

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

COUNCIL

Minutes from the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 29th January, 2026 at 5.00 pm in the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: Councillor A Bullen (Chair)
 Councillors B Ayres, T Barclay, A Beales, S Bearshaw, J Bhondi, P Bland, R Blunt, F Bone, A Bubb, R Coates, Mrs J Collingham, S Collop, R Colwell, C J Crofts, M de Whalley, P Devulapalli, S Everett, J Fry, D Heneghan, P Hodson, B Jones, A Kemp, J Kirk, P Kunes, S Lintern, B Long, J Lowe, A Moore, J Moriarty, C Morley, S Nash, J Osborne, T Parish, Pidcock, J Ratcliffe, S Ring, C Rose, J Rust, A Ryves, S Sandell, D Sayers, S Squire, M Storey and A Ware

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Dark, T de Winton, A Dickinson, H Humphrey, A Lawrence, Mrs V Spikings and D Tyler

C:83 PRAYERS

Prayers were led by Father Adrian Ling.

C:84 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dark, Dickinson, Humphrey, Lawrence, Spikings, Tyler and Chief Executive Kate Blakemore.

C:85 MINUTES

RESOLVED: The minutes from the meeting held on 27th November 2025 were agreed by as a correct record and signed by the Chair,

C:86 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

C:87 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor provided Council with information on an upcoming visit of a Royal Naval Vessel – HMS Trumpeter in February 2026.

C:88 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no Urgent Business.

C:89 **PROPORTIONALITY**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

RESOLVED: That the proportional allocation of seats be amended in accordance with the table set out in the report.

C:90 **PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

1. Question from Kevin Waddington

The Mayor invited Kevin Waddington to ask a question as set out below:

“Carried forward from previous local plans onto the draft "Masterplan" are the proposals to build 50 dwellings on Hardings Way and at its north end about 350 on Boal Quay. Building these 50 houses would necessarily mean that residents cars, dustcarts, delivery vans, large house moving lorries etc. would have to traverse Hardings Way for access. This would seemingly be in contravention of the conditions on which Norfolk County Council received the grant from central government to surface the road, and would also have a very bad effect for both people and the wildlife that lives on Hardings Pits the local nature reserve. This at a time when the Council is said to be supporting an application to make Hardings Pits a Village Green.

Boal Quay is a loop in the river that is frequently inundated with all the positive effects that has for wildlife. The approach to Lynn from the south is widely regarded as the most rural, most peaceful and attractive of any town in England. The proposal to extend the "greenway" from the north end of Hardings Way, along Boal Street and on to the South Quay will be welcomed by anyone who approaches by this route. It is however, incompatible with the proposals to build 350 dwellings on Boal Quay up to 5 stories high and therefore completely out of keeping with the nearby medieval areas of Nelson Street and the South Quay, because unless some sort of overbridge was constructed motor vehicles would have to traverse some part of the "greenway". So much better could this area be used to further enhancing the southern approach to the town.

The views of the population on this issue are well established. There have been a dozen well attended demonstrations against building and its accompanying motor traffic on Hardings Way, and a Petition on the issue has now over 1400 signatures.

The draft stage is always the best time to eliminate unfelicitous proposals and my question to Council is this: in the light of the recently adopted biodiversity plan and because most people oppose this aspect

of the plan, will the Council take a critical look at these ill-sited building proposals with a view to removing them?"

Councillor Moriarty responded to the public question as set out below:

"Good afternoon Mr Waddington.

Good to see you again and thank you for your question. I think we met last on the site which is the subject of your question, along with Cllr Rust, a couple of years back.

There is a quite a long preamble to your question and I just want to qualify a couple of your assertions before getting to the nitty gritty. You mentioned our latest Local Plan. The Borough Council adopted its Local Plan in March 2025. This was informed by a series of public consultations; it was ultimately found 'sound' by independent government appointed inspectors at examination and was agreed by this Council last year.

As part of Local Plan, King's Lynn Riverfront Regeneration Area along with site policies for the Boal Quay site and the site North of Wisbech Road, which are both allocated for at least 50 new homes, sets out the criteria development proposals will be subject to. These include access arrangements subject to the satisfaction of Norfolk County Council as the Local Highway Authority and the conditions you refer to will be a matter for them. Other considerations will include nature conservation issues including biodiversity, project level habitat regulation assessment, site specific flood risk assessment, and heritage impact assessment.

