

# CROYDON PLACE REVIEW PANEL



TERMS OF REFERENCE













# Contents

1 Introduction	06
2 Panel Structure	08
3 Panel Management	09
4 Review Day Structure + Panel Operations	11
5 Outcome of Review Sessions	13
6 Place Review Criteria	14
7 Monitoring and Evaluation	16
8 Conflicts of Interest	17
9 Confidentiality	18
10 Appendix 1 - Review Session Guidance Notes	19
11 Panel Member Biographies	21

# 1 Introduction

1.1. The independent, multidisciplinary and high calibre Place Review Panel (PRP) provides an additional specialist service within the pre-application service offered by the Council. It is an important step in elevating the quality of Croydon's built environment and creating a destination of choice in London & the south east.

It continues the Council's commitment to deliver places and design of the highest standards. With an ever increasing number of high profile development proposals coming forward across the borough and a major uplift in the number of pre-application submissions and planning applications being received, the panel provides a vital step in ensuring this development cycle leaves a legacy of places that will be loved and admired by residents and visitors alike.

The panel will provide independent, expert advice on projects relating to all aspects Croydon's built environment, including but not limited to major development schemes as part of the significant regeneration and growth of the Borough; infrastructure and highways schemes; parks; street furniture, public realm projects and civic spaces.

In line with the recommendations of the Farrell Review and National Planning Policy Framework, the panel will complement the proactive and award winning services already provided by the Council's planning service, and further ramp up the quality of design and delivery

that will be expected from developers.

1.2. A Place Review Panel is similar to a design review panel, however includes a broader range of expertise, and can provide advice on a broader scope of issues relating to development proposals and the built environment as a whole.

1.3. A new PRP will run for a period of two years, at which point it will be reviewed and refreshed if required. The panel will comprise of approximately 25 high calibre panel members (3 chairs and 22 panellists), with expertise in planning, architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, regeneration, conservation, engineering, place making and culture.

1.4. The purpose of the panel is to provide independent, impartial and expert design and place advice for major and strategic development proposals undergoing a DTS pre-application process.

1.5. The NPPF, Farrell Review and best practice guidance by professional built environment institutions (i.e. RIBA, RTPI, LI, CABE); all advise that local planning authorities should have local design/place review arrangements.

The guidance recommends that early reviews produce the greatest benefits; saving overall costs, negotiation times, and enhancing quality. They are particularly important at early stages of the pre-application



process, however should also be used during important post planning application stages, such as reserved matters and discharge of conditions for complex projects.

1.6. The PRP does not alter the importance and significance of the proactive planning and design advisory services currently offered by the Council's Development Management and Spatial Planning teams (Plan Making and Placemaking), as well as the Planning Committee.

Rather, following best practice guidance and with the increasing volume of major and strategic cases coming forward across the borough, the review panel will act as an additional moment in time check to ensure that the quality of design and places in Croydon are optimised; and act as a gateway to planning committee.

1.8. AGMs will be held with all panel members, members of the planning committee, officers and other key stakeholders – this will provide an important opportunity to review the panel processes, structure and applicant feedback.

1.9. Place Reviews will be an integrated part of the pre-application process. At the end of each review meeting a written report containing comments and independent advice will be produced by the panel chair with support of Council officers. The report will be circulated by the chair to the applicant team, officers and other relevant parties.

Council officers will integrate the Place Review Panel's report back into official pre-application meetings. In addition to the officer feedback in the report to the Planning Committee, officers will also include an overview of the Place Review Panel feedback within their report to the Committee.

NOTE: Panel members are to provide independent, non-statutory and impartial place critique and design advice for development proposals; such advice (verbal or written) to be provided on the basis that Applicants are strongly advised by the Place Review Panel that the panel feedback is not actioned until officially fed back into the pre-application process by Council officers and that any advice which is actioned before this is fed back into the pre-application process will be done at the Applicant's own risk

## 2 Panel Structure

2.1. The panel consists of a total of 25 multidisciplinary, built environment professionals of the highest calibre including 22 panellists and 3 chairs. Members are experts who specialise in planning, architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, regeneration, conservation, engineering, place making and culture.

