

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY PANEL**

Minutes from the Meeting of the Environment and Community Panel held on Tuesday, 3rd September, 2024 at 4.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

PRESENT: S Collop (Chair)
Councillors P Bland, A Bullen, R Colwell, P Devulapalli (Vice Chair),
D Heneghan, A Kemp, J Kirk, P Kunes and S Sandell

Portfolio Holders:

Councillor M de Whalley- Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Biodiversity

Councillor J Rust- Cabinet Member for People and Communities

Councillor S Squire- Cabinet Member for Environment and Coastal

Officers:

Martin Chisholm, Assistant Director, Operations and Commercial
Duncan Hall, Assistant Director, Regeneration, Housing and Place.

Barry Brandford, Waste and Recycling Manager

Dave Robson, Environmental Health Manager

External Representatives:

George Fuhrmann- Representative from Environment Agency

Phillipa Hulme- Representative from Environment Agency

EC23: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hodson, (Councillor Long was substitute).

EC24: MINUTES

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

RESOLVED: The Minutes from the previous meeting held on the 16th July 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

EC25: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Bland declared a Pecinary interest on EC30:The Wash East Coast Management Strategy- Unit C as he owned a property in Heacham on the ridge.

EC26: **URGENT BUSINESS**

There was none.

EC27: **MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

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

Councillor Joyce, Squire, Rust and de Whalley were present under Standing Order 34.

EC28: **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

Item of business 10, LAHF Round 3 was brought forward on the agenda to that published to item 7 at the request of the Assistant Director, Regeneration, Housing and Place.

EC29: **LAHF (LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSING FUND) ROUND 3**

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

The Assistant Director for Regeneration, Housing and Place presented the report to the Panel. He highlighted the funding was to provide 12 new build home, 4 for eligible Afghan households and 8 properties for temporary accommodation.

He highlighted to the Panel 12 new build homes which would then be transferred to West Norfolk Housing Company. The Assistant Director for Regeneration, Housing and Place added this funding supported the Borough Council's new Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy.

He outlined the options and recommendations set out in the report and drew the Panel's attention to the risk of delivery being mitigated due to the stock of properties being constructed by the Borough Council.

The Assistant Director for Regeneration, Housing and Place provided an update to the Panel on LAHF 1 and 2 which were delivered and confirmed the LAHF 3 date for delivery was 31st March 2026.

The Chair thanked the Assistant Director for Regeneration, Housing and Place for the report and invited questions and comments from the Panel.

Councillor Long commented the report was concise and sought clarification if the properties were from new build stock or existing properties on the market.

The Assistant Director for Regeneration, Housing and Place confirmed to the Panel the opportunities in the current market would be considered and acquisition from a third party however using the Borough Council's stock of properties made it easier in LAHF 1 and 2.

Councillor Kemp asked if the funding would be used on abandoned and existing properties which required refurbishment or if it was only used on new build properties.

The Assistant Director for Regeneration, Housing and Place highlighted the benefits of new build properties and explained the flexibility of the funding which that opportunity could be explored. He added the maintenance of new build properties were more suited for the overall achievement.

Councillor Rust, Portfolio Holder added how the Borough Council is fortunate to have the opportunity again and highlighted the benefit of LAHF 1 and 2. She added further the Borough Council's stock provided assurance on quality.

Councillor Bullen sought clarification on the location of these properties.

The Assistant Director for Regeneration, Housing and Place confirmed the properties would be in King' Lynn.

RESOLVED: The Environment and Community Panel supports the recommendations to Cabinet as set out below;

1. The Council will enter a Memorandum of Understanding with MHCLG based on the attached prospectus for the Local Authority Housing Fund (see appendix 2). Authority is delegated to the Executive Director (Place) in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing People and 105 Communities to agree the final terms of the Memorandum of Understanding with MHCLG.
2. The Council will accept the total sum of £1,694,876 offered to the Council by MHCLG under the Local Authority Housing Fund to deliver the programme understanding the match funding requirements as set out in the report and attached prospectus.
3. Cabinet agrees that, subject to agreement from West Norfolk Housing Company, the properties will be acquired by West Norfolk Housing Company, funded by the grant, debt financing and other available funding.
4. Authority is delegated to Assistant Director Resources & S151 Officer in consultation with the portfolio holder for Finance to agree terms with West

Norfolk Housing Company for the transfer of properties on the Council's developments including arrangements for deferred consideration if necessary.

