

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

COUNCIL

Minutes from the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 24th September, 2026 at 5.00 pm in the Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn

PRESENT: Councillor S Bearshaw (Chair)

Councillors B Ayres, T Barclay, A Beales, J Bhondi, P Bland, R Blunt, F Bone, A Bubb, A Bullen, R Coates, Mrs J Collingham, S Collop, R Colwell, C J Crofts, P Devulapalli, S Everett, J Fry, B Griffin, P Hodson, B Jones, A Kemp, J Kirk, B Long, A Moore, J Moriarty, S Nash, J Osborne, T Parish, F Pidcock, P Powers, J Ratcliffe, S Ring, C Rose, J Rust, A Ryves, D Sayers, Mrs V Spikings, M Storey and A Ware

C:36 PRAYERS

Prayers were led by Father Ben Almond.

C:37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dickinson, Heneghan, Humphrey, Joyce, Kunes, Lintern, Lowe, Morley, Sandell, Squire, Tyler, de Whalley and de Winton.

C:38 MINUTES

RESOLVED: The minutes from the meeting held on 29th July were agreed as a correct record.

C:39 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

C:40 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

C:41 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no Urgent Business.

C:42 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no petitions or public questions.

C:43 REVIEW OF PROPORTIONALITY

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

In proposing the recommendations contained within the report, Councillor Beales proposed an amendment to the proportional allocation of seats. He explained to Council that the Audit Committee, which had a current Membership of five Members, had experienced issues with maintaining a quorum and he proposed that the Membership be increased to seven Members, which would maintain a quoracy of three. Councillor Beales outlined the impact that this would have on the proportionality report as contained in the Agenda as follows:

Audit Committee Membership would be revised to seven Members and political make up would be 3 Independent Partnership, 2 Conservative, 1 Reform and 1 Labour. This would impact the overall proportionality further in that the Labour Group would lose a seat on the Licensing and Appeals Board and the Independent Partnership would gain a seat on the Licensing and Appeals Board.

Councillor Ring seconded the amendment to the proposal.

After being put to the vote, Council agreed the amendment to proportionality in order to increase the Membership of the Audit Committee from five Members to seven Members.

Council then approved the revised proportionality calculations, as amended.

A copy of the revised proportionality figures, as approved by Council is appended to these minutes.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Membership of the Audit Committee be increased from five Members to Seven Members.
2. That the proportional allocation of seats be amended in accordance with the table appended to these minutes.
3. That the make up of Task Groups be amended in accordance with section 3 of the report and Democratic Services liaise with Group Leaders regarding revised appointments to Task Groups as required.

C:44

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COUNCIL BODIES

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

Cabinet – 8 September 2026

CAB45: Appointment of Honorary Aldermen

Councillor Beales proposed Cabinet Recommendation 45, Appointment of Honorary Aldermen, and expressed his support for the

former Councillors nominated for Honorary Alderman status. He highlighted the significant contribution each nominee had made through their civic duties, Council responsibilities and ward representation, together with their dedicated service to the local community.

Councillor Blunt seconded the proposal and stated that he did so with great honour.

Councillor Hodson proposed the addition of former Councillor Sampson to the list of nominees. In response, the Mayor advised that this could be considered at a future date to allow the appropriate process to be followed and to ensure that the eligibility criteria were fully considered.

Councillor Long referred to the timing of the awards and requested that consideration be given to how recognition of service could continue to be achieved in the future, particularly in light of proposals for local government reorganisation and the establishment of a Unitary Council. He noted that many newly elected Councillors might be unfamiliar with those who had previously given distinguished service to the Borough Council.

Councillor Rust expressed her support for the nominations and agreed that the individuals concerned were worthy recipients of the honour.

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Spikings, proposed the addition of former Councillor Nockolds to the list of nominees. The Mayor advised that this nomination would be considered alongside the additional nomination put forward by Councillor Hodson.

Councillor Moriarty reminded Council of the role and purpose of Honorary Aldermen, which was to represent the Mayor in their absence, and expressed his support for the recommendations.

Councillor Collop spoke in support of the nominations and reminded Council that former Councillor Lord Howard had played a key role in the establishment of the King's Lynn Area Committee.

Councillor Collingham commented that it was important to ensure that the award retained its prestige and suggested that this could be diminished if it were conferred upon too many former Councillors.

Councillor Kirk expressed his support for the nominations before Council.

Councillor Kemp also supported the nominations and stated that it was important to maintain the tradition of recognising distinguished service to the Council.