2.2. The panel membership will run from Nov 2016 to Nov 2018 – it will be reviewed and refreshed if required every two years following this period. Application requirements will be detailed and published when required. Please note that if the two year timeframe is extended at the end of the contract, consultants may continue to be appointed under their existing contract conditions. All clauses will be reviewed and refreshed if required at the end of the contract.

A handful of reserve panellists and chairs are in place, in case circumstances of appointed panel members change during the two year appointment and a replacement is required.

2.3 Each review day panel will consist of 1 chair and normally up to 5 panellists, who will be selected from the pool based on the expertise and specialist skills required for the projects being reviewed that day.

### 2.4. Chair Responsibilities

2.4.1. Panel chairs are responsible for managing the review sessions. The chair of the review session must mediate complex discussions and debates, and ensure that each panel member is given a fair opportunity to express their comments and recommendations. The chair should ensure that review discussions are constructive and collaborative.

2.4.2. Panel chairs must provide impartial, professional oral and written advice. The chair of the particular place review session must write the final report with the support of Council officers following the reviews. The chair must then authorise the final report and circulate it to all required parties, including the applicant team 2 - 3 weeks after the review.

2.4.3. Panel chairs must attend AGMs with Council

officers, chair of the Planning Committee (or delegated representative) and other key stakeholders. There may be a requirement for the panel chairs to attend other meetings depending on caseload and potential issues that may arise - this will be communicated if and when required with sufficient notice.

2.4.4. Panel chairs must also be available to meet regularly and travel to Croydon for occasional meetings and events where required.

### 2.5. Panellist Responsibilities

2.5.1. Panellists must provide impartial, professional oral advice during the review sessions to assess and critique design in the built environment and place quality.

2.5.2. Panellists must provide comments and/or edits to the chairs draft report after a place review session.

2.5.3. Panellists must attend AGMs with Council officers, chair of the Planning Committee (or delegated representative) and other key stakeholders.

2.5.4. Panellists must also be available to meet regularly and travel to Croydon for occasional meetings and events where required.

All panel members (chairs and panellists) must attend briefing days when the Place Review Panel is first set up in order to gain a thorough understanding of the local political, socio-economic and cultural landscape, important policy requirements, masterplan guidance, as well as participate in area walk throughs and site visits.

Panel members may be requested to provide advice where reasonably required by the Council over and above the scheduled review days, briefing days and AGMs.



# 3 Panel Management

3.1. The management team for the panel will include the panel chairs, a Spatial Planning officer and case officers of the particular schemes being reviewed on particular review days.

3.2. When a new panel is formed, all members will be required to attend two briefing days to gain a thorough understanding of the local political, socio-economic and cultural landscape, important policy requirements and masterplan guidance. Briefing days will also include area walkthroughs and site visits. A briefing pack will be given to all panel members for reference.

3.3. In addition to AGMs, there may be occasional meetings with the panel chairs, key Council officers, chair of the planning committee and relevant stakeholders. The frequency of this will be dependent on caseload and sufficient notice provided.

3.4. If a panel member is unable to attend a review day they have been selected for, they must provide two weeks' notice where possible, in order for a replacement panel member to be booked in.



St George's House



Croydon Town Hall, Queen's Garden





Thornton Heath Library, FAT Architects



# 4 Review Day Structure + Panel Operations

There will be one review day per month with up to four schemes being reviewed on each day.

Where possible, reviews will take place on the same day each month, with each session lasting a full a working day or half working day.

Meetings are likely to take place in a suitable venue such as the Town Hall or the Council Offices.

## 4.2. Review Day Structure

4.2.1. Each review day will consist of 1 chair and normally up to 5 panellists, selected from the pool of 22 panellists and 3 chairs. The selection will be based on the expertise and specialist skills required for the projects being reviewed that day.

Declaration of Interest forms must be signed by all panel members who are selected for a review day as soon they are made aware of the schemes to be reviewed.

4.2.2. A review session panel will be kept consistent for follow up review of the same scheme where possible.

4.2.3. There will be one Place Review meeting per month with up to 4 schemes being reviewed per review session.

4.2.4. Depending on caseload there may be a need for panel members to be available to provide advice over and above the review meetings, briefing days and AGMs. The Council will communicate any additional requirements to panel members with sufficient notice and fees will be determined depending on the type of service required.