I should point out that It must be some ten years since government inspectors told us our local plans should include the term 'at least', but I do not recognise the figure you use more than of 350 dwellings on Boal Quay.

The masterplanning work that is now progressing and was subject to public consultation until 16 January does not yet propose a final number of units due to the stage of concept development which will need to consider a number of factors in order to reach the decision on the appropriate number of units for the site, including the type of housing need required in the town, the appropriate design to be in keeping with the adjacent conservation area and adjacent greenspaces and finally what is viable for a developer in order to build it out.

The masterplanning work underway for King's Lynn is reviewing the merits of the previous scheme for Boal Quay and considering new opportunities and ideas identified through the recent consultations and latest local and national policies, including the reforms and housing targets set out in the proposed National Planning Policy framework. Locally, the masterplanning is reflecting on the vision set out in the Pride in Place Regeneration Plan approved by Cabinet and the

Neighbourhood Board and the strong feedback through the extensive engagement on the Pride in Place plan (formally the Long term plan for towns and plan for neighbourhoods) through Vision King's Lynn, and on the need to provide more green spaces and greening of the town centre.

Other, more site specific new opportunities being reviewed as part of the masterplanning process to maximise greening, improve biodiversity and ensure that the development blends into and enhances the important natural environment in the area.

Your question covers a number of portfolios and I will hand over to Cllr De Whalley your comment that the Council is 'said to be' supporting the establishment of a village green, but you have asked me if we will, before considering the results of our consultation, we will remove part of its subject.

If we removed something you liked before considering responses, you would be enraged, so no, nothing will be prematurely removed at this stage. We are reviewing all of the consultation responses and working through testing the plans with the development of a delivery strategy. We are planning a further public consultation on the final draft of the masterplan in the spring (it was due to be May after the local elections but we may be able to bring this forward if we are not constrained by a potential pre-election period). We have an update to the Regeneration and Development panel on the masterplan consultation on 10th February."

Councillor de Whalley provided further information as set out below:

"The Village Green application comprises of three connecting sites and from the river to Wisbech Road they are.

The Beuys' Acorns oak circle, inspired by artists Acroyd and Harvey; Harding Pits Doorstep Green; & South Lynn Community Orchard, in conjunction with the Purfleet Pantry.

We were required to remove the Beuys' Acorns site from the Local Plan before the Village Green application could be made. An agreement has been made along with an annual grant to Harding's Pits Association to ensure their future and the care of all three sites. The said Village Green application is with Norfolk County Council for approval and as the land belongs to the Borough Council it should be a formality.

The Borough Council has not only donated the land but also considerable time and resources to make the oak circle and community orchard valuable assets. Village Green status ensures the future of all three sites in perpetuity."

Mr Waddington did not have a supplementary question.

2. Question from Margaret Friend

The Mayor invited Margaret Friend to ask a question as set out below:

“Please identify which of the councils assets are being considered for sale to meet the costs of the renovations of the Guild Hall. Please can you reassure us, the people of King's Lynn that any or all of the amount will not impact on any other much needed projects that the council have already committed to.

In particular the west Lynn Ferry project of safer landing stages on both sides of the river.”

Councillor Ring responded to the question as set out below.

“Thank you for the question. I would begin by noting that this question appears to have been framed around figures and assertions that have been repeatedly promoted by a lone councillor despite not being supported by any report or decision of this Council.

I would refer members and the public to the report and presentation made to full Council in July regarding the Guildhall project, which set out clearly the scope, costs, funding approach and associated risks.

Nothing has changed since that presentation. I do not recognise the claim that estimated costs have increased from £15 million to in excess of £30 million. That figure has not been presented to Council, does not appear in any public report, and is not an accurate reflection of the Council's position. Its repetition risks misleading both members and residents. Any rise in cost of this project since its inception more reflects the increased ambition of this administration.

The July report remains the relevant and accurate public record. Any future changes to costs or funding would be brought forward transparently through the Council's approved governance and decision-making processes.

By way of a supplementary the questioner referred to a figure of £30 million and asked if this would come from the 2026/2027 budget.

Councillor Ring stated that the funding for the Guildhall was approved in July 2017 and detail of the project funding was included in the reports that went through the relevant democratic processes at the time and was not part of this years budget.

3. Question from Karen Champion on behalf of the West Lynn Action Group

The Mayor invited Karen Champion to ask a question as set out below:

“Please could we know what was recommended by the £150,000 Greyfriars report on the West Lynn Ferry, so that we can be assured that adequate funds are put into the budget to carry out all of the recommendations.”