5. The Council requests that West Norfolk Housing Company works with the Council to deliver the properties through the fund.
6. Cabinet agrees to the principle of allocating 4 properties acquired through the fund to eligible Afghan households.
7. Authority is delegated to the Executive Director (Place) to alter the proposed Florence Fields tenure mix, originally agreed by Cabinet on the 17th January 2023, where necessary, to facilitate the disposal of properties previously identified as Private Rent and/or Open Market Sale, to West Norfolk Housing Company (WNHC) as affordable housing

EC30: **WASH EAST COAST MANAGEMENT STRATEGY- UNIT C- TECHNICAL REPORT**

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

The Environment Agency representatives gave a presentation on the Wash East Coast Management Strategy (WECMS) to the Panel.

Phillipa Hulme from the Environment Agency explained the policy hierarchy including the Shoreline Management Plans (SMP), funding group and stakeholder group.

Phillipa Hulme highlighted which part of the Wash East Coast were Unit A, B and C. Units A was Hunstanton Cliffs, Unit B was Hunstanton Town and Unit C was South Hunstanton to Wolferton Creek. She explained the SMP policies and timeline for Units A, B and C.

She explained the current management approach which included annual beach recycling, intermittent beach recharge and ongoing beach monitoring. She brought to the Panel's attention the key challenges with this management approach, which was ridge mobility and beach recharge consequently a review had taken place.

George Fuhrman from the Environment Agency highlighted key conclusions which included the Wash East Coast Management Strategy (WECMS), economic trigger for change which had been met although the environmental and evacuation trigger had not been met. He added further key conclusions where annual beach recycling was effective and sustainable and human activity and damage on the ridge needed to be limited.

George Fuhrman outlined the WECMS review which included stakeholder engagement, environmental impact assessments, climate

change allowances, funding calculations, coastal processes and the standard of protection provided by the defences.

He explained the WECMS review timeline to the Panel along with the engagement which had taken place. He added the key takeaway messages were that the challenges were unique and complex. Engagement with the community and other partners would continue throughout the process and the primary defence, damage to and human activity on the ridge needed to be limited to allow it to perform its flood risk function.

The Environmental Health Manager added as part of the engagement the drop-in sessions were well attended and positively received.

The Chair thanked the representatives from the Environment Agency for the report and invited questions from the Panel.

Councillor Long commented a no regret clause in the policy plan should be inherited going forward. He added there was records of King's Lynn Conservancy Board which highlighted what had happened in and around the Wash. He sought clarification on if it was correct material from the Wash was adding to the defences instead of eroding and nature was providing barriers already.

George Fuhrman clarified the trend of the Wash was accretion rather than erosion.

Phillipa Hulme commented she was not aware there was a no regret clause previously or the data of the wash available however the WECMS review was the focus.

Councillor Long commented further it was positive to know there was accretion and welcomed the Wash East Coast Management Strategy.

The Environmental Health Manager commented overall there was accretion however unit A, the Hunstanton Cliffs & Unit B Hunstanton Sea Defences were suffering with erosion.

Councillor Kemp sought clarification on the timescales and why it would take until 2027/2028. She further commented it could be done cheaper and quicker using compute software. She referred to the floods in 1953 and stated a permanent solution was needed such as concrete barriers.

Phillipa Hulme explained it would take until 2027/2028 as it was a collaborative exercise and wanted the best option to be achieved. She added stakeholders' input was encouraged and the ridge was growing which resulted in further defence.

George Fuhrman added further all defence options were being considered and work would continue after the deadline dates which had been specified.

The Vice-Chair, Councillor Devulapalli thanked officers for the report and asked how the houses on the ridge had been affected and how these residents were being contacted.

Phillipa Hulme explained to the Panel the data showed the ridge had been strengthened and this was a slow process however a few houses had been affected in parts of Heacham. She added due to the slow process there was no imminent need to relocate residents from these houses. She clarified in terms of communication with residents, there was engagement with the community to protect the ridge which included an option of putting notice boards up to discourage residents from walking along the ridge, along with strong enforcement presence within the area.

Councillor Bullen asked how many occasions enforcement had been needed and if vehicles were permitted on the ridge.

Phillipa Hulme confirmed enforcement had not been needed officially and there had been a positive response to engagement.

George Fuhrman confirmed vehicles were not allowed on the ridge.

Councillor Long explained his understanding on why concrete defences would not work due to a technical reason.

Phillipa Hulme provided further reasons why a concrete defence would not be effective and that different options needed to be considered.

Councillor Colwell commented on an experience where public damage had been caused to the ridge and encouraged the public if this was seen to be reported for enforcement action to be taken. He added he felt residents would be reassured with Wash East Coast Management Strategy.

Phillipa Hulme encouraged the public to contact the Environment Agency if they had concerns or questions.

