

FOBP response to the draft OKR IIA March 2016

Following a reminder from the Old Kent Road People community group we would like to make the following response to the OKR IIA scoping for the AAP. Several members of the Friends of Burgess Park have been attending the OKR Forum meetings. We note that in the draft map of the area includes parts of Burgess Park, Glengall Wharf Garden and the Surrey Canal Walk all of which fall within Burgess Park and are covered by the Friends of Burgess Park. Could you please ensure that the Friends of Burgess Park is included in all consultation relating to the plans.

The IIA which seems very comprehensive although it talks about children and young people but does not specifically mention early years provision or access to open air sports or gym facilities. Access to the park is mentioned plus green routes and linking Burgess Park to Southwark Park. Limited green space in the area is noted as it the need for increasing provision. Shortage of play facilities in the area also noted.

We would suggest some amendments to the following Key Objectives:

IIAO3 or IIAO5 or IIAO13: should include reference to outdoor sports, gymn and BBQs

IIAO2: should refer to early years and childcare facilities

IIAO1 or IIAO15: should refer to opportunities for more diverse forms of housing ownership and renting models such as self-build, co-operatives and more diverse form of encouraging entrepreneurial activity and opportunities for existing small businesses to scale up and be supported via the opportunity area.

In terms of proposed increase in population it will be significant and the implications need to be very clear. In some areas of the country TRAs are also taking this on along with community asset transfers.

Could promoting entrepreneurial activity be included into IIAO1?

Further focus on walking would be welcome and it is essential to improve the navigation of the area. Reference materials are requested for the plans, strategy and programme section — cycling reports are included under Transport but not walking, suggestions are:

Making the Case for Investment in the Walking Environment (Living Streets, UK CHARITY FOR EVERYDAY WALKING)

<http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/1394/2011-making-the-case-full-report.pdf>

Walking to School (Living Streets, UK CHARITY FOR EVERYDAY WALKING)

<http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/1408/walk-to-school-outreach-best-practice-report.pdf>

The AAP has to cover a lot of statutory requirements but is incredible formulaic - what does the council and local people actually want to achieve, what big, key beneficial changes. One proposal would be for the OKR to transferred into a tunnel, it has a major negative impact on the area. Air pollution levels are extremely high should any housing or schools be near the OKR as it currently is?

The OKR forums have been the opportunity for local groups to indicate what they want from the redevelopment. People who have been attending the forums are keen to see what proposal Allies

and Morrison will suggest; they think this is the way they will see what ideas Southwark has. How does this then feed into the formal AAP.

It is understandable that people currently living in Council property are worried that they might find their buildings redeveloped as has happened and is happening to the Heygate and the Aylesbury with implications for local communities and affordability. The speed of change across the central area of Southwark is now happening extremely fast and understanding all the implications of all the activity is very difficult.