Councillor Beales, in summing up, thanked Members for their contributions to the debate. He reminded Council that there were

currently nineteen serving Honorary Aldermen and advised that rather than considering ad hoc nominations, through would be given to proper consideration to the significant number of former Councillors that fulfilled the minimum requirements for nomination as an Alderman, mindful of the exceptional nature of the award and giving due respect to the will of Council.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council places on record its sincere appreciation and gratitude for the eminent services rendered to the Borough Council by former Councillors Carol Bower, Colin Manning, Lesley Bambridge and Lord Greville Howard.
2. That, pursuant to Section 249(1) of the Local Government Act 1972, the title of Honorary Alderman be conferred upon former Councillors Carol Bower, Colin Manning, Lesley Bambridge and Lord Greville Howard in recognition of their eminent service to the Borough.
3. That an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council be convened on Thursday 29 October 2026, immediately following the ordinary meeting of the Council, for the formal conferment of the title of Honorary Alderman and the presentation of aldermanic badges to the recipients.

CAB46: Future Swimming Provision for West Norfolk

Councillor Ring proposed Cabinet Recommendation CAB46, *Future Swimming Provision for West Norfolk*, and reminded Council that there were two recommendations for consideration. He outlined the need for a replacement swimming facility, highlighting the condition of the existing St James Pool, which was approaching the end of its operational life and incurring increasing maintenance costs. He emphasised the importance of maintaining swimming provision within the Borough and referred to the need to improve water safety and swimming ability amongst young people. Councillor Ring advised that the proposals had been developed following extensive consultation and stakeholder engagement and encouraged Council to support the recommendations.

Councillor Beales seconded the proposal and reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Rust expressed her support for the proposals, stating that they responded to the needs of young people across West Norfolk. She highlighted concerns regarding low levels of swimming ability and noted that the proposals supported the Council's ambition to become a Marmot Place. She further commented that the project would contribute to addressing health inequalities and provide wider preventative health and social benefits.

Councillor Long acknowledged that the Corporate Performance Panel had considered and supported the recommendations. However, he requested further information on the costs associated with bringing the existing St James facility up to a standard that would enable its continued operation. He suggested that, in light of the pause in Local Government Reorganisation, consideration should be given to delaying the project until further information on the ongoing costs of retaining St James Pool had been provided.

Councillor Long proposed that progress on the project be delayed to allow further work to be undertaken. The Mayor referred Councillor Long to Council Procedure Rule 13.13 and advised that the proposal did not constitute a valid amendment. Councillor Long subsequently advised that he would not be supporting the recommendations.

Councillor Kemp expressed concern that relocating the pool from the town centre would reduce accessibility for many residents. She noted the advantages of the current location in terms of proximity to bus and rail services and stated that she could not support the proposals due to concerns regarding the proposed location.

Councillor Osborne acknowledged concerns relating to the proposed location but agreed that St James Pool required replacement as it was an outdated facility. He explained that redevelopment on the existing site would result in the Borough being without swimming provision for a significant period. Councillor Osborne stated that the proposed project timetable would allow sufficient opportunity to consider access improvements and confirmed that he would be supporting the proposals.

Councillor Bubb commented that the proposed location could be difficult to access for residents without private transport. He suggested that either a town centre location or a dedicated bus service should be considered.

Councillor Moriarty spoke in support of the proposals and questioned why the concerns raised by Councillor Long had not been put forward when the matter was considered by the Corporate Performance Panel.

Councillor Ryves expressed the view that additional information was required regarding both the costs of retaining St James Pool and the overall costs of the proposed project, particularly in light of the Council's financial position and borrowing requirements. He also suggested that further consideration should be given to the proposed location.

Councillor Moore stated that he would have supported a proposal to delay the project to allow further work to be undertaken. He disagreed with comments made regarding accessibility and, following a point of clarification from Councillor Osborne that his earlier comments related

to improvements in access to Lynnsport, reiterated his concerns. Councillor Moore stated that the proposals should be revisited to provide Members with a fuller understanding of the costs associated with retaining St James Pool and to allow previous work to be reviewed. He advised that he would not be supporting the recommendations.

Following further comments from Councillor Ryves, the Mayor reminded Council that Councillor Ryves had already spoken on the matter.

Councillor Bone commented that retaining the existing location would result in a period without swimming provision whilst redevelopment works were undertaken. He emphasised the importance of maintaining swimming facilities for schools and considered Lynnsport to be within walking distance of a number of secondary schools. Councillor Bone confirmed that he would be supporting the recommendations.

