

Kennington Oval and Vauxhall Forum current position on OAKDA (21 June 2016)

The Oval Gasholder, at the heart of our area, and covering 2.2 ha, when active was a major COMAH hazard, which, under PADHI and London Plan guidance, inhibited development in its surrounding 20 or so hectares. Now it is decommissioned, we wish to

- release the Oval Gasholder KIBA from KIBA status to aid comprehensive mixed use development, respecting London Plan and SPG strictures about industrial land release, by conditioning release on additional alternative KIBA provision elsewhere,
- secure sympathetic street patterns (Create Streets shows this is possible) and development heights not compromising the iconic presence of the newly listed Gasholder as the pinnacle of development, with a material palette not just steel and glass
- secure adequate land allocation for any public facility eg a replacement library (requiring 0.1 ha), and at least 0.4 hectares of green public open space, to remedy local deficiencies and contribute to new green east/west linkages, and
- support a significant and increased employment offer on the site, conditioned to maintain its long term presence, as a more flexible substitute for KIBA status.

Lambeth is a dense borough and our wards even denser, at 33,030 people in 246 ha, or about 134 people per ha. Lambeth 2015 green space per head is already low, at 1.44 ha per 1000 persons, and is set to fall further under FALP housing allocations to 1.29 ha/per 1000 persons by 2025. Consistently with Lambeth Local Plan Policy EN1(d) (green linkages and increased open space) we wish to give development plan status and encouragement to creation of green linkages between our relatively isolated green spaces, both north to south and east to west, at the same time remedying a deficiency in the centre of our area by requiring 0.4 ha of new green public open space as one of the conditions of release of the OAKDA site from KIBA status.

In more detail, as regards **KIBAs**, on the basis of the current London Plan and SPGs, Lambeth is a restricted transfer borough, and should lose no more than 0.4 ha of KIBA land a year. It is not clear whether it is intended to release the whole of the KIBA, which embraces the Beefeater Gin site and Big Yellow Storage, neither of whom say they wish to redevelop. Lambeth's KIBAs are a mixed bag, and while some are efficient providers of B class floor space (around 1.5 times the physical area of the site), some such as Waterworks Rd are extremely inefficient (see table attached). Even if we cannot increase the area covered by KIBAs, we ought to be able to squeeze more compensating B class floor space out of the existing mix, if we had to make a plea in mitigation to the Mayor. In the longer term, given the Government's intention to allow switches from industrial space to residential as permitted development, it is not clear whether KIBAs are still viable as a concept, or whether Lambeth should instead make wider use of site specific Article 4 Directions, to exclude permitted development rights (cf the Governments expectation that boroughs will do this in the run up to the 2019 abolition of the CAZ protection from PD conversion of offices to residential). As regards **street pattern**, we are pleased to see the developer proposals so far in this regard, though the Kennington Park Estate need some permeability come their way too. As regards **tall buildings**, we are clear that this is not an area favoured for tall buildings (more than 30m, or about 9 storeys tall) under London Plan criteria, nor one identified as suitable for tall buildings under the Local Plan. The neighbours hate the idea, and in our view, tall buildings would detract from the salient silhouette of the retained gasholder, recently listed.

It is the lattice top of the gasholder, set against the sky, which is the visual spur to the listing, alongside its historic engineering past (the iconic picture is from the Oval cricket ground on match days, when, as a safety precaution, the gasholders were kept part deflated, hence showing the top lattice clear against the sky), and, at 48m tall, it should maintain dominance as the peak of any development, itself no higher than 30m. And two or more tall buildings count as a cluster, and clusters are used as precedents by pushy developers to secure more and taller towers.

As regards **public facilities**, there has been talk of perhaps 150sqm devoted to D1 uses. If, as has been suggested in the Culture 2020 study, it is intended to relocate the Durning Library, perhaps with enhanced IT and community uses, this is far too little. Assuming that the Bishop's ward library needs will be met as part of the Johanna school redevelopment, that leaves the library needs of the 32,000 inhabitants of Prince's and Oval wards to be met (we quote 33,000 for our KOV area which includes a small slice of Bishop's). The standard Library Association metric is 30 sqm per 1000 residents, so requiring about 960 sqm, if you are supplying a proper library, (and not some cut down bookshelf ancillary to a gym!). This might cost around £3.7m to build, if we are looking for funding from S106 or CIL. The key issue would be whether it could be made low running cost, eg thermally efficient.

The developer is offering significant **new public realm** (about 1 ha), but most of it is hard landscaped and only 0.1 ha is green (most of his green space is tucked away for the gated developments on site). There is a significant gap in green provision in the area around the gasholders (see map) and we aim for 0.4 ha, the size of a pocket park, which would also contribute to improved west east green linkages. Fortuitously, the area of the gasholder is also 0.4 ha, and we know that a park of this sort has been established in one of the Kings Cross gasholders, but we are not prescriptive about where the 0.4 ha is, provided it is present as a compact body (and not elasticated into unusability, like the VNEB linear park).

We are very pleased with the **employment offer** that has been secured, and all credit to Cllr Hopkins and officers for pressing the issue. But as noted ref KIBAs, it may be necessary to fortify it against PD changes with an Article 4 Direction, to secure its future in the long term. (See extract from Mayor's SPD on the CAZ Mar 16, and the Ministerial announcement about extension of PD rights, Oct 2015, attached)

David Boardman
KOVF Planning Group
21 June 2016