Councillor Squire, Portfolio Holder thanked the officers from the Environment Agency for the report. She encouraged engagement from residents, and it was important to give time for this to be done correctly. She added residents were provided with reassurance and stressed the importance of preventing the public from walking along the ridge.

Councillor Long proposed a recommendation to Cabinet which was second by Councillor Kunes.

RECOMMENDATION: The Environment and Community Panel noted the progress and supports the future work on the Wash East Coast Management Strategy and encouraged the process being carried out for the future management of the shoreline.

EC31: **AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN**

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

The Environmental Health Manager presented the report to the Panel and explained the two air quality management areas in King's Lynn which were Gaywood Clock and London Road. He informed the Panel the annual mean was $40\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ which both areas had previously breached the standard. He explained once areas had been declared then an air quality action plan was implemented.

He highlighted the air quality action plan included six priorities and thirteen measures which included increased active travel, public transport (bus) improvements, transport management, review new developments, public information and air quality project. He added measures included working with Norfolk County Council for the Southgates masterplan, low emission buses and modifying traffic lights to run efficiently.

He referred the Panel to the recommendations and highlighted the reasons for the London Road air quality action plan to be adopted. The Environmental Health Manager explained the gyratory review and Southgates Masterplan combined with other new developments; further air modelling would be carried out to assess the combined impact from new traffic flow. He added planning applications were considered as part of this action plan. He added further the reasons of the Gaywood Clock air quality management area to be revoked was due to the annual mean no longer exceeding $40\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

The Chair thanked the Environmental Health Manager for the report and invited questions and comments from the Panel.

Councillor Colwell expressed his concerns on revoking Gaywood's air quality management area. He commented he had researched the data and there were periods during commuting hours where the annual mean would be exceeded. He asked with the Florence Fields developments and other new developments, what consideration had been given. He stressed this recommendation should be held off and reviewed in the future.

The Chair, Councillor Collop echoed Councillor Colwell comments and expressed her concern with revoking the Gaywood's air quality management area.

The Environmental Health Manager clarified the monitoring data was in the annual states reports and confirmed the Statutory air quality objective of $40\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ had not been exceeded over the last 5 years. He confirmed Gaywood measurements were currently all under $30\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and added the data was considered from a scientific point of view and based on human health. He added the Florence Fields was considered and was confident in revoking Gaywood Air Quality Action Plan

The Chair, Councillor Collop asked if what month of the year the data was collected and asked if this could be postponed for a year.

The Environmental Health Manager clarified the data was an annual mean therefore throughout the year data was collected. He added monitoring would continue in Gaywood and there were additional tubes to monitor. He added that further this was considered as part of the Florence Fields planning application.

Councillor Colwell thanked the Environmental Health Manager for the reassurance the monitoring would continue and understood the annual mean determined the air quality management area however wanted to highlight there was peaks throughout the day and year. He encouraged Councillors to promote active travel.

Councillor Kemp questioned if the budget for monitoring would remain without an air quality action plan and further questioned if the statutory government annual mean was $10\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ rather than $40\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. She commented that revoking the air quality action plan at Gaywood would be premature.

The Environmental Health Manager explained to the Panel the air quality action plan was designed to mitigate against emissions from road transport. He added wider health benefits may come from working with public health on PM10 & PM2.5 project. He noted the concern regarding short term peaks, but these are monitored and had not exceed the 1 hour short-term objective of $200\text{ug}/\text{m}^3$. The air quality management area was declared due to exceedances above the $40\text{ug}/\text{m}^3$ annual mean level and this was now no longer being breached.

Councillor Kunes commented this was an issue which was going away due petrol and diesel cars no longer being bought in five years' time. He further referred to the life expectancy of cars and supported revoking the Gaywood air quality action plan.

The Vice Chair, Councillor Devulapalli, commented she was concerned the average mean was used for the air quality action plan. She added she wanted the air quality management area to remain in place due to the Florence Field development. Councillor Devulapalli added within the Borough there was lack of public transport and therefore the reason residents were car dependent.

The Environmental Health Manager brought to the Panel's attention the air quality statutory guidance was set by central government and not set locally. He added transport was the main source and this was being reduced and the data supported this.

Councillor Long commented that there had been overall improvement on the data and if the decision was made to not revoke Gaywoods air quality action plan and criteria was not met, and funding cannot continue for monitoring stations.

Councillor Colwell sought clarification on the difference between the Gaywood area and the London Road area as neither of them had exceeded the national air quality strategy limit. He stressed his concern on residents' health to the Panel.