Thank you for your question.

“I was pleased to visit the ferry operation with the leader last week and talk to the ferryman who complimented the work we have done and the prospect of further improvements.

I cannot tell you about any recommendations with respect to Greyfriars Project Management’s feasibility study as it is yet to be finalised. The Greyfriars report will lay out all the options to members and officers, with the expectation that it will go to cabinet this summer via due process. The £150,000 budget, agreed by Council, is to bring the proposal to RIBA stage 3 of which the study is only a part.

Consultation has taken place with ward members, the Environment Agency, the ferry operator and the Conservancy Board to inform the study. The ward members will be updated and consulted again as soon as the report is ready.

Public updates continue via my reports to Council, the press, social media, and the council website.

We are currently constructing a budget to be brought before Council on 27th February. Any further schemes requiring funding, such as the ferry, would be brought by officers for consideration in line with the Capital Strategy.

The Greyfriars study is the beginning of a complex major technical project for a generational improvement of the ferry infrastructure to support safe operation of this historic service well into the future.”

By way of supplementary the questioner referred to three feasibility studies and asked when work would commence.

Councillor de Whalley stated that due process would be followed prior to action.

4. Question from Helen Mead

Helen Mead was not present at the meeting for this item.

5. Question from Ermine Amies

Ermine Amies was not present at the meeting for this item.

C:91 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COUNCIL BODIES**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

(i) Cabinet – 20th January 2026

Councillor Beales, seconded by Councillor Ring, proposed the recommendations from Cabinet on 20th January 2026.

CAB107: RISK STRATEGY AND POLICY

RESOLVED: The recommendation from the Cabinet meeting held on 20th January 2026 in relation to the Risk Strategy and Policy were approved by Council as set out below.

Full Council adopted the revised Risk Management Policy and Strategy.

CAB108: SAFEGUARDING POLICY

RESOLVED: The recommendation from the Cabinet meeting held on 20th January 2026 in relation to the Safeguarding Policy were approved by Council as set out below

Full Council agreed changes to the Members' Code of Conduct to include explicit safeguarding responsibilities.

CAB110: PROPERTY DISPOSAL

Full Council were informed that this recommendation from Cabinet had been called in and was therefore withdrawn from the Full Council Agenda.

C:92 **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - KING'S LYNN TOWN COUNCIL**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

In proposing this item, Councillor Beales read out the recommendations and outlined the detail of the Community Governance Review, reminding Members that this proposal was to initiate a first stage consultation and the Council would be guided by the outcome of the consultation responses.

Councillor Everett seconded the proposal and stated it was about allowing residents to have their say. He made reference to the history of the town, the civic tradition and town charters. He reminded Councillors that further decisions would follow on if to move further following the first consultation round.

Councillor Long commented that civic tradition was important but residents needed to be aware of the impact on precepts and finances and it was important that information was included in the consultation documentation.

Councillor Bone commented that any financial impact on residents needed to be made clear. He acknowledged that this proposal was for the first round of consultation only.

Councillor Blunt supported the proposals, commenting that it was important that roles and responsibilities of any Town Council were clearly defined to residents.

In summing up, Councillor Beales commented that this proposal was just for the first round of consultation and detail would follow later in the process. He explained that it was important that the Council was guided by residents and the consultation would help determine if the Community Governance Review should proceed further.

RESOLVED:

1. Full Council endorsed the initiation of a Community Governance Review for the unparished area of King's Lynn, enabling the first stage of resident consultation. Following this, Officers will assess the feedback received and confirm the proposed timetable for completing the CGR, giving due consideration to the concurrent Local Government Reorganisation legislation, after which Full Council will determine whether to proceed to stage 2.
2. Full Council considered and approved the draft Terms of Reference for the Community Governance Review.

C:93

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

Councillor Kirk, seconded by Councillor Hodson, nominated Councillor Pidcock to the vacancy on Hunstanton Advisory Group.

There were no nominations to the other outside bodies.

RESOLVED:

1. Councillor Pidcock was appointed as the Borough Council's representative on Hunstanton Advisory Group.

C:94 **NOTICES OF MOTION**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

(1/26) - Submitted by Councillor Blunt

Councillor Blunt presented his Notice of Motion as set out below. By way of an update Councillor Blunt commented that although a decision had been made to postpone the Elections, it was still important that residents were aware that it was not a decision of this council.

