



Planning Committee
Monday, 3rd November, 2025 at 9.30 am
in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market
Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

Reports marked to follow on the Agenda and/or Supplementary Documents

1. **Correspondence Received After the Publication of the Agenda**
(Pages 2 - 4)

To receive the Correspondence received since the publication of the agenda.

Contact

Democratic Services
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
King's Court
Chapel Street
King's Lynn
Norfolk
PE30 1EX
Tel: 01553 616394
Email: democratic.services@west-norfolk.gov.uk

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 3rd November 2025

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE
PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA**

Item No. 9/3(b) 25/00590/O Page No. 105

Agent: The following comments were circulated to Planning Committee Members -

National Highways (NH) have responded by basically dismissing the application because they need more time. I am sorry for this, but we have requested this before and it has been declined. The proposal includes an entrance which is demonstrably safer than all the others on the north side of the A47 in East Winch.

Previously we have made several responses to questions NH have asked, including a swept path analysis and revised layout enabling the refuse, and other vehicles to enter and leave the site, avoiding obstruction on the A47, all other entrances on the north side do not enable commercial vehicles to avoid parking on the road whilst collecting or delivering goods and services. We have tried to satisfy HE to date, we can demonstrate that this entrance is the safest, and in addition that the bus layby is the least obstructed of the three in East Winch.

As this is partly a safety issue and Highways England have not had sufficient time to examine and consider all the aspects, we therefore request that the Planning Committee defer the examination of this application until the December meeting to allow HE sufficient time to complete their evaluation.

Assistant Director's comments: The Agent's comments are noted. However, the National Highways comments referred to above do not represent their latest position. The agent has had the opportunity to provide National Highways with the required information, as they have been consulted on four occasions. Their latest comments received on 21 October 2025 (which have been sent to the agent) are that National Highways recommend the application is refused. This is included within the Officer Report on page 110/111.

In addition, the Secretary of State for Transport directs that in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Affecting Trunk Roads) Direction 2018, LPAs must not determine an application contrary to a recommendation from National Highways unless the Secretary of State has been consulted and determined how the LPA should proceed in accordance with the outcomes of Article 5 of that direction.

Item No. 9/3(C) 25/01186/F Page No. 123

James Wild MP: Makes the following comments:

Mr Clarkson has explained that the application has been balled in and will be considered at committee meeting on 3rd November 2025.

Mr Clarkson has set out his concerns that the application may be refused and the impact this will have on him and his wife, in the attached correspondence, together with his consent to share his concerns with the council.

Planning Committee
3 November 2025

I understand there has been support for his application from local councillors, the parish council, and other residents.

I would be very grateful if Mr Clarkson's concerns may be thoroughly considered.

The Supporting statement is included within the report on p. 126. Full comments are available on public access.

Assistant Director's comments: The comments of James Wild MP are noted. The planning history and applicant's personal circumstances have been discussed throughout the Officer's report and the content within these documents do not raise any additional material planning considerations which would alter the recommendation.

Item No. 9/3 (d) 25/01308/F Page No. 135

Applicant: (summarised) In response to address the comments made by the Conservation Officer, planning permission to extend the stable block was approved by the Council with common brick. At the time, had the gault brick been a prominent characteristic, why this approved especially when gault bricks were readily available? Three types of bricks were clearly visible as the original stable block was in a very dark red.

Many of the properties along School Road have been aesthetically altered. Within this area, there are a total of 48 buildings. Of these, 21 have either been painted, rendered or clad. 5 additional properties have a mixture of brick and colouring. This amounts to over 50% of the 48 buildings in conservation being coloured in some way. Furthermore, there are two properties along School Road which have been clad; one is very similar in appearance to my own. These are 25 houses along from my property. I look at the house in comparison with other buildings and feel that it is a vast improvement on the street view, than the mix match of bricks which it once was.

Other buildings which have been cladded display the same or very similar colours. In addition to this, there are approximately 4 other properties which have been painted in a similar hue which I feel compliments the addition of the blue cladding and does not make it stand out. This highlights the fact that this is just a personal opinion of preference, and not factual. I am not the only homeowner along School Road who has used the cladding method to improve my property.

The following correspondence was forwarded from Paul Gallacher, the services manager from Cedral in relation to the cladding ventilation:

I can confirm that the minimum 30mm ventilation gap has been left behind the boards, with a minimum of a 10mm continuous gap left at the top and bottom of the system for full circulation. The airflow behind the Cedral weatherboard enables the system to remove moisture.

The brickwork on the part of the building which has been clad is 9 inch solid with no cavity, so traditional insulation was not an option. Insulation on the inside had been constructed and failed to address the damp. In the worst of the rooms, internal cladding was added to the West and North walls but had very little impact on the mould, which then spread across the ceiling. With reference to the "traditional methods of damp remediation", I can confirm that various paints and sealants had been tried with no lasting effect.

Understanding the full impact that this was having on my tenant's health, I looked into the best

method of hopefully curing any ongoing damp problems. I spoke with two people who had previously had cladding installed and was told by both it had made a considerable difference not only with damp issues, but with noise reduction and heating bills.

This building work had no direct benefit to me, other than the preservation of the property. It was a very expensive venture, part of it paid for by a lump sum which I had received from a pension pot. I strongly believed that what I was doing was what was in the best interests and health of my tenants, the youngest member of which suffers from ongoing health concerns, including respiratory problems. Government guidelines require landlords to ensure their properties are free from hazards like serious damp and mould that affect health and safety. Damp and mould primarily effect the airways and lungs, but can also affect the eyes and skin. Acting as a responsible landlady and adhering to these guidelines, I feel that the work I have had carried out far outweighs any of the comments mentioned and the harm to the heritage asset.

Assistant Director's comments: The Applicant's comments are noted. Other materials within the locality have been considered on pages 140 - 142 of the Officer's report. The Applicant has shared that the works were carried out to benefit the tenant's health and wellbeing. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF advises that where a proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal including securing its optimum viable use. The less than substantial harm to the significance of Upwell's Conservation Area is not thought to be outweighed by the limited private benefit and would have no public benefit, as explained in the Officer's report.

Insofar as climate change, whilst evidence has now been provided to demonstrate that the cladding is ventilated and would not 'trap damp', no further information has been submitted in relation to the properties of the cladding insofar as thermal energy and efficiency systems in accordance with Policy LP06.