Councillor Ratcliffe advised that she had attended the Corporate Performance Panel meeting and considered that the matter had been thoroughly debated, with costs receiving detailed scrutiny. She confirmed her support for the proposals.

Councillor Colwell spoke in support of the recommendations and expressed concern at suggestions that the project be delayed. He described the proposal as an exciting opportunity to deliver an important community facility and support the local economy. He noted that Lynnsport was surrounded by existing housing development, was accessible to residents and benefited from free parking.

Councillor Devulapalli thanked Councillor Ring for engaging with stakeholders throughout the process. However, she expressed concern regarding the accessibility of the proposed location and the availability of public transport links. She also queried whether alternative sites had been considered and stated that a pause in the project would allow the concerns raised to be addressed.

Councillor Griffin noted that there were already two other swimming pools located to the north of the town centre and commented that the area surrounding Lynnsport often experienced significant traffic congestion at peak times. He stated that he would not be supporting the recommendations as he felt the proposals had not been subject to sufficient scrutiny.

Councillor Beales referred to previous comments regarding the accessibility of Lynnsport and noted that these appeared to conflict with concerns raised about traffic congestion in the area. He stated that Lynnsport was already a well-used facility and advised that accessibility considerations would form part of the overall customer experience and design process. Councillor Beales reminded Members that St James Pool was nearing the end of its operational life and

carried significant maintenance costs. He also referred to the results of the public consultation and emphasised the need for investment in a modern replacement facility.

Councillor Blunt, as Chair of the Corporate Performance Panel, advised that the matter had been the subject of extensive debate at the Panel and confirmed his support for the proposals.

Councillor Sayers stated that whilst he remained mindful of the financial implications, the project was about more than finances and would provide a valuable facility for the residents of West Norfolk.

Councillor Nash commented that no information had been provided regarding the ongoing costs of retaining St James Pool or detail of other potential locations that had been considered. He referred to the proposed development at West Winch as a possible alternative location and advised that he would not be supporting the recommendations.

Councillor Ring, in summing up, advised that a cross-party working group had examined a range of locations and options and had concluded that no town centre site was capable of accommodating the proposed facility. He stated that the Lynnsport location was essential to ensuring the economic viability of the project. Councillor Ring further advised that redevelopment of the St James site would result in the town centre being without swimming provision for approximately two years, with significant implications for swimming clubs and local schools. He referred to available public transport options, including West Norfolk Community Transport services, and stated that Lynnsport was accessible to many residents. Councillor Ring expressed disappointment that Councillor Griffin was unable to support the proposals, particularly given the benefits that the new facility would bring to residents living in more deprived areas of the Borough. He stated that any delay would postpone the delivery of a much-needed facility for the residents of West Norfolk and urged Council to support the recommendations.

RESOLVED:

That Full Council:

1. Approve the allocation of a maximum of £845,609.17 from reserves to fund the new Lynnsport Project through to RIBA Stage 3.
2. Delegate authority to the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance, to determine the appropriate reserve to fund the work.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED FOR A COMFORT BREAK FROM 6.18pm to 6.30pm.

C:45

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL KING'S LYNN

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

Councillor Beales proposed the recommendations contained within the report and advised Members that it was important that the matter be considered by Full Council, given the significance of the Hospital to the local community. He stated that it was vital for both the Council and residents to understand the Council's formal position on the future of the Hospital and to provide reassurance regarding the actions being taken by the Council. He considered it appropriate that Full Council had the opportunity to debate the matter.

Councillor Beales explained that the intention was also to assist the QEH and Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee by setting out the formal view of the Council.

He outlined the recommendations contained within the report for Council's consideration, including the proposal to arrange a Joint Panel Meeting following a briefing from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The recommendations recognised that some highly specialised services could be provided on a regional basis; however, this should not be used as justification for the removal of essential local services from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, particularly given the rural nature of the area.

Councillor Rust, in seconding the report, expressed her support for the recommendations. She referred to previous campaigns that had been undertaken and the recent Hospital Annual General Meeting. She referred to maternity services and noted that fertility rates had declined nationally. Councillor Rust also referred to elective procedures which could be delivered regionally but emphasised the need to maintain appropriate local provision, particularly for emergency services.

Councillor Rust highlighted the current Healthwatch survey and encouraged residents and Councillors to respond, whilst noting that some of the questions were restrictive. She further encouraged individuals to contact the Hospital directly if they were unable to fully express their views through the survey.