4.2.5. Upon the establishment of the panel a tentative programme will be circulated to members. Panel members will be given approximately 2 - 3 weeks' notice prior to a review where possible.

4.2.6. Place Reviews will be attended by members of the Place Review Panel, the applicant team, relevant Council officers and a representative of the Planning Committee (as an observer).

## 4.3. Review Day Format

- Panel briefing w/officers (approx. 60 mins)
- Site Visits (if required – approx. 90 mins)
- *Presentation 1 (approx. 20 mins)*
- *Question & Answers 1 (approx. 10 mins)*
- *Open Discussion 1 (approx. 30 mins)*
- Panel Debrief (approx. 30 mins)

The italicised part of the above section will be repeated for up to 4 schemes per review day.

4.3.1. Site visits will take place as required. This will be outlined in the review day briefing pack. The Council will arrange travel for sites visits.

4.3.2. Panellists are responsible for their own safety and security during site visits and area walkthroughs, and should be suitably prepared for such activities.

4.3.3. Case officers will be invited to brief the panel in the morning briefing session, as well as during the review for their particular case and the de-brief at the end of the day.

4.3.4. Each development proposal will be presented by a representative of the Applicant team, usually the architect. A guidance document of the type of presentation material expected during the Place Review meeting can be found in Appendix 1.

4.3.5. During the open discussion, feedback will be provided by each panel member. It will be chaired, mediated and summarised by the panel chair. Panel members will also be able to ask officers questions and clarifications if required.

4.3.6. Lunch provided in the mid-session interval

4.3.7. At the end of each review there will be a debriefing of the review session with the panel and Council officers.

## 4.4. Review Session Roles

4.4.1. Review Participants: the review panel and applicant team are the only active participants during the review sessions

4.4.2 Review Administrators: Spatial Planning and Development Management officers manage, administrate and facilitate the review day, however are observers during the reviews themselves, unless asked specific questions by the Panel Chair.

4.4.3 Review Observer: the Chair of the Planning Committee (or delegated representative) will be invited as an observer during the review sessions.

4.4.4. Additional Council officers who support the operations of the review meeting and/or the schemes under scrutiny may also be present if required

4.4.5. Planning committee members and council officers present will not be active participants during the review session. However the Panel chair may ask them questions

or request clarifications if required

4.4.6. Other expert bodies with specialist interest or expertise such as heritage or other specialisms may also be invited to the panel meetings if required depending on the complexity of the scheme under review

#### 4.5. Place Review Fees and Charges

- First Review = £4000 (plus VAT)
- Follow up Review = £3500 (plus VAT)
- Post Submission Review = £3500 (plus VAT)

4.5.1. Applicants will be required to submit a PRP application form and pay fees prior to the review taking place.





# 5 Outcome of Review Sessions

5.1. The panel chair will write the final report with the support of Council officers and circulate it to all required parties including the applicant team 2 – 3 weeks following the Review session.

The report will contain a summary of the discussions/ comments made during the review session – it will also advise on ways to improve the design and place quality of the proposal. Panel advice (verbal or written) is independent, impartial, non-statutory. Applicants of development proposals are strongly advised that the panel feedback is not actioned until officially fed back into the pre-application process by Council officers and that any advice which is actioned before this is fed back into the official pre-application process will be done at the Applicant's own risk.

5.2. The aim of the panel's report is to assist and encourage the potential to achieve high quality design and placemaking. Place Review Panel reports will be published on the Council's Planning Register along with all other application documents once a valid planning application has been submitted and registered for a scheme, unless otherwise agreed in special circumstances. For schemes that do not require planning consent, the Place Review Panel reports will be provided on request once applications for any other relevant consents have been submitted – please refer to section 9 on confidentiality for more information.

5.3. A place review will be highly advisable prior to the first presentation to Planning Committee and act as a gateway to it. Follow up reviews may be required and recommended in several cases.



