

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

REGENERATION AND DEVELOPMENT PANEL

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Regeneration and Development Panel held
on Thursday, 23rd October, 2025 at 6.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Town
Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

PRESENT: T Parish (Chair), B Anota, R Blunt, F Bone, A Bubb,
Mrs J Collingham, R Colwell, M de Whalley, P Hodson, S Lintern,
J Osborne and J Ratcliffe

Portfolio Holders

Councillor J Moriarty
Councillor S Ring,

Officers:

Jemma Curtis, Regeneration Programmes Manager
Duncan Hall, Assistant Director, Regeneration, Housing and Place
Connor Smalls, Regeneration Programmes Officer
Alex Fradley, Planning Policy Manager
Hannah Wood-Handy, Planning Control Manager
Stuart Ashworth, Assistant Director for Environment and Planning

Present under Standing Order 34:

Councillor Lintern
Councillor de Whalley
Councillor Anota (Teams)
Councillor Blunt (Teams)
Councillor Collingham(Teams)
Councillor Ratcliffe (Teams)

External Attendees

Representatives from BDP
Representatives from Anglian Water.

RD45: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Crofts.

RD46: MINUTES

RESOLVED: The minutes from the meetings held on the 1st July and
9th September 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the
Chair.

RD47: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There was none.

RD48: **URGENT BUSINESS**

There was none.

RD49: **MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

Councillor Lintern and de Whalley were present under Standing Order 34.

Councillor Anota, Blunt, Collingham and Ratcliffe were present Under Standing Order 34 on Teams.

RD50: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

There was none.

RD51: **KING'S LYNN MASTERPLAN**

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

Representatives from BDP and the Regeneration Programmes Manager gave a presentation to the Panel.

The Chair invited questions and comments from the Panel.

The Chair, Councillor Parish questioned the costings of the four consultants used.

The Regeneration Programmes Manager explained due to the different elements and details of the scope of work for the riverfront, the cost was between £250,000 to £300,000 for the use of consultants.

The Chair, Councillor Parish commented on the phrase used, 'investable opportunities' and sought confirmation it related to devolution and local government reorganisation and future spend and strategy.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Collingham commented previous money had been spent on consultants however there was no progress. She expressed her concern that previous work had not been learnt from and sought clarification if the previous work which had been carried out was still relevant or useful. She highlighted the amount of money being spent further on consultancy was concerning with no outcome.

Portfolio Holder, Councillor Ring advised work previously had been learnt from and private investment was not going to be received until planning was approved for the Masterplan.

Representatives from BDP provided assurance, previous work was being considered and useful. He explained evidence was being reviewed as the first phase of the project.

The Chair, Councillor Parish sought clarification on consideration of other proposals such as Southgates and STARS Projects.

The Regeneration Programmes Manager referred to the previous panel meeting in which Norfolk County Council provided an update on STARS to include Baxters plain and the plans are due to be submitted before Christmas to the Department of Transport. She highlighted to the panel, Southgates was to be included in the Masterplan as already an extensive piece of work had been carried out to plan for the development,

Councillor Bone sought assurance on the plans for South Quay, Boal Quay and Devils Alley as he had concerns heritage and culture were not restored.

Representative from BDP explained the riverfront scheme was to be reviewed to establish what already exists. He added there was an extensive consultation and engagement process to include co-design workshops.

Councillor Colwell referred to the Port area and Common Staithe Quay and questioned if these could be used for car parking so the Tuesday Market Place could be used and appreciated for alternative uses.

Representative from BDP explained the car parking strategy was also being developed and it was being considered what was most appropriate.

The Regeneration Programmes Manager provided further detail on the masterplan identifying future developments to open spaces such as the Tuesday Market Place.

Councillor Bone referred to zone six which was West Lynn and commented the significance of this area for residents to view the quay and the expressed his concern this would be used for a car park.

Representative from BDP explained due to the bio diversity aspect from planning this area was restricted for development however park and ride could be explored. He added the site was a key asset to enjoying the river for King's Lynn.

Councillor Bubb commented on the Ferry and the importance of this working and the river crossing needing to be accessible for residents.

