



Planning Committee
Monday, 26th October, 2026 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. **Receipt of Correspondence received after the publication of the agenda (Pages 2 - 6)**

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

26 October 2026

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

Item No 9/1(a) 26/01426/FM Page No. 14

West Walton Parish Council – Provided comments in support of the application with no reasons given.

Cllr Ryves – Requested current financial statements relating to the application, and an explanation for these as submitted by the Agent.

Assistant Director's Comments: The Parish Council's consultation response was received after finalisation of the Agenda. The support is noted however does not alter consideration of the application as set out in the Officers Report.

The financial information we have received is confidential information that we are not able to share due to GDPR concerns. Summaries of the information received has been provided with agreement from the Applicant and is discussed on Page 20 of the Agenda (Paragraphs 4-6).

In terms of explanation of the business income, there is an email chain scanned 6th October on Public Access where the case officer asked for an explanation of the significant increase in profits, and the Agent/Applicant's response. This is reflected in the information contained in the committee report.

Item No 9/2(a) 26/00860/O Page No. 24

National Highways: Revised comments submitted and summarised below.

National Highways issued a No Objection letter on 25 June 2026. Their formal recommendation is unchanged based on the current application material. Notwithstanding, it would be appropriate to secure conditions regarding sustainable drainage and landscaping works.

Arboricultural Officer: Revised comments submitted and summarised below.

The revised description of "up to four dwellings" may allow for less development of the site but does not resolve the main arboricultural concerns previously identified. Although the layout is indicative, it suggests that accommodating four dwellings would be likely to result in conflict with retained trees, particularly in relation to the construction, access and future garden environment of the indicated Plot 4. A reduced scheme (for three dwellings for example) would give greater scope to retain existing trees and result in satisfactory long-term relationship with the development. The previous concerns remain relevant, including the matter of the uncertain long-term retention and management of the southern hedgerow/tree buffer adjoining the A47.

Assistant Director's Comments: The revised comments are received in response to the most recent consultation. The National Highways comments do not alter the consideration of the

application as set out in the Officers Report. The Arboricultural Officer comments should be considered alongside the discussion within 'Form and Character' in the Officers Report on page 36, and again, do not alter the recommendation.

Item No 9/2(b) 26/01265/F Page No. 41

Agent: Provides a Supplementary Ecological Briefing Note and related Drawings, which clarifies the Consultant Ecologist's position regarding the site in response to the comments from the LA's Senior Ecologist. The documents are available for Members to view on-line.

Also for clarification, a visual appraisal has been submitted with photographs showing views towards the site from the north of the River Hun, Broadwater Road and Beach Road which illustrates the screening of the proposed building by the existing trees/vegetation, which border the site (and within the site). All trees and vegetation shown are proposed for retention (and protection during the works as outlined in the arboriculturalist's report).

Parish Council: *"The Parish Council is unable to attend the Planning Committee Meeting on 26 October 2026 but would like to take this opportunity to draw Members attention to the following points.*

- The reason given by Councillor de Winton for calling in this application (i.e. Holme objects to everything) is certainly not justified by the evidence and our comments whether in support or favour are always supported by policy-based arguments.*
- It is our understanding that this Application should be determined in accordance with the 2026 NPPF and the KL&WN Local Plan.*
- Our policy based comments on the application are set out in our consultation response – but the following is of specific relevance: "*

o Holme lies in an area defined as Managed Re-Alignment by the Shoreline Management Plan.

o The development site lies in a location defined as being subject to Coastal Change Management (Adopted Policy Map1, Local Plan Policy LP17) and within the Flood Risk Area shown as greater than 1.200 AEP Risk of flooding.

o Existing properties in this part of Beach Road were flooded to waist height during the 2013 tidal inundation.

o According to Policy LP 17, given that the site is at risk of flooding in a 1: 200 event now or in the future (as evidenced by the Applicant's SFRA) no new dwellings will be permitted.

- The above are considered to be critical policy considerations (ref NPPF F5(1), LP17, HNTS2) and on this basis the Parish Council could not support the Application. It is not sustainable development.*

We trust these points, together with the Parish Council's full consultation response will be taken into account in reaching a decision which could have far-reaching consequences for developments in areas of Managed Re-Alignment which are subject to the Council's policy of Coastal Change Management".

Environment Agency: The EA has reviewed the revised documents and confirms that they are now in a position to remove their objection, but strongly recommends that the mitigation measures

proposed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), referenced ESP Ltd (Beach Road, Holme Next the Sea) dated August 2026 and addendum to FRA dated 30th September 2026, are adhered to, in particular:

- Finished floor levels will be set no lower than 6.0mAOD.
- Flood Response Plan will be prepared following consultation with Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Emergency Planning Department.
- Flood resilient / resistant measures will be incorporated into the development up to 500 mm above finished floor levels

Senior Ecologist: Following the receipt of an Ecology Note, which makes the case that the scrub habitat would not be lost, the Senior Ecologist confirms that they are now in a position to remove their objection, subject to conditions and an informative.