Councillor Rust also referred to planned housing growth and the increasing population, highlighting the need to ensure that local healthcare services were maintained and developed accordingly.

Councillor Sayers provided details of an occasion when his partner had required urgent healthcare support during pregnancy and had been able to access assistance quickly through the ambulance service. He stated that the situation would have been very different if local assistance was unavailable. Councillor Sayers expressed concern that the loss of local ambulance provision could have serious

consequences in similar situations and stated that lives could be placed at risk.

Councillor Colwell welcomed the report and its recommendations. He stressed the importance of providing residents with a clear statement of the Council's position. He referred to the community petition, which had attracted more than 10,000 signatures, and encouraged those who had not yet signed to do so. He emphasised the need to reassure residents that vital hospital services would remain locally.

Councillor Colwell also informed Council of a public event 'Human A&E Queue' demonstration due to take place on the Tuesday Market Place on 17 October at 11.30am.

Councillor Osborne expressed his support for the proposals and commended the recommendations set out within the report.

Councillor Kemp stated that local services should not be removed given the distances involved in travelling to alternative hospitals and rural nature of the area. Whilst acknowledging the important role of Health Hubs, she emphasised that core hospital services should continue to be provided locally.

Councillor Fry outlined the range of services currently provided locally and gave an example of the Accident and Emergency process, explaining how it could be adversely affected if patients were required to travel further for emergency treatment. She also highlighted the importance of patient flow in supporting patient health and wellbeing and referred to the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit provision. Councillor Fry expressed her support for the recommendations contained within the report.

Councillor Long spoke in support of the report and stated that people's health and lives should not be placed at risk. He highlighted the potential impact on ambulance services if greater travel distances were required, together with the implications for hospital patient transport services.

Councillor Ryves, in supporting the recommendations, suggested that the Council should consider allocating funding to gather evidence and data to support the case for retaining local hospital services. The Mayor referred Councillor Ryves to the recommendations contained within the report and advised that this matter could be considered further by the Joint Panel when it examined the issues in greater detail.

Councillor Ring addressed Council and stated that the prospect of not having a fully functioning local hospital was a matter of significant concern. He referred to services that had already been lost or were no longer available in King's Lynn, including certain mental health provisions. Councillor Ring stated that residents were concerned about the potential loss of further vital services. He emphasised that the issue

was not a political matter but one that was of collective importance to the people of West Norfolk and the surrounding area who relied upon the services provided by the Hospital.

Councillor Jones stated that the Hospital had saved his life, as well as the lives of many other residents.

Councillor Parish commented on his own experience of using emergency services at the Hospital and stressed the importance of retaining services locally. He noted that ambulances would be unavailable for longer periods if required to travel greater distances.

Councillor Storey commented that the Hospital was the most important building in the Borough and that residents' health and wellbeing were of paramount importance. He expressed his full support for the recommendations and thanked the Leader for bringing the matter before Council.

Councillor Devulapalli reminded Members that she served on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Board of Governors and encouraged Councillors to pass any comments to her for onward submission to the Board. She also urged Members to complete the Healthwatch survey and agreed to circulate details of the survey to all Councillors.

Councillor Collingham expressed the view that West Norfolk was being overlooked and referred to concerns relating to both hospital and railway services. She supported Councillor Ryves' suggestion that funding should be made available to gather evidence and data to strengthen the case for retaining local services.

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Spikings, reminded Council that any loss of services would also result in the loss of skilled doctors, nurses and other key support staff. She emphasised the importance of ensuring that appropriate services were available locally and highlighted the levels of deprivation experienced in the area.

Councillor Ratcliffe supported the comments made throughout the debate. In response to comments regarding rail services, she informed Council that she had met with the MP for South West Norfolk to discuss the matter. Councillor Ratcliffe also commented on challenges facing West Norfolk in relation to transport links, broadband provision and healthcare services, and urged Members to support the recommendations contained within the report.

Councillor Beales, in summing up, thanked Members for their contributions and the constructive manner in which the debate had been conducted. Referring to the suggestion that additional funding be made available to gather evidence, he stated that whilst he did not want to pre-empt scrutiny by the Joint Panel, he reassured Members that funds would be allocated if needed and would be reported to Council.

On being put to the vote the recommendations contained within the report were approved unanimously.