The Regeneration Programmes Manager commented on the desire for investment in the Ferry infrastructure and explained the reasoning of it not be included in the business case and outlining that economic growth would strengthen the case.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Collingham questioned the economic benefit of an improved Ferry if the West Lynn site was restricted for development.

Councillor Colwell questioned if the Chapel Street car park was included in the King's Lynn Masterplan.

The Regeneration Programmes Manager explained it would be featured in the plan however there had already been pre-development work carried out and it was being considered as part of the car parking strategy.

Vice- Chair, Councillor Osborne commented on the importance of keeping up to date on the planning and biodiversity net gain policies and the impact they were to have on the masterplan.

The Chair, Councillor Parish commented on the two parts of the consultation and hoped there was more responses to other consultations that had been carried out.

Councillor Bubb sought clarification on the benefits of this masterplan for residents in rural areas.

The Regeneration Programmes Manager explained King's Lynn is the main key service centre within the Borough therefore it was important to maintain the viability of the town centre.

Portfolio Holder, Councillor Ring commented on the design of the riverfront and explained residents and consultation would be listened to. He expressed his agreement with the Tuesday Market Place used for other purposes and not just a car park. He commented the Port area sites were a catalyst which needed to be focused on to allow car parks to be relocated. He provided assurance previous work which had been done was useful and was to be used as part of the masterplan.

The Chair, Councillor Parish asked if previous work of the Market Place Task Group had been included and used in the masterplan.

The Regeneration Programmes Manager confirmed this had not yet been considered but agreed to take this action on board.

The Chair, Councillor Parish questioned if sign post could be used instead of the term, wayfinding infrastructure.

Councillor Colwell sought assurance on the awaited confirmation of the Del Monte site.

The Regeneration Programmes Officer confirmed there had only been little engagement with the company which was ongoing.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Collingham referred to public transport and highlighted pressure needed to be put on the train service. She questioned how the masterplan consultation aligned with the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWHIP) consultation.

The Planning Policy Manager commented, planning had been an integral component of the masterplan and the planning team had met with BDP representatives. He added the principles were to be embedded into the next Local Plan. He highlighted the sites mentioned had been available for a long time and it was important to consider what was viable and achievable for King's Lynn.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Lintern questioned why the Del Monte site was included in the masterplan if it was not in the control of the Borough Council.

Portfolio Holder, Councillor Ring highlighted the Del Monte was a critical site and outlined the similarities to the Port area site. He explained the Borough Council was attempting to engage with the owners.

The Chair, Councillor Parish summarised and highlighted Members want to see results and for the masterplan to be achievable by getting to the planning stage as the Panel had seen previous reports.

RESOLVED: The update was noted, and the comments of the Panel would be taken into consideration as appropriate

RD52: **PRESENTATION FROM ANGLIAN WATER**

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

A Representative from Anglian Water gave a presentation to the Panel. A copy which is attached.

The Chair invited question and comments from the Panel.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley expressed his concern with planning consent and questioned the situation with Anglian Water objecting to planning applications.

Representative from Anglian Water explained Anglian Water work with Officers at the Borough Council. She added Anglian Water were

lobbying for change and highlighted working together to overcome barriers.

Councillor Bone commented if the population were to continue to increase and questioned if there was under investment and if Anglian Water should have better planned.

Representative from Anglian Water commented lessons were to be learnt from the past and growth had been restricted due to how Anglian Water are regulated and invested. She explained the Local Plan did not tie in with Anglian Water's current short term investment plan. She highlighted they were lobbying to tie in with the Local Plan timescales and there needed a fundamental change with how Anglian Water was regulated.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Blunt thanked the representative from Anglian Water on the clarification as a strategic response was not received to the Local Plan. He commented on the West Winch development and hoped there was a strategy being put in place from Anglian Water. He commented that often comments on planning applications did not take account of the cumulative effect of other planning applications within the area.

The Representative from Anglian Water explained they were currently working on a drainage and wastewater management plan which was a statutory requirement. She explained this plan considered networks and wastewater recycling centres were currently in place and how they could manage growth in the future. She added Council Officers were engaging in this but acknowledged there were challenges. She referred to the cumulative impact and explained planning responses looked at known growth and infrastructure was considered as part of the response.