*Airport House Croydon. Grade II listed*



*East Croydon Bridge. Studio Egret West / Hawkins Brown*

# 6 Place Review Criteria

6.1. Place Reviews will be an additional specialist service, particularly important for major, complex and strategic developments undergoing the DTS process – it will act as a gateway to the Planning Committee. Applicants will be advised to undergo a place review at as early a stage as possible – where possible, this will be discussed and agreed during the inception meeting and integrated into the project programme. The first review as well as follow up reviews will be incorporated into the project programme and PPA where it can be envisaged it would be required. (Please see the Pre-application Customer Advice Note on the Council website for further details)

Proposals that are likely to require a Place Review will generally meet, but not be limited to, the following criteria as also established by CABE:

6.1.1. Proposals which are considered a Major or Strategic Scheme (as defined by Government Regulation)

6.1.2. Proposals which are significant because of their size or uses they contain:

- Large buildings or group of buildings such as courts, large religious buildings, museums or art galleries, hospitals, shopping and leisure complexes, office, commercial buildings and other spaces with civic significance
- Infrastructure projects such as stations and other transport interchanges, bridges, power stations and substantial waste plants
- Major changes in the public realm such as pedestrianisation schemes or proposals to create or enhance high streets, public squares, parks and civic open spaces
- Large scale masterplans, including spatial planning policies, Design Codes and other forms of design guidance for large sites or areas

6.1.3. Proposals which are significant because of their site:

- Proposals which affect important views or are sited in such a way that they give rise to exceptional effects on their locality and wider

townscape

- Proposals which are of particular regional or local significance
- Proposals which are the subject of major public investment

6.1.4. Proposals with an importance greater than their size, use or site would suggest:

- Proposals which are likely to establish the planning, form or architectural quality for the future large scale development or redevelopment
- Proposals which are out of the ordinary in their context or setting because of their scale, form materials or surroundings
- Proposals which are particularly relevant to the quality of everyday life and contain features which, if repeated, would offer substantial benefits for society and economy or conversely, detriments

6.2. Schemes that are elevated to the Council Development Team Service (DTS) will be highly recommended to undergo a Place Review. These proposals will tend to follow the following development types:

- Provision of 50 or more dwellings
- Development of tall buildings that exceed the London Mayoral referral threshold
- Provision of over 10,000 sqm of commercial space
- Change of use of over 10,000 sqm of floorspace
- Development of a site in excess of 2.5 hectares
- Major infrastructure and public realm scheme
- Reserved Matters pursuant to outline planning permissions relating to large scale development



6.3 Officers will provide clear recommendation and guidance to the applicant team regarding the requirement for a Place Review, as they may be particular variations depending on the scheme.

6.4 A first review prior to the first planning committee will be highly recommended, and subsequent reviews will be advisable depending on the scale, complexity and significance of the scheme.

6.5. Place Reviews will also be available as part of the post submission services offered – depending on the scale and complexity of the scheme, they may be highly advisable during reserved matters and occasionally during discharge of conditions stages, as well as detailed application elements of a large outline planning application.



*Ruskin Square, Phase I Residential (AHMM / MUF)*



# 7 Monitoring and Evaluation

7.1. Annual General Meetings (AGMs) will take place with Council officers, Chair of the Planning Committee (or delegated representative) and other key stakeholders.

The AGMs will provide an opportunity to discuss major applications in development that are due for a Place Review, provide updates on recently reviewed schemes and evaluate the panel processes, structure and applicant feedback.

This meeting will allow panel members and other relevant stakeholders to evaluate the effectiveness of the Place Review Panel and consider ways to make it more efficient in helping enhance the quality of places being delivered.

7.2. The panel and related processes will be reviewed every two years and refreshed if required.





# 8 Conflicts of Interest

8.1. Panel members are expected to act in the public interest and adhere all the guidance and clauses contained within the contracts of engagement and tender documents.

Declaration of Interest forms must be completed and signed by all panel members, where they must declare any projects in Croydon that they have been involved with in the preceding 12 months, as well as any schemes in the pipeline. The DoI Form must be completed every 12 months, as well as in advance of a review session.

