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 13 additional pitches on this site.</p> <p>The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.</p>
GT21	<p>It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation as the local highway network is not of sufficient standard to support further development, with no clear means of making meaningful improvements.</p> <p>This is compounded by the cumulative traffic impact of further proposed allocations nearby in Upwell/ Outwell on the local highway network. It is not considered highways impacts can be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 5 additional pitch on this site.</p> <p>The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.</p>
GT05	<p>Suitable access appears to be achievable.</p> <p>No provision for off carriageway walking/cycling.</p> <p>The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.</p>
GT09	<p>The carriageway is just one vehicle width but local traffic only as this is not a through road.</p> <p>No off-carriageway walking/ cycling.</p> <p>The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.</p>
GT11	<p>The carriageway is just one vehicle width but is used by local traffic only as this is not a through road.</p> <p>No off-carriageway walking/ cycling.</p> <p>The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.</p>
GT15	<p>The Highway Authority does not object to the formalisation of one pitch and provision of 1 additional pitch.</p>
GT20	<p>It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation as the local highway network is not of sufficient standard to support further development, with no clear means of making meaningful improvements.</p> <p>This is compounded by the cumulative traffic impact of further proposed allocations nearby in Upwell/ Outwell on the local highway network. It is not considered highways impacts can be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate an additional pitch on this site.</p> <p>The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.</p>

Ref	HA Comment
GT28	<p>It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation as the local highway network is not of sufficient standard to support further development, with no clear means of making meaningful improvements.</p> <p>This is compounded by the cumulative traffic impact of further proposed allocations on Small Lode It is not considered highways impacts can be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 2 additional pitches on this site.</p> <p>The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.</p>
GT29	<p>Existing hedge must be trimmed back on inside of the bend. Existing access and internal site arrangements improved to provide a single perpendicular access from the carriageway edge. If this is done the Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.</p>
GT34	<p>It is not clear how the site is or will be accessed, assuming this will be via restricted byway, this should be widened to 4.8m and surfaced for 10m from the B1355 to enable accessing vehicles to pass. Cutting of adjacent hedges would need to be secured to achieve acceptable visibility. No facilities for off-carriageway walking / cycling.</p> <p>Subject to securing width improvements and the land for required visibility, the Highway Authority would not object to this proposed allocation.</p>
GT54	<p>Suitable access appears to be achievable. No provision for off carriageway walking/cycling. The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch</p>
GT55	<p>This site has a conditioned splay across their site which is not currently adhered to. Should that be maintained the Highway Authority would accept one additional pitch as traffic volumes are low.</p> <p>No opportunity for safe walking /cycling from site.</p> <p>The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch subject to meeting the conditioned requirements for access.</p>
GT56	<p>No off-carriageway walking/cycling available but low traffic volumes likely & wide verges available.</p> <p>The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 9 additional pitches.</p>

Ref	HA Comment
GT59	It is not clear that a safe point of access with suitable visibility can be achieved. If suitable visibility can be achieved, the Highway Authority does not object to the formalisation of the one existing pitch and provision of 4 additional pitches.
GT66	Site remote with no off-carriageway walking/cycling. The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.
GT65	Acceptable visibility appears to be achievable; it should be noted that the access is located at a corridor of movement albeit within a 40mph speed limit. No objections to an additional 5 pitches subject to relocation of the existing sign in the highway verge.
GT25	It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation due to the increased slowing stopping and turning movements at the junction of the A134 which is a corridor of movement. Site remote with no off-carriageway walking/cycling. The Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation of 2 additional pitches.
GT62	Site remote with no off-carriageway walking/cycling facilities. Subject to demonstration that a suitable access can be achieved, the Highway Authority would not object to the proposed allocation of 2 additional pitches.

2.4. Should you have any queries with the above comments please contact Richard Doleman (Principal Infrastructure Development Planner) at richard.doleman@norfolk.gov.uk or call 01603 223263.

3. **Lead Local Flood Authority**

3.1. Response to follow.

3.2. Should you have any queries with the above comments please contact the Lead Local Flood Authority at llfa@norfolk.gov.uk.

4. **Children's Services**

4.1. No Comments

5. **Historic Environment**

5.1. No comments.

6. **Minerals and Waste**

6.1. No Comments.

7. **Natural Environment**

7.1. No Comments.