The Assistant Director for Environment and Planning commented on the Local Plan and hoped Anglian Water investment would align with the plan. He reminded Members Anglian Water were not a statutory consultee to applications, but their comments were considered.

Portfolio Holder, Councillor Moriarty welcomed proactive engagement and commented Central Government encouraged developments to be built but needed to be reminded of the other aspects such as Anglian Water infrastructure need to be considered.

The Chair, Councillor Parish highlighted the issues with wastewater disposal at Heacham meaning no further development in that area.

Councillor Bubb referred to the Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and the money being spent pumping water into the wash. He questioned why Anglian Water did not receive any of this water.

The Representative from Anglian Water explained they were working with, and discussions with the IDB were ongoing. She added other innovative works were ongoing including a new reservoir and new strategic pipelines to help with demand.

In response to a question from Councillor Lintern, under Standing Order 34, the representative from Anglian Water clarified farms managed their own water supply. She added Anglian Water were not allowing non-domestic allocation for agricultural uses such as chicken farms.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Blunt commented that he was surprised that there was no legal requirement for Anglian Water to supply to non-domestic allocations such as industrial or agricultural supplies.

The Representative from Anglian Water explained they work with non-domestic allocations to enable supply however they ensure domestic supply was not affected for the future.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Blunt commented this was providing further overheads for businesses restricting production. He added that he felt Anglian Water should be providing water to both domestic and non-domestic customers.

The Representative from Anglian Water explained strategic pipelines had been delayed and if water wasn't there to supply them, a balance needed to be considered to ensure future domestic use. She highlighted innovations were being considered to resolve the situation.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley questioned what other water companies were doing to resolve the situation. In addition, he questioned if Anglian Water were working with Central Government to achieve the building targets.

The Representative from Anglian Water explained there was no easy solution and re use of water was not permitted by the Water Industry Act. She added it was not just water that was being reviewed it was also the delivery and the infrastructure.

The Assistant Director for Environment and Planning commented Central Government were realising the issues with water infrastructure and supplying water to new developments, as they were being contacted on the issue from various angles.

The Planning Policy Manager commended the working relationship with Anglian Water throughout the Local Plan. He highlighted things can be done locally with agencies such as Anglian Water, IDB and Environment Agency.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley referred to his ward, Gayton and Grimston and the issues with water quality. He commented there was capacity for water recycling and ability to feed into the water recycling centres however the quality was lower due to the recycling centre being smaller and slower. He questioned if Anglian Water were looking to resolve the situation.

The Representative from Anglian Water explained if this was descriptive work then there would be no numeric permit therefore the quality is measured in a different way. She confirmed Anglian Water were working with the Environment Agency to identify issues and find resolutions. She explained there were compliance factors in a permit.

The Assistant Director for Environment and Planning confirmed that he didn't think Grimston was a descriptive works and advised Members, Anglian Water have recently spent a lot of money to resolve the water quality issue within the area.

The Chair, Councillor Parish commented Anglian Water needed to be involved before sites were allocated.

Representative from Anglian Water provided assurance that they are already engaging with the planning team at the Borough Council.

The Planning Policy Manger highlighted to the Panel site allocations were adopted by the Local Plan and planning permission being approved can include clauses. He explained the importance of the timescales of the Local Plan aligning with Anglian Waters investment plan. He provided assurance to the Members of the continued working relationship and positive work being done.

The Assistant Director for Environment and Planning referred to upcoming planning committee training. He acknowledged there was disagreements between Anglian Water and the Borough Council, but Officers were working together.

RESOLVED: The update was noted and the comments of the Panel would be taken into consideration as appropriate.

RD53: WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD DECISION LIST

Councillor Blunt commented the Panel should not only work with reports on the Forward Plan but also scrutinise and challenge external impacts. He suggested a challenging progress update on the West Winch development.

It was confirmed to the Panel that short term improvements to Southgates was added to the Work Programme.

It was agreed the Democratic Services Officer would arrange a workshop prior to the next Regeneration and Development Panel meeting to discuss and organise the work programme.

RESOLVED: The Panel's Work Programme was noted.

RD54: **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Regeneration and Development Panel would be held on **13th January** at 6.00pm in the **Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place.**

The meeting closed at 8.15 pm