

**LONDON**  
**REVIEW PANEL**

██████████  
Senior Regeneration Manager  
Peabody  
Parkview Hub  
212-214 Yarnton Way  
Thamesmead DA18 4DR

2<sup>nd</sup> May 2019

Dear ██████████

**London Review Panel: Thamesmead Community, Enterprise and Learning Hub**

Please find enclosed the London Review Panel report following the review of the proposals for the Thamesmead Community, Enterprise and Learning Hub on 16<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,



Russell Curtis  
*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 Thamesmead Community Hub

Friday 16<sup>th</sup> April 2019  
Review held at: Peabody

### London Review Panel

Russell Curtis    Chair  
Alice Fung        MDA  
Fenella Griffin    Special Assistance Team (SAT)

### Attendees

██████████            GLA Regeneration  
██████████            GLA Regeneration  
██████████            Peabody  
██████████            Peabody  
██████████            Artist-in-residence  
██████████            Project Orange  
██████████            EVA Studio  
██████████            Daisy Froud

### Apologies / report copied to

██████████            GLA Regeneration  
██████████            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**

Former Moorings Social Club, Arnott Close, London SE28 8BG and Byron Close arches, Byron Close, London, SE28 8AA

## **Presenting team**

██████████	Peabody
██████████	Peabody
██████████	Artist-in-residence
██████████	Project Orange
██████████	EVA Studio

## **Thamesmead project introduction**

Representatives from Peabody framed the history and historic vision for Thamesmead, describing the extraordinary approach to town planning and place-making. The way in which the Moorings neighbourhood has evolved over the last 50 years was portrayed, changing dramatically in demography yet remaining a very strong community.

Peabody communicated the duality of their ambitious, long-term programme of development for the area and the immediacy of the required change for the existing communities. A priority is to deliver tangible change for the people that live here, and Peabody recognise that this Good Growth funded project has the opportunity to stimulate positive resident engagement and deliver long-term change if managed correctly.

Verity-Jane Keefe, Artist-in-residence for the Moorings and the regeneration project outlined her work in the area to date and illustrated the evolving structure of the design team. The project is an exploration and testing of codesign, and these principles are intended to be instilled at every possible moment of the project, to allow space for everyone for participate and have a voice.

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

### *Summary*

The London Review Panel consider the Thamesmead Community, Learning and Enterprise Hub to be an exemplary project for public engagement. The design team are to be congratulated on the project process which the Panel would like to see emulated across London. The Panel are very supportive of the work carried out so far and commend both the client and design team for their tenacity in a challenging socio-economic environment.

The Panel views this London Design Review as an interesting interrogation of the co-design process rather than a critique of the design and have confidence in the talents of the design team to execute the restoration job of an interesting building as long as decisions are guided by the community.

The success or failure of the project will be its long-term viability and the appetite the community have for the continued governance and responsibility of the social club. The ambition to link the spaces, creating a route through the Moorings is to be applauded. However, the Panel suggests the identity of these interventions and how they relate to each other as a unifying element needs a more confident design exploration.

## ***Process and Evaluation***

- The Panel question what success looks like for the project and what objectives and outcomes have been established. The Panel acknowledges the planned Peabody 5-year evaluation framework and

would welcome a defined and agreed-upon project vision and objectives for the scheme, to inform design decisions and future governance.

- The Panel commends the intention to train the neighbourhood forum to contribute to this dialogue of evaluation, which would further support the community codesign role as meaningful engagement rather than endorsement.
- The Panel urges the design team to prioritise the conversations that are happening through the engagement process and codesign work, whilst recognising their responsibility to guide how this process works and evolves.
- The use of an architectural model as a design tool is applauded by the Panel, which encourages further use of models as a provocation with which to elicit ideas from the community on the use of spaces and choice of materials and fittings
- The procurement of the construction team and future suppliers or services for the Hub offers an additional way for the project to support the local community. The design team is encouraged to consider ways in which the local supply chain can be involved in the construction and running of the building.

### ***Governance and Sustainability***

- The team is urged to consider the most appropriate and sustainable governance model for the community centre. The mechanism of responsibility and level of resident empowerment underpins the success of the project and needs to be carefully planned and managed.
- The Panel encourages skills training and development to build capacity within the community for future governance as well as day-to-day operation of the spaces. The GLA may be able to offer support through 'Team London' opportunities.
- The 'Meanwhile Space' at Loughborough Junction Arches were offered as an example of local resilience and a successful community governance structure.
- The Panel would welcome the Business Plan and economic viability of the centre to be worked up with the community and integrated into the co-design process.
- The Panel identifies the programming of the space(s) as key to the success of the community centre, to allow different uses throughout the day. The Panel recommends scenario testing to anticipate how groups might use the centre, testing the 'seasonal social life' and imagining a day, month and year in the life of different groups.
- The Panel recommended the wider provision in nearby centres and spaces are mapped and analysed to ensure the offer is sustainable.
- The Panel questioned the integration of young and older people sharing a space and how that is envisioned working. Intergenerational engagement work is recommended to evolve the conversation of space sharing and appropriate programming.
- The role of the Royal Borough of Greenwich and its responsibility to engage with the process and contribute positively to the development in a constructive way was noted by the Panel. Early collaboration with the Borough is urged by the Panel to facilitate joint working.

### ***Identity and Aspect***

- The Panel note the alternating openness and access points of the arches and query the proposed permeability of these. The perceived primary entrance of 'front' or 'back' of these is a design challenge to consider.
- The social club appears to have an inward looking or internal aspect, the Panel questions how the design can address this to reveal the activity within and welcome in passers-by.
- The Panel recognises the challenge of a first-floor community centre and identified the entrance as a critical point to communicate a welcoming and inclusive outlook. The design team is advised

to consider the signage, visibility and security mechanisms that could be used to best promote a sense of permeability and inclusiveness to the entrance space.

- The Panel notes a potential tension between a community sense of ownership and a Peabody presence on the ground floor and would welcome further engagement work, working with both the community and Peabody's Social Economic Development team on the design of this aspect.
- The rear elevation of the social club was identified as an access route for many people. The way in which this element of the design is treated should be carefully considered; How can you make the back act as a front?
- The Panel encourages the design of the wayfinding strategy to link to the identity of the project and the area.
- The Panel regards the existing route(s) as unintuitive and would encourage the scheme to be extended to include the road on Byron Close and the pedestrian routes and pathways. The route itself should be considered a destination with a strong spatial identity, providing opportunities for social interaction and conveying a sense of arrival and reception to the Moorings.
- The Panel identified scope for Arnott Close to be a town square and focal point and would advocate for this to be included in the future vision for the area, even if not immediately deliverable.
- The Bentway Park created under a Toronto Expressway by Public Work was cited by the Panel as an interesting and relevant precedent.
- The design team is urged to think of the pockets of space holistically, to weave in the identity of the Moorings and help the community to take ownership. The way in which the Byron Close 'arches' link to the identity of the area and to the Hub needs further consideration.