RESOLVED: That Council:

1. Support the retention at QEH of 24/7 A&E, acute medicine, emergency general surgery, critical care, anaesthesia and emergency theatres, consultant led maternity and obstetrics, paediatrics and appropriate neonatal care, trauma and orthopaedics, core acute medical specialties, stroke assessment and inpatient care, and comprehensive diagnostic services.
2. Recognise that highly specialised services may appropriately be provided at regional or tertiary centres where there is a clear clinical case.
3. Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Norfolk and Waveney University Hospitals Group seeking assurance that the new hospital and any future clinical strategy will maintain the complete package of services necessary for QEH to continue functioning as a full District General Hospital serving West Norfolk and its wider catchment.
4. That Council notes the significance of this matter and its relevance to the Council's scrutiny function, and requests the Chairs of the relevant Panels to convene a Joint Panel meeting to consider the future provision of services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.
5. The Joint Panel should be informed by the Councillors' Briefing Session arranged with the Hospital, with Members encouraged to identify and raise key questions and lines of enquiry during that briefing to support the Panel's subsequent consideration of the issues.
6. That representatives of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital be invited to attend the Joint Panel meeting to provide information, respond to Members' questions, and assist the Council in understanding the implications of future service delivery and hospital development plans for West Norfolk and its wider catchment area.

C:46 **NOTICES OF MOTION**

None.

C:47 **NOTICE OF MOTION 02/26 - REVIEW OF CONSULTANT EXPENDITURE RELATING TO LYNNSPORT PROPOSAL**

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

Councillor Blunt, as Chair of the Corporate Performance Panel proposed the recommendations within the report which presented the

findings of the Corporate Performance Panel following its review of Notice of Motion 2/26 regarding consultant expenditure on the Lynnsport and St James Pool proposal. He explained that the Panel had reviewed the procurement arrangements, governance processes, financial controls and affordability assessments associated with the project. It was demonstrated that consultants were appointed through a compliant procurement process using an established framework and mini-competition. The project progressed through appropriate governance routes, with Cabinet and Council considering key decisions throughout its development.

Councillor Blunt advised that the Panel also examined affordability and financial oversight and Members were advised that affordability assessments formed part of the project development process and that concerns regarding borrowing constraints were identified through review by the Section 151 Officer before any final commitment was made. Those concerns ultimately led to the project being paused and reconsidered.

Councillor Blunt explained that the Panel further considered whether value had been obtained from the work undertaken. Whilst the project had not progressed, Members recognised that the studies, technical assessments and design work completed provided an important evidence base that could continue to inform future leisure investment decisions.

Councillor Blunt explained that, importantly, the review also identified lessons for future projects, particularly around the benefits of earlier stakeholder engagement and maintaining affordability reviews throughout project development.

The Corporate Performance Panel made no further recommendations and concluded that the matters raised within Notice of Motion 02/26 had been fully considered. Councillor Blunt requested that Council note the findings of the Panel and agree that the requirements of the Notice of Motion had now been fulfilled.

Councillor Long as Vice Chair of the Corporate Performance Panel, seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: That Council:

1. Notes the findings of the Corporate Performance Panel in response to Notice of Motion 02/26.
2. Notes that the Panel found evidence that procurement, governance and financial oversight processes were applied during the development of the Lynnsport proposal.

3. Supports the continued incorporation of lessons learned from the project, particularly in relation to stakeholder engagement and ongoing affordability review during major capital projects.

4. Agrees that the requirements of Notice of Motion 02/26 have now been fulfilled.

C:48

CABINET MEMBERS REPORTS

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

Councillor Beales moved the Cabinet Members Reports and provided an update on the pause of Local Government Review, and the recent staff briefings that had been arranged and well attended.

Councillor Blunt referred to the decision to pause Local Government Reorganisation and to recent communications issued by Norfolk County Council. He sought reassurance that West Norfolk would continue to have a strong voice and representation in discussions going forward. In response, Councillor Beales advised that six Norfolk authorities had supported the three-unitary authority model and considered this to be a position of strength. He assured Members that he would continue to advocate for West Norfolk's interests and ensure that the area remained fully represented in future discussions.

In response to a question from Councillor Everett, it was confirmed that the Community Governance Review relating to the establishment of a Town Council for King's Lynn was continuing to progress. Members were advised that a second phase of consultation would be undertaken, providing further information on governance arrangements, precept implications and financial considerations. The consultation material would first be considered and agreed by the Electoral Arrangements Committee before being issued.

Councillor Kemp referred to funding for improvements to the Ferry Landing Stage. Councillor Beales explained that discussions had been taking place between the Borough Council and Norfolk County Council regarding the matter and agreed to circulate Norfolk County Council's most recent response to all Members for information.