“This Council strongly believes that Norfolk County Council Elections in May 2026 must go ahead”.

Councillor Sandell seconded the Motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Osborne spoke in support of the Motion stating that in certain cases it made sense to postpone an election, but it did not make sense in these circumstances. He made reference to the Leader of Norfolk County Council’s submission to Government and that in his view it did not answer the question.

Councillor Bone stated that he supported the Motion.

Councillor Beales spoke in support of the Motion and referred to the importance of democracy. He stated that it was important to maintain a good working relationship with Norfolk County Council at all levels, but this was proving difficult with the Norfolk County Council Leader’s approach to this issue in that they had not sought involvement from any other Councillors. Councillor Beales referred to the decision made by other County Councils and how they had met formally to debate the issue. He was also concerned that Norfolk County Council had stated that this was not a Key Decision.

Councillor Kirk stated that the Reform Group supported the Motion and reminded Councillors that he had resigned from Norfolk County Council because of this last year. He stated that this delay was not democratic.

Councillor Long commented that the Leader of Norfolk County Council was required to respond to the submission and had responded on the basis of capacity. He also made reference to the delay in the Mayoral Combined Authority Elections which had been decided by Government, even though Norfolk and Suffolk were in a position to deliver them. Councillor Long commented that the decision on postponement of election would have been better made after the outcome of Local Government Reorganisation, which would be known in March.

As a point of clarification, Councillor Beales stated that the districts managed Norfolk County Council elections on their behalf and to his knowledge Norfolk County Council did not ask this Council, nor

Breckland District Council, nor North Norfolk District Council about their capacity to hold local elections.

Councillor Sayers spoke in support of the Motion, referred to other authorities that had made the case that they did have capacity and was disappointed that there had been no respect for democracy. He called upon the Leader of Norfolk County Council to resign.

Councillor Kemp stated that elections should be held and the Government should have made a decision after the outcome of Local Government Reorganisation was known in March.

Councillor Devulapalli asked if any more of the twin-hatters would stand down to force an election.

Councillor Storey stated that his priority was to his residents and he would continue to ask what they wanted and do the best for them.

Councillor Moriarty thanked Councillor Blunt for bringing this Motion forward. He supported the Motion. He asked Councillors to be mindful of the impact arranging elections had on officers when called at short notice.

Councillor Nash commented that Councillors had the powers to force an election by resigning and commended Councillor Ring for doing so. He asked Councillors to join him in a round of applause for those that had resigned.

Councillor Coates asked about the cost of by-elections.

Councillor Ring stated that it was not just the Leader of Norfolk County Council's responsibility to respond to Government and that it should have be addressed by the Council.

Councillor Long commented that it was the responsibility of the Leader to provide a technical response which was given by officers.

Councillor Ring supported the Motion and referred to the importance of Local Government and democratic legitimacy. He stated that the decision to postpone elections muted the voice of the people and provided information on why he had stood down from his County position. He encouraged all Councillors to support this Motion.

Councillor Parish proposed that Council move to the vote.

Councillor Sandell as seconder of the Motion commented that it was important residents voices needed to be heard and supported the Motion.

RESOLVED: The Council supported the Motion that “This Council strongly believes that Norfolk County Council Elections in May 2026 must go ahead”

(2/26) – Submitted by Councillor Moore

Motion: Review of Consultant Expenditure Relating to the Lynnsport Proposal

Councillor Moore presented the Notice of Motion as set out below

“This Council notes the work undertaken in relation to the proposed redevelopment of the Alive Leisure Lynnsport facility, including plans to relocate the St James Pool as part of a scheme reported to be in the region of £49 million.

This Council further notes that approximately £2 million of public funds were incurred through the use of external consultants in developing this proposal, and that the scheme was later deemed unaffordable by the Section 151 Officer.

This Council is concerned that significant expenditure was incurred before affordability concerns resulted in the project being halted. This raises questions regarding financial oversight, governance, and value for money in the development of major capital projects.

Given the importance of protecting public funds and maintaining public confidence in the Council’s financial management, this matter warrants further scrutiny.

This Council resolves to:

1. Request that the Corporate Performance Panel reviews the decision making and governance processes relating to the use of external consultants in the development of the Lynnsport and St James Pool proposal.
2. Request that the Corporate Performance Panel considers whether appropriate affordability checks and financial controls were applied at an early stage.
3. Require that the findings and any recommendations are reported back to Full Council.”