8.2. If panel members who in the preceding 12 months have been personally or professionally involved with a particular proposal under discussion, or who may otherwise have a potential conflict of interest where their involvement in the Place Review meeting could potentially have the effect, or could be perceived to have the effect of influencing the financial or non-financial interest of the person, or another individual or organisation and/or its site with whom that person has a familial or formal relationship; panellists must declare this in good time and council officers coordinating the panel of the nature of the interest. Once declared the panel member must not participate in any reviews concerning the particular scheme in question.

In the case that colleagues of panel members who work within the same external companies are involved/have been involved in projects within the borough which could result in a conflict of interest, the panel member must declare this in good time and demonstrate that a Chinese wall has been put in place to avoid additional conflicts. It is unlikely that the particular panel member will be appointed to review such schemes.

8.3. Any conflicts of interest will be recorded in the minutes of the review meeting.

8.4. A list of projects to be reviewed during a panel meeting will be provided up to 2 – 3 weeks in advance where possible. Panel members are expected to declare any conflicts of interests in writing at this stage.

8.5. The panel will review proposals which may be refused by the Council. If members are approached to become involved in sites/schemes that have been presented to the panel which they sat on, they should not do so until at least 24 months after the Council has determined the scheme.

## 8.6. Schemes put forward by Panel members

8.6.1. There may be situations where panel members may be presenting to the panel as the applicant/applicant's representative. In this situation the panel member is not acting as a member of the Place Review Panel, but in the capacity of the applicant/applicant's representative.



Croydon Skyline over Queen's Gardens



# 9 Confidentiality

9.1. Proposals which are reviewed during the pre-application stage will be treated as confidential unless the applicant gives written permission for the Place Review Panel Reports on the schemes to be publicly released or the scheme is presented to Planning Committee. If a scheme is presented to Planning Committee during its pre-application its Place Review Panel report will be summarised in the Planning Committee Report but not published in full.

9.2. Place Review Panel reports will be published on the Council's Planning Register, along with all other application documents, once a valid planning application has been submitted and registered for a scheme, unless otherwise agreed in special circumstances. For schemes that do not require planning consent, the Place Review Panel reports will be provided on request once applications for any other relevant consents have been submitted. It will be made clear that any panel advice (oral or written) does not hold any statutory weighting, and cannot be implemented or incorporated in the development of the scheme until it has been officially fed back to

applicants by Council officers. The panel feedback and report is advisory and applicants must not action any points until they are officially included within formal planning advice by Council officers. If actioned prior to this, it will be done at the Applicant's own risk.

9.3. Panel Members shall keep confidential all information provided to them as part of their role in the panel and shall not disclose or use that information for their own benefit, nor disclose it to any third party.





# 10 Appendix 1 - Review Session Guidance Notes

## 10.1 Presenting to the Panel

10.1.1 The total time for one review is approximately one hour, within which time the applicant will be given 20 mins for their presentation. A draft of this presentation must be sent to the case officer 2 weeks prior to the review taking place.

The applicant presentation will be followed by questions and clarifications from the panel, leading to comments and advice in an open discussion between the panel and applicant team. The presentation should include a brief introduction to the scheme, brief, background, aims, concept and describe the scheme with reference to the plans, drawings and visualisation.

## 10.2 Presentation Materials

10.2.1. Presentation materials must be clear and legible allowing the development scheme to be clearly viewed and understood. Schemes can be presented using digital media with support of panels and/or display boards if required.

10.2.2. Supporting materials including drawings, photographs and models are encouraged where they provide a greater understanding of the scheme and context. Final PowerPoint presentations must be emailed to the organising officer a minimum of 24 hours in advance of the panel meeting for setting up purposes.

