



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by **R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 08 November 2017

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/W/17/3175536**

**The Old Coal Yard, Hardwick Narrows, West Winch PE33 0NA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs A Carman against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 16/02085/F, dated 29 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2017.
  - The development proposed is a new residential dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on highway safety in relation to the free flow of traffic on the A10 West Winch Road.

### Reasons

#### *Highway Safety*

3. The appeal site comprises an area of residential garden land and is located to the rear of a row of existing properties along West Winch Road. The proposed development would introduce a single storey dwelling into the site which would utilise the existing narrow unmade track access located off the A10, Hardwick Narrows Lane. Norfolk County Council Highways Team identifies the A10 as a principle route in Norfolk's Route Hierarchy and is designated as a Corridor of Movement.
4. The Council have accepted that the principle of development is acceptable in this instance however, this is subject to the proposal being acceptable against the relevant policies of the development plan, which include safe access. The A10 forms a main route to and from King's Lynn and is subject to high volumes of both domestic and commercial traffic movement. It has a speed limit of 40 mph at the site access. Furthermore, the Highways Team have provided evidence of 8 road traffic crashes that have occurred on this stretch of the A10 in proximity to the access.
5. Although, the access is already used by a number of existing dwellings the proposed development would intensify the use. The access is narrow in width and not readily visible from the A10 as you approach it in either direction.

Whilst the development would be for one additional dwelling, this would have the potential to generate around 6 additional vehicular trips per day. Combined with the width of the access, which is approximately 7.6 metres at the back of the highway and reduces to around 3.2 metres, and the level of traffic on the A10, this would cause harm to the area in terms of highway safety. Vehicles would potentially have to cross the flow of traffic to enter or exit the site depending on their direction of travel and should vehicles meet on the access or at the junction, this would result in significant reversing being required. Intensification of the access would add unacceptably to the number of slowing and stopping movements which would be harmful to the free flow of traffic and would prejudice the function of the A10 as a Corridor of Movement. From the accident data submitted, it is evident that a number of the incidents were as a result of cars either waiting in the highway or turning across the flow of traffic.

6. The Appellant has identified other examples where access has been permitted on to the A10 including The Winch Public House, Esso Garage and the Eastview Caravan Park. These are historic and existing arrangements and I do not have full details of these accesses and therefore cannot fully assess their relevance. However from the information provided I consider that significant differences exist between these and the proposed development. The Winch and the Esso Garage have much clearer points of access which are visible from some distance along the highway, and as such are not comparable to the proposal in terms of access width and its visibility on the approach. In terms of the lack of highway consultation for the caravan park, I am not aware of the background to this, and although it serves a number of properties again the access is clear and wider than the proposed development. I accept that there are a number of driveways and roads leading off the A10 however this does not justify the increase in use of the access point which would conflict with the free flow of traffic in this location. I therefore consider that these cases are not comparable and do not set a precedent for the appeal access being acceptable.
7. The proposed development would therefore result in harm to the flow of traffic along the A10 and highway safety in the area due to the width of the access and the increase in traffic movements which would be likely to cross the direction of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS11 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) which requires new development to provide safe and convenient access for all modes of travel.

#### *Other Matters*

8. There have been no objections from any of the other statutory consultees. However, regardless of this, the evidence supplied by the Norfolk County Council Highway Team supports the view that there would be highway safety implications as a result of the development.
9. The Appellant has stated that at peak times, the traffic on the A10 is stationary, however, I consider this to make it further evident that the A10 carries a significant amount of traffic as a principle route.
10. It has been raised that the proposed development has not been dealt with consistently by the Council given other approvals that have been given which access onto the A10. However, for the reasons above the proposed development would be harmful to highway safety which would not be outweighed by any other considerations in this instance.

**Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*R Norman*

INSPECTOR