Councillor Ryves seconded the Motion and reserved the right to speak.

Council were reminded that prior to the debate on any Notice of Motion, the Leader had the right to propose that the Motion be referred to a relevant Council Body for consideration.

Councillor Beales thanked Councillor Moore for the Notice of Motion and proposed it be submitted to the Corporate Performance Panel for consideration under Council Procedure Rule 7.1.22.

Councillor Moore accepted the proposal to refer the matter to the Corporate Performance Panel.

Councillor Jones seconded the proposal from the Leader to submit the item to the Corporate Performance Panel for consideration.

RESOLVED: That the Notice of Motion be passed onto the Corporate Performance Panel for consideration.

(3/26) – Submitted by Councillor Kemp

Motion to Stop Incinerator on West Norfolk Border

Councillor Kemp presented the Notice of Motion as set out below:

“This Council has a proud tradition of standing up against the South Lynn Incinerator - and held the public poll, in which 65,000 residents voted No. These residents have not gone away. Even after Planning Permission, Government stopped the incinerator. Residents, including Clenchwarton and West Lynn, dread the prospect of being downwind of two 90 metre high Incinerator Stacks, close to the West Norfolk border in Wisbech, one of the biggest incinerators in Europe. This Council is one of 4 "host" authorities for the Wisbech Incinerator, and instructs the leader to write to Government to halt the project.”

Councillor Rose seconded the Motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Beales proposed that the Motion be debated at this meeting.

Councillor Kunes, seconded by Councillor Long proposed that Council move straight to the Vote.

Council voted on if this Notice of Motion should go straight to the vote. This vote was lost and Council continued with the debate.

Councillor Beales stated that the Council had opposed the incinerator and highlighted the campaign work that he himself had been intrinsically involved in and the work of Councillor de Whalley and other Members of KLWIN (King's Lynn Without Incineration) such as Mike Knights, Richard Burton and Martin Little. He also highlighted the key roles played by the then Council Leader, Councillor Nick Daubney, former Chief Executive Ray Harding and former Councillor Lord Howard who had lobbied hard using Westminster contacts. Unfortunately the permission for this incinerator had already been granted by Government and Councillor Beales felt that it was too late for a letter to Government to make a difference. Councillor Beales stated that the Council were fully engaged with supporting Fenland District Council and highlighted that the Motion put forward made no reference to Fenland District Council. Councillor Beales stated that he

did not support this Motion, but he would be prepared to write to the Leader of Fenland District Council to see if he could help.

Councillor Sayers supported the Motion because of the impact it would have on residents, the economy and tourism, but felt that this was a case of election campaigning.

Councillor Bone proposed an amendment to the Motion so that the last sentence read:

“This Council is one of four hosts, with the primary host being Fenland Council. We would like the Leader to engage and support the impacted Council to pose opposition to the Government in writing of the incinerator”.

Councillor Kemp accepted the amendment to the Notice of Motion.

Council debated the Notice of Motion, as amended.

Councillor Squire commented that unfortunately the moment had passed on this and instead Councillor Kemp may like to investigate ways to promote recycling. Councillor Squire highlighted the work of the Council in educating and encouraging residents to use food waste caddies and recycle. Councillor Squire invited Councillor Kemp to accompany her on the roadshows.

Councillor Devulapalli supported the Motion and felt it was important for the Council to make a stand.

Councillor de Whalley referred to the campaign efforts to oppose the incinerator. He explained that the Council could take action in the future if the incinerator breached levels whilst operating.

Councillor Parish commented that this had been considered by Council on three previous occasions and highlighted air pollution and recycling levels.

Councillor Ring stated that this Motion was electioneering and could not support it.

Councillor Rose as seconder spoke in support of being seen to do something to stop the incinerator.

Councillor Kemp in summing up stated that many of her residents were concerned and she would be happy to accompany Councillor Squire at a Recycling Roadshow. Councillor Kemp stated she had been writing to the Government herself on this issue. Councillor Kemp requested a recorded vote on this matter. This was not supported by the required amount of Members.

Councillor Moriarty asked for clarification on the Motion and it was explained that Council were voting on the Notice of Motion, as amended which required the Leader to engage with Fenland District Council.

Councillor Beales commented that he would be prepared to write to the Leader of Fenland District Council, but did not support writing to Government.