In particular, they request conditions relating to:

- A Construction and Ecology Management Plan,
- A sensitive lighting strategy, and
- Ecological Enhancements in accordance with the Extended Phase 1 Ecological Impact Assessment (Sections 17 and 18).

The requested informative relates to protected species.

Assistant Director's Comments: It is acknowledged that the EA has removed their objection given that the Applicant has addressed their flood risk concerns. Therefore, reason for refusal no.3, set out within the officer report on page 55 of the agenda is also now removed as part of the overall officer recommendation.

The additional information submitted by the Applicant's Agent is noted and while the illustrative drawings and photographs demonstrating how the site is screened from long views may address the Norfolk Coast Protected Landscape Team's concerns with regards to a visual appraisal (as set out within the officer report on page 50 of the agenda), this does not alter the recommendation or reason for refusal no.1 (design and character) set out on page 55 of the agenda.

The Parish Council's comments are noted.

It is acknowledged that the Ecology Officer's concerns have now been addressed, subject to the imposition of conditions. Therefore, reason for refusal no.4, set out within the officer report on page 55 of the agenda is now removed as part of the overall officer recommendation.

Amendment to Reasons for Refusal

p. 55 Delete Reasons 3 and 4.

Cllr Coates: 'Please can you place a copy of the email dated 29 September 2026 from Highways in the planning file for 26/00900/F. You will see that what you describe as "safe on street parking", Highways describes as "undesirable parking on the highway" and I shall want to make that point at Committee.

Your Recommendation is that the proposed development be carried out in accordance with two plans but I cannot find the Indicative Building Layout Rev 06. Perhaps you can tell me how to find it in the planning file so as to avoid doubt.

Condition number 2 says that the extraction equipment shall be maintained in accordance with the report. Will you agree to add the following words to the end of that condition: "with records of maintenance kept available for inspection" or words to that effect. Without them, I can see that the maintenance of the extraction equipment will be ignored and, if ever the matter is challenged, it will merely be said that the equipment has been maintained. If you can confirm this matter to me before the Committee meets, that would be helpful.'

Assistant Director's Comments: The Local Highway Authority response Cllr Coates refers to is available on the Public Access file. As noted within the Officers Report to committee, this application relates solely to the installation of extraction equipment on the existing Public House. Comments from Cllr Coates, and the separate comments from the Local Highway Authority in regard to parking on Ling Common Road being undesirable are noted however are not relevant to this application.

Comments on parking on the highway were addressed as part of the Appeal Decision for the original residential scheme approved by PINS under 19/01622/F, paragraphs 13 and 14 of that appeal decision state as follows:

'There are local concerns that the level of parking for the public house may be inadequate as it is a large pub and with staff parking there might not be sufficient space for customers. There are concerns that this might cause roadside parking of cars and trade vehicles. Ling Common Road is narrow, and representors say it is used by farm vehicles and some vehicles travel at speed, and that in the past when the pub has been busy, cars have overflowed onto the road and pavement. However, there is no convincing evidence that roadside parking is a common problem or which demonstrates why the proposed number of parking spaces for the public house would be unacceptable, causing a risk to highway safety, and why I should take a different view from the CHA.

The Framework, at Paragraph 111, states that 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'. This is a stringent test for proposals to be reasonably refused on highway grounds, and not one that is met here.

14. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not have a harmful effect on highway safety, with particular reference to parking. Accordingly, it would not conflict with CS Policy CS11 and DMP Policy DM15 which require that proposals demonstrate that adequate parking facilities would be available. It would also meet the provisions of the Framework.'

The wording of Paragraph 111 of the NPPF at the time of that decision is now expanded upon by TR6:4 which states: '4. Development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe

adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion.'

These considerations are already set out in the officer's report and it is not considered likely that any highway safety impacts would be caused by self-restricting parking along Ling Common Road. It should be noted that the email from the Highway Officer does not state that there would be highway safety reasons to object to parking on Ling Common Road, instead it is noted that it would be undesirable.

Again, Members should note that this application only relates to extraction equipment for the Public House and the decision should be made based upon the application which is in front of them.

Indicative Building Layout Rev 06 was scanned to the file dated 5th October 2026. The plan is conditioned in accordance with the title written on the plan.

The LPA does not consider it necessary to add wording to require records of maintenance to be provided for the flue, however this is a matter that Members could consider as part of determination.