Councillor Kemp explained the pollution caused by tyres and brakes and commented that Gaywood was a main area of King's Lynn. She further commented on the World Health Organisation statistics and annual means. She proposed to not revoke the Gaywood air quality action plan.

The Environmental Health Manager responded to Councillor Kemp and clarified the correct annual means and statutory requirements. He clarified Gaywood had not exceeded the annual means. He further explained the difference between Gaywood and London Road which was highlighted in the report.

The Vice-Chair, Councillor Devulapalli asked the Environmental Health Manager of the implications of the Gaywood air quality action plan to remain.

The Environmental Health Manager explained the monitor at Gaywood was old and needed ongoing funding to ensure that it remained operational. He added a third party was used and therefore the data was unbiased.

Councillor de Whalley, Portfolio Holder thank the Environmental Health Manager for the report and the attention of detail included in the report. He added post pandemic levels of air pollution had consistently remained below the statutory requirements due to changes in behaviour and clarified Gaywood would continue to be monitored with the air quality action plan being revoked. He highlighted recommendation six in the report and expressed his support.

A recorded vote was taken by the Environment and Community Panel.

For	Against	Abstain
Bland	Colwell	
Bullen	Collop	
Devulapalli	Kemp	
Heneghan		
Kirk		
Kunes		
Long		
Sandell		

RESOLVED: The Environment and Community Panel supports the recommendations to Cabinet, as set out below;

1. Adopt the Air Quality Action Plan for Railway Road/ London Road attached as Appendix 1
2. Revoke existing Gaywood Air Quality Management Area

EC32: **FOOD WASTE COLLECTION- MAXIMISING COLLECTION**

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

The Waste and Recycling Manager presented the report and confirmed to the Panel there was an officer delegated decision. He explained the proposal was a trial in four areas to provide households with a free supply of caddy liners. He advised the first part of the Food Waste Collection Trial was to be focused on schools and to encourage and influence children such as recycling week. He explained in the future this was then to be rolled out to non-commercial settings such as residential care homes. He brought to the Panel's attention there had been a decline in food waste recycling since the pandemic and since food caddy liners had stopped being sold.

The Waste and Recycling Manager explained to the Panel, food waste was now more valuable and provided opportunities for companies to pay for food waste to process it and make it into electricity.

He added the four areas in which the trial was to take place, information and support would be provided to residents. He explained further if residents were to actively participate in this trial, food caddy liners would be provided.

The Chair thanked the Waste and Recycling Manager for the report and invited questions and comments from the Panel.

Councillor Heneghan commented providing caddy liners was a good incentive and encouraged residents to use their food caddies.

The Chair, Councillor Collop referred to the years when food caddies were being provided if there was an increase in the amount of recycling and sought clarification of the overall percentage.

The Waste and Recycling Manager confirmed there was an increase of 20 tonnes a month, in parts of Downham Market, Docking and King's Lynn town centre.

Councillor Colwell noted one of the areas in the trial was Reffley Lane and asked how many households this would be and commented he would like to encourage and promote this.

The Waste and Recycling Manager confirmed an estimate of 900 homes.

Councillor Long commented the food waste scheme was beneficial for young families and the food waste caddy being introduced.

Councillor Bullen sought clarification on how many tonnes were previously collected.

The Waste and Recycling Manager confirmed initially 3000 tonnes per year were collected in 2013 and 1800 tonnes were now being collected.

Councillor Kemp expressed her support and questioned if there was a service provided to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The Waste and Recycling Manager confirmed there was not a service provided to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and encouraged the opportunity.

The Vice Chair, Councillor Devulapalli sought clarification on the date of food waste action week and questioned if this could be extended to restaurants.

The Waste and Recycling Manager confirmed this was something which could be done over time as there was limited capacity with staff. He added the focus was on long term impact and the food waste action week was in April 2024 and would be 3rd- 9th March 2025

[FOOD WASTE ACTION WEEK - March 3-9, 2025 - National Today](#)

Councillor Squire, Portfolio Holder thanked the Waste and Recycling Manager for his report and was pleased the Panel supported this trial. She explained how fortunate it was the food waste caddies were introduced so early and the focus was on increasing the recycling and food waste rates.

RESOLVED: The Panel supported the Officer Delegated Decision.

EC33: **WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD DECISION LIST**

Members of the Panel were reminded that an eform was available on the Intranet which could be completed and submitted if Members had items which they would like to be considered for addition to the Work Programme.

RESOLVED: The Panel's Work Programme was noted.

EC34: **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Environment and Community Panel would be held on **8th October 2024** in the **Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place.**

The meeting closed at 6.34 pm