RESOLVED: Council approved the Notice of Motion, as amended:

“This Council has a proud tradition of standing up against the South Lynn Incinerator - and held the public poll, in which 65,000 residents voted No. These residents have not gone away. Even after Planning Permission, Government stopped the incinerator. Residents, including Clenchwarton and West Lynn, dread the prospect of being downwind of two 90 metre high Incinerator Stacks, close to the West Norfolk border in Wisbech, one of the biggest incinerators in Europe.

This Council is one of four hosts, with the primary host being Fenland Council. We would like the Leader to engage and support the impacted Council to pose opposition to the Government in writing of the incinerator”.

(4/26) Submitted by Councillor Kemp

Motion - No to Council Sale of the Freehold of Hardwick Bridge Residential Park Homes for Over 55's

The Mayor explained that the time limit for considering Notices of Motions had been reached and this Notice of Motion would roll over to the next ordinary meeting of Council.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED FOR A COMFORT BREAK FROM 6.55pm to 7.05pm

C:95

CABINET MEMBERS REPORTS

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube.](#)

Councillor Beales moved the Cabinet Members Reports.

By way of update Councillor Moriarty explained that he had met with Heritage Live and impacted organisations regarding Sandringham Events and there had been positive engagement and lessons learned. He had also met regarding the RHS event in July.

Councillor Rust referred to a recent SNAP meeting at Gaywood Library which she was unable to attend.

Councillor Kunes referred to a recent Norfolk County Council press release relating to Electric buses which had been partly funded through the Bus Service Improvement Plan Grant and asked if there were any plans to introduce electric buses in this area. Councillor de Whalley explained that bus companies were looking into feasibility of this, but range was also an issue.

In response to a question from Councillor Collop, Councillor Ring confirmed that the Gaywood Nursery site had been withdrawn from sale, pending the recommendations from the Cemeteries Informal Working Group.

Councillor Kemp asked Councillor Rust relating to Hardwick Bridge Caravan Park. Councillor Ring stated this question should be directed at him and reminded Councillor Kemp that she should not be releasing confidential information. Councillor Kemp stated that it was in the public interest.

The Mayor advised Councillor Kemp that she should not be disclosing confidential information and asked her to stop.

Councillor Kemp stated that this was a very sad day for this Council and we were living in a dictatorship here.

Councillor Beales asked Councillor Kemp to confirm what she meant by a dictatorship and asked that the Monitoring Officer note the comment made by Councillor Kemp.

Councillor Beales called a point of order reminding Councillors that the Mayors ruling could not be challenged at the meeting.

Councillor Kemp attempted to question Councillor Ring further and was asked by the Mayor to stop. Councillor Kemp stated again that we were living in a dictatorship if the Cabinet were not talking about the things that they were doing.

The Deputy Mayor referred to Council Procedure Rule 19.1 and asked for Councillor conduct to improve.

Councillor Parish referred to the meeting with Sandringham Estate and felt that the consultation should be wider. Councillor Beales agreed to make that suggestion and confirmed that Sandringham Estate would be treated in exactly the same way as any other licensed event.

Councillor Long asked if consideration would be given to holding a civic event to mark the retirement of the Chief Executive of King's Lynn IDB, Norfolk Rivers and WMA. Councillor Beales commented that he would pass on this request to Mayor and it could be used as an opportunity to meet the new post holder.

In response to a question from Councillor Kemp, Councillor de Whalley referred to his response to the public question relating to the Ferry.

Councillor Heneghan stated that the Mens Shed would have to move shortly due to the Council selling the land and sought assurance that the Council would support them as needed. Councillor Ring stated that this information was not correct and stated he suspected this had been created by a Councillor. He referred to the Asset Management Policy and the principles within in.

Councillor Kemp asked Councillor Ring which Councillor he was talking about and if he was referring to her.

The Mayor asked Councillor Kemp to not interrupt.

Councillor Kemp stated that she felt this was disgusting, the allegations that the Council had been making about her and she wouldn't put up with it.

The Mayor asked Councillor Kemp to stop interrupting.

Councillor Kemp said that people shouldn't lie about her.

The Mayor paused the Meeting and asked Councillor Kemp to leave the meeting.

Councillor Kemp left the meeting at 7.31pm.

Councillor Ring continued with his response to Councillor Heneghan explaining that social value and community importance would be considered.