Councillor Parish referred to the ongoing 'Call for Sites' consultation and requested that consideration be given to making future online consultations easier to navigate. Councillor Moriarty reminded Members that the Call for Sites exercise represented an early stage of the Local Plan process. He advised that the consultation had been developed in conjunction with the Communications Team and that briefing sessions had been held with parish councils. Councillor Moriarty explained that the next stage would involve the Local Plan Task Group considering the submitted sites, together with a review of

the effectiveness of the consultation process and any improvements that could be made for future exercises. He thanked the officers involved in progressing the Local Plan.

Councillor Long referred to advertising posters for circuses displayed on lampposts and, whilst acknowledging that such displays were exempt from fly-posting restrictions, asked whether further efforts could be made to reduce visual clutter. Councillor Beales agreed to investigate the matter. He also advised that improvements to the appearance of the Southgates Garage site would be progressed in the near future.

Councillor Everett raised concerns regarding recent disruptions to Fen Line rail services. Councillor Ratcliffe advised that she had met with the relevant Members of Parliament, who recognised that the recent service failures were unacceptable. She also confirmed that she was liaising with organisations including Transport East and Greater Anglia to pursue improvements and agreed to provide Members with updates through future Cabinet Members' Reports to Council.

Councillor Kemp referred to safeguarding services and the South Lynn Health Hub and asked what steps could be taken to secure GP provision at the facility. Councillor Rust agreed to write to the Integrated Care Board to propose that funding be made available to support the provision of GP services at the Health Hub.

Councillor Parish requested that parish councils continue to be kept informed regarding developments related to Local Government Reorganisation. Councillor Beales reminded Members that the process had been paused rather than cancelled and referred to correspondence he had received from the relevant Government Minister.

Councillor Blunt referred to proposals for a second substation at Walpole and asked whether there would be opportunities for parish councils to contribute to discussions regarding areas of risk. Councillor Beales agreed to meet with Councillor Blunt to discuss the matter further.

Councillor Kirk congratulated all those involved in the Heritage Open Day events, including the Mayor and Deputy Mayor. Councillor Beales endorsed those comments and acknowledged the significant contribution made by all those involved in delivering the event.

Councillor Kemp referred to the recent withdrawal of a bus service that had served St James Surgery and asked whether any action could be taken to reinstate it. Councillor Ratcliffe requested further details and agreed to investigate the matter.

Councillor Sayers referred to the Data Protection complaints procedure and advised that he had been unable to locate the relevant information

on the Council's website. Councillor Ratcliffe confirmed that the policy had been approved and published and advised that further work was being undertaken to implement and publicise the associated complaints procedure.

Councillor Blunt congratulated all those involved in organising the Hunstanton Soap Box Derby and asked whether opportunities to expand the event in future years had been considered, including the provision of video screens or grandstands. Councillor Beales advised that he would pass those suggestions to Councillor Lintern for consideration.

Councillor Kemp referred to the Call for Sites exercise and the consideration of land within areas at high risk of flooding. Councillor Moriarty advised that all submitted sites would be assessed through the Local Plan process and that further consultation would be undertaken as required.

Having sat for almost three hours, the Mayor proposed that the duration of the meeting be extended to enable the remaining business to be concluded. Upon being put to the meeting, Council did not agree to extend the duration of the meeting.

Councillor Devulapalli referred to the Health and Wellbeing Partnership and the ongoing review of its membership arrangements. Councillor Beales advised that a meeting had been arranged to ensure that the Borough Council remained appropriately represented and involved in the Partnership's future work.

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm

Amended proportionality as agreed by Full Council on 24th September 2026
(agreed amendment was to increase the Membership of the Audit Committee to seven Members)

	Total Membership	Independent Partnership	Conservative	Labour	Reform UK	Progressive Group	West Norfolk Independent Group
Total number of Members	55 (includes 1 non aligned)	20	17	5	7	2	3
Standards Committee	7	3	2	1	1	0	0
Licensing Committee	13	5	4	1	2	0	1
Licensing and Appeals Board	13	5	4	1	1	1	1
Planning Committee	13	5	4	1	2	0	1
Regeneration and Development Panel	12	4	4	1	2	0	1
Environment and Community Panel	12	4	4	1	2	1	0
Corporate Performance Panel	12	4	4	1	1	1	1
Appointments Board	9	4	3	1	1	0	0
Audit Committee	7	3	2	1	1	0	0
Electoral Arrangements Committee	11	4	3	1	1	1	1
Total number of seats	109	41	34	10	14	4	6