30th November 2018

Regeneration,
BCKLWN,
Chapel Street,
King’s Lynn,

Dear Sir,

Riverfront Development (Nelson’s Quay) Consultation.

The ward forum represents residents of the St Margaret’s with St Nicholas Ward and those who work and have businesses located within it. Our completed feedback form is enclosed and our constituents have the following additional comments.

Size and scale of buildings.
This area is flat and undeveloped, as such it affords river views. We are concerned that in order to accommodate the 436 homes and over 7500sqm of commercial space, the buildings will need to be higher than the proposal to build ‘up to six storeys’. Undoubtedly buildings of this size will dominate and block the open views, which are presently to be enjoyed. We strongly advocate that four storeys is the absolute maximum height and only employed where necessary and that this is adhered to as the norm rather than the exception.
Once six storey buildings are introduced it will be difficult, if not impossible, to oppose the introduction of more and they could become the norm.

Circular building on the northern boundary of Harding’s Pits Doorstep Green
It is difficult to identify the purpose of this structure and there is no indication of its dimensions, in particular its height. Unless it is a completely flat structure we are opposed to it because of its effect upon views from and towards Harding’s Pits Doorstep Green.

Building design.
It is stated that design has been executed “with the built heritage of King's Lynn in mind.” However, while we understand that the heritage views provided in the scheme documents are an indication of the ‘bulk’ of the buildings, and while not advocating replication of earlier architectural styles, we trust that before the development comes before the detailed planning process, that the designs will have been adjusted to blend modernity with a style that is far more in sympathy with the surrounding buildings. The buildings in Tuesday Market Place, for example, exhibit more follows/
the quality of variety and ‘playfulness’ that we should be aiming for the Riverfront Development.

Proposed wetland habitat.
Though pleased that this is to be incorporated into the plan, we are anxious that the present ‘natural’ aspect (of the Nar Loop) is properly protected and the site does not become an urban park of ponds flanked by concrete paving and artificial water features. The depiction shows very large buildings completely surrounding this habitat and, to an extent, blocking views to the river both from within and without the site. This most definitely requires adjustment to allow for more open aspects.

Parking.
The streets surrounding the development site are narrow and congested – as one would expect in a medieval town - and overwhelmed with parked vehicles, many used by visitors to the town. Both Boal Quay public car park and the NCP park in Church Street are generally full – the statement on the exhibition boards that Boal Quay is ‘rarely fully utilised’ is completely untrue. It is difficult to identify alternative sites within an easy walking distance of either of these car parks – as is proposed. The new development will inevitably introduce more vehicles and we question whether subterranean parking under the residential buildings, even if this is technically feasible on a wetland site, will be adequate; in any event such parking will not be available to visitors.

Construction
Building on inherently unstable ground, a wetland area containing both the Nar outfall and the bank of the Ouse, it is to be assumed that considerable pile-driving will be necessary. Foundations of existing structures, in particular listed buildings on Bridge Street and the Carmelite Arch will undoubtedly be affected. They must be protected and surveys undertaken before any work is enacted, provision made to mitigate any damage and full compensation is available and in place before any work takes place. The same applies for the buildings in the quarter bounded by Saturday Market Place, Church Street and Nelson Street.

Cycle Bridge across the Nar.
We applaud the proposal of a cycle bridge across the Nar to continue a cycle route along Boal Quay to the South Quay. Diverting the National Cycle Route along the waterfront has been aspiration for transport campaigners for decades.

Harding’s Pits Doorstep Green.
Though not a part of this ward, this community open space is much used for recreation by many ward residents – as well as those from further afield. We support and endorse the plan, which aims to “maintain habitats within the Harding’s Pits Doorstep Green and promote its amenity use.”
Harding's Way.
We are much relieved that at present a move to open up Harding's Way (HW) to all traffic, to which the ward forum is opposed, is not a part of this scheme, and that the development includes retention of the bus gate. We were disturbed, however, to see that the exhibition boards designate HW as a 'Highway Route'. While we accept this is 'illustrative' and a technical term, we advise that it is not employed lest it becomes a reality by default.

Fishing Co-operative.
The ward forum is pleased that the scheme 'is designed to support the existing fishing co-operative' which is regarded as 'both a cultural and economic asset for the town'; we are fully in support this aim.

Nelson's Quay.
The ward forum is totally opposed to use of this name; Nelson's links with King’s Lynn were minimal and we have in George Vancouver and Samuel Gurney Cresswell two far more appropriate heroes whose names could be employed. Though the name – Nelson’s Quay - is described as a ‘working title’ this misnomer is already coming into common use; we request that it is abandoned and one of the other two names employed straight away or, more sensibly and accurately, the development is known as South Quay, which is what it is and is known as such by all and sundry.

Julian Litten,
Chairman,
St Margaret’s with St Nicholas Ward Forum.