Councillor Ryves asked Helen Mead's Public Question as set out below:

"Public records indicate that the estimated cost of the Guildhall renovation and regeneration has increased from an original figure of £15 million to in excess of £30 million, with the final cost still subject to change due to the obligations arising from the Full Repairing Lease.

Can the Council clearly explain how this significant increase in expenditure will be funded, and provide explicit reassurance to residents that meeting these additional costs will not require the diversion of funding from other services, nor adversely affect the delivery of those services?"

Councillor Ring responded as follows:

"I would again note that this question follows a narrative that has been actively promoted primarily by the same lone Councillor rather than reflecting widespread concern. The suggestion that this represents the

collective anxiety of “the people of King’s Lynn” is, in my view, a gross mischaracterisation.

Turning to the substance of the question: the Council is already progressing asset disposals, ahead of the formal adoption of an Asset Management Plan and Asset Disposal Policy. In doing so, we are operating in accordance with the principles that will underpin that policy.

Those principles are clear and consistent: the Council will dispose of poor-performing assets and assets that do not deliver social, community or strategic value. Capital receipts will be used responsibly, either to support current and future capital projects across the authority or to reduce debt.

No assets are earmarked for any particular scheme, including the Guildhall. Decisions are taken through the Council’s approved decision-making framework, which in some cases sits short of full Council but remains subject to proper governance, transparency and scrutiny.

I can also reassure members and residents that the Guildhall project will not be funded at the expense of other committed projects, including the West Lynn Ferry scheme.”

In response to a question from Councillor Crofts, Councillor Lintern agreed to investigate the potential of the Allotment Competition returning and potential links with the Garden Competition. Councillor Crofts indicated he would like to be involved in the judging.

Councillor Sayers asked a question about the use of drones instead of fireworks. Councillor Lintern explained that the cost of drone displays had been looked at, but were too expensive. She also highlighted the benefits of people attending organised firework displays over using fireworks themselves.

Councillor Nash asked Ermine Amies Public Question as set out below:

“Has the council reviewed and revised policies including safeguarding and data policies and procedures following the 2025 For Women’s Supreme Court Judgement to ensure that single-sex spaces and services for women and girls are protected and all policies and procedures are compliant with the Equality Act?”

Councillor Rust stated that the Council kept all of its policies and procedures, including Safeguarding and Data Protection, under regular review to ensure they remained lawful, proportionate and compliant with the Equality Act 2010 and other relevant legislation.

Following significant legal judgements, including those of the Supreme Court, officers consider any implications for local authority practice

and take legal advice where appropriate. Where clarification or updates were required to ensure policies remained compliant with the law, these are addressed through the Council's established governance and review processes.

Councillor Rust stated that the Council remained committed to meeting its duties under the Equality Act, including the Public Sector Equality Duty, and to ensuring that services were delivered safely, fairly and lawfully for all service users, including women and girls. If specific policy documents were revised as a result of legal developments, these would be progressed through the appropriate decision-making and scrutiny arrangements.

Councillor Kunes requested a meeting with Councillor Beales on polluted countryside between Clenchwarton and King's Lynn.

Councillor Coates asked if there had been any interest in the properties at Styleman Court, Hunstanton since the local restriction had been removed. Councillor Ring stated that there had been no sales, but there had been interest.

In response to a question from Councillor Nash, Councillor de Whalley stated that the Council were working with re-fit to ensure that they met the requirements relating to the heat pumps at King's Court.

In response to a question from Councillor Devulapalli, Councillor de Whalley agreed to look at the Government Report on Biodiversity that Councillor Devulapalli had referred to and would work with officers to investigate the implications for West Norfolk.

Councillor Long referred to a Facebook Post from the Council encouraging residents not to use their wood burners on a certain day in January and asked if this was sensible, given that it was winter. Councillor de Whalley stated that this had been done for a number of years and was to raise awareness of pollution.

Councillor Blunt raised concern relating to the number of all Councillor emails which had been sent and asked Councillor Beales if he had noted an increase. Councillor Beales commented that it was frustrating that Councillors were not following due process in putting things through the correct routes, for example submitting an item for scrutiny. Councillor Beales explained that the Monitoring Officer would be providing Councillors with information on the proper use of the Councillor email address.

Councillor Nash referred to the question asked by Councillor Long relating to wood burners and asked if the social media post was targeted at smoke control areas. Councillor de Whalley commented that it was about raising awareness of air pollution.

C:96 **MEMBER'S QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions.

The meeting closed at 7.47 pm