

**LONDON**  
**REVIEW PANEL**

April 2019

Dear [REDACTED]

**London Review Panel: Livesey Exchange**

Please find enclosed the London Review Panel report following the review of the Livesey Exchange proposals on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2019. On behalf of the Panel, I would like to thank you for your participation in the review and offer the Panel's ongoing support as the scheme's design develops.

Yours sincerely,



David Ogunmuyiwa  
*Mayor's Design Advocate*

cc.

All meeting attendees

Jules Pipe, Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills

Debbie Jackson, Executive Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment, GLA

Patrick Dubeck, Head of Regeneration, GLA

# LONDON REVIEW PANEL

## Report of London Review Panel meeting Livesey Exchange

Friday 5<sup>th</sup> April 2019

Review held at: 93 Peckham High Street, London, SE15 5RS

### London Review Panel

David Ogunmuyiwa (Chair)

Hilary Satchwell (also representing Southwark Design Panel)

### Attendees

[Redacted]	PEM people/ Livesey Exchange
[Redacted]	Livesey Exchange PM
[Redacted]	Livesey Exchange
[Redacted]	PEM People
[Redacted]	PEM People
[Redacted]	Counterculture
[Redacted]	GLA Regeneration
[Redacted]	GLA Regeneration
[Redacted]	What If: projects Ltd.
[Redacted]	What If: projects Ltd.
[Redacted]	What If: projects Ltd.
[Redacted]	What If: projects Ltd.
[Redacted]	Max Fordham
[Redacted]	Stockdale
[Redacted]	Southwark Regeneration Team
[Redacted]	Southwark Regeneration Team
[Redacted]	Southwark Regeneration Team
[Redacted]	Old Kent Road Regeneration Team
[Redacted]	Old Kent Road Regeneration Team
[Redacted]	Old Kent Road Regeneration Team

### Apologies / report copied to

[Redacted]	Architecture 00
[Redacted]	GLA Regeneration
[Redacted]	GLA Regeneration

### Report copied to

Jules Pipe	Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills
Debbie Jackson	GLA
Patrick Dubeck	GLA

### **Confidentiality**

Please note that while schemes not yet in the public domain, for example at a pre-application stage, will be treated as confidential, as a public organisation the GLA is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) and in the case of an FOI request may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.

### **Project name and site address**

Livesey Exchange, Lovegrove Street, London SE1 5EW

### **Presenting team**

[REDACTED]	Livesey Exchange PM
[REDACTED]	PEM people/ Livesey Exchange
[REDACTED]	What If: projects Ltd.
[REDACTED]	Counterculture
[REDACTED]	Max Fordham

### **Livesey Exchange introduction**

Representatives from the Livesey Exchange offered a detailed background to the project and described one of the primary motives of the LEX is to engage with as many members of the community, to build the capacity to react and adapt positively to regeneration. The LEX is described as a community knowledge exchange, sharing skills, requirements and ideas, providing a space for an aspirational and inclusive community of people empowering people.

### **London Borough of Southwark Council's views**

LB Southwark offer their complete support for the project and note how the project meets a range of policy agendas, including affordable workspace, social integration and creating a positive future for the Borough's young people. LB Southwark endorse the pragmatic approach the design team have taken and are impressed by the way in which the site positioning constraints have informed the project, resulting in an interesting architectural response. The LEX context of the Old Kent Road and the significant changes the area is about to go through gives even more importance to the scheme, an impetus to engage as many people as possible and create a self-supporting space for a growing community.

### **Design Review Panel's views**

#### *Summary*

The London Review Panel commend this exciting and positive project and acknowledge the considerable work and careful thought that has gone into the work so far. The Panel thank the presenting team for the contextualisation of the project and understand the Livesey Exchange is more than a piece of architecture

and will be a valuable addition to the area, with a huge social impact for the communities of Peckham and Bermondsey.

The Panel question the way in which the scheme addresses the boundaries and edge condition of the site and encourage a more detailed conversation with TfL and LB Southwark to ensure the public realm proposals are fully integrated. The Panel feel the project would benefit from a prioritisation of objectives, to aid decision making and give clarity to the hierarchy of spaces and required accommodation programme. The Panel note the evolving specification of the scheme which users of the workshop or workspace can assist with and help populate, however functional elements such as meeting rooms and storage should not be overlooked. The routes through the site should be considered further, as should the important frontage to Old Kent Road, the main approach to the site.

### *Edge Condition & Access*

- The Panel question how the scheme addresses the edges of the site and find parts of the current scheme insular and inward-looking.
- The Panel queried if both proposed routes through the site were required and if these add further complexity to challenging site parameters. A more rigorous testing of the routes is encouraged, to assess the value of maintaining the severance of the site.
- The Panel endorse joined up work to integrate the project with the TfL 'Healthy Streets' programme.
- The Panel encourage the team to pursue conversations with Serco, the adjacent builders' merchant regarding the parcel of unused land. This would be very beneficial to the scheme and the Panel would very much support these conversations.

### *Street Presence & Positioning*

- The way in which the proposed building form responds to the site would benefit from greater consideration. The Panel suggest the building form could be linear without being rectilinear. If the utility of the linear is required, the Panel encourage the design team to consider ways in which the positioning of the building form meets or reacts to the edges of the site.
- As design work continues, the Panel recommend a testing of site positioning. The rotation of one volume to open the prominent corner of the site would be beneficial to the scheme and bring people into the site.
- The Panel note that rotating one volume would enable the events space to extend into the courtyard, which could be advantageous for future programming of the space.
- The Panel acknowledge the corner location of the billboards and encourage the team to anticipate the possible future scenario in the design process. The Panel note the angles of the billboards must remain but the boards themselves can be moved up or down.
- The Panel is interested to understand how the conflict of site constraints including the TfL street realignment proposal and the LB Southwark billboards could be reconsidered as part of the project.

### *Building Programme & Business Plan*

- The Panel encourage the team to pursue opportunities to maximise advertising or billboard space for the site as an income generator for the LEX.

- The Panel suggest the design of the building should aim to maximise the amount of lettable floor space, to ensure the most sustainable future for the project.
- The careful programming and management of the multi-functioning space is considered to be key to its success. The Panel advise that the programming should make the space work hard.
- The 'back of house' and operational requirements of the building could be further developed. The Panel highlighted a lack of meeting space and storage.
- The Panel noted that capital costs have not been interrogated in this review and queried both the level of occupancy and programme that the building has been designed to and whether these elements could be feasibly reduced to fit the project budget.
- The way in which energy generation and passive technology is designed and employed could be very beneficial to the scheme. The Panel encourage consideration of renewable energy such as Air Source Heat Pumps, which are cost effective and would secure a sustainable future for the project.
- The Panel queried the levels of insulation and noise, contributing to the user experience and comfort of the space. It was noted that two building volumes are usually more expensive to build and service and offer a poorer performance in terms of energy consumption.

#### *Architectural language & materiality*

- The Panel advise the team to define and agree upon the objectives of the project to help inform design decisions. The prioritisation of these objectives is key to developing the scheme beyond the challenging project constraints.
- The Panel acknowledge the necessary balance required in the design to maximise the flexibility and ability to adjust without hindering the immediate use.
- The Panel queried the security of the building and how robust the ground floor will be. As design work continues, passive security measures could be integrated as part of the design. The Panel encourage the design of the edge condition to be used to protect the building, separating the façade and offering security in a simple and low-tech way.
- The Panel understands the materiality of the interior is in development and welcome the suggestion of a simple material palette.