10.2.3. The presentation should be clear on the aspirations of the scheme as well as the understanding of the context, brief and how the projects sits and relates within its surroundings. The following points can serve as a general guide for the type of material from a presentation, however it must be noted that it is not limited to this and each scheme will have particular conditions that will require a tailored presentation in order to ensure a productive review session. This can be developed with guidance from the case officer:

- **Contextual analysis** showing the site in relation to its surroundings; understanding of wider socio-economic + cultural landscape and constraints & opportunities of any future development in relation to this
- **Movement systems** including pedestrian, cycle + road networks and accessibility to public transport

- **Urban grain and street patterns** if relevant (usually applicable to masterplan and projects or larger scale)
- **Building context** including ownerships, conservations areas, existing buildings to be retained and/or demolished, listed buildings and new buildings and future developments
- **Building mass** in particular new buildings with regard to their height, size scale and relation to adjoining sites and wider townscape
- **Open spaces** both existing and proposed, especially how they relate to the buildings, the public realm as well as movement and orientation
- **Design Development and options** of the various way a scheme is being approached, including the preferred options
- **Plans, sections and elevations** of proposed development should be sufficiently annotated to explain the hierarchy and purpose of the spaces, orientation and scale. These plans can be sketches or diagrams, particularly during the first pre-application review
- **Public Realm** treatment, orientation and site sections to show its relationship of public realm to the proposed building and adjoining areas; demonstration of how changes in the wider public realm will affect wider civic functions, productivity and activity around the site
- **Views and panoramas** to and from the building (especially if it lies within a conservation area because it is useful to show existing view and new views with proposed scheme). Presentation of verified and dynamic views is advisable here to assess townscape impacts of proposed scheme and its mass
- **Detailed Drawings** or visual examples of use and treatment of materials and if applicable energy efficiency proposals

## 10.3. Further Information

10.3.1. It is strongly advisable that projects undergo a place review at as early a stage as possible before the first presentation to planning committee.

Undergoing a place review at an early stage during the pre-application process will mean that there are greater chances for a greater number of issues to be resolved prior to planning submission, making the process more efficient, and saving on overall time and costs for the applicant team.

Subsequent follow up reviews may be required depending on the complexity and nature of the development – officers will advise applicants on whether or not this will be a recommended step.

10.3.2. For further information and guidance, please refer to the “Farrell Review of Architecture and the Built Environment” available at: <http://www.farrellreview.co.uk/>

10.3.3. For additional information on Design Reviews please also see the CABI & RIBA guidance document available at: <http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/resources/guide/design-review-principles-and-practice>



Taberner House Site (Consented scheme by MAKE Architects)



# 11 Panel Member Biographies

## 11.1. Panel Chairs

### **Angela Brady, Brady Mallalieu**

Angela Brady was born in Dublin and graduated from DIT in Architecture in 1981. She is past president of RIBA (Royal Institute of British Architects 2011 -2013 and Director of Brady Mallalieu Architects, set up with Robin Mallalieu who are an award winning RIBA Chartered practice, specialising in quality contemporary sustainable design based in London.

Angela has given over 50 keynote speeches around the world, including in India, China, Vietnam, USA, EU and the Middle East on sustainable city making and low carbon design. Angela advises many design review committees including CABI English Heritage-Urban Panel, RIBA, RIAI, Design Champion for London Development Agency and Chaired RIBA Women in Architecture for five years and is a rep of the Global Irish Business Forum.

Angela is a professional TV broadcaster co-writing and co presenting a new TV series "Designing Ireland" a review of Irish Architecture, Craft and Industrial Design and Design Thinking broadcast in Nov 0215 on RTEOne Angela has previously presented the overseas strand of The Home Show Channel 4 and designed and built the house on "Building the Dream" on ITV She co-produces/directs and makes short films including (1) "Why Study Architecture?-The role of the architect" and (2) 'Designing for Champions' about the London 2012 designers.

### **Neil Deely, Co-founder and Director, Metropolitan Workshop LLP**

Founding partner of Metropolitan Workshop, Neil has designed major public buildings and large mixed-used projects in the UK and overseas. His experience encompasses the disciplines of urban design and masterplanning and the design of buildings in sensitive heritage contexts. Neil has undertaken several major urban design commissions for city councils and worked on strategic regeneration projects in Swindon, Oslo, Bergen and Dublin.

Neil is currently involved in some innovative approaches to the delivery of new homes to meet the UK housing shortage. He led the practice's research

into the needs of the UK's private rented sector, and led the winning entry for the Wates/RIBA Private Rented Sector international Competition. Neil has been a member of Design Council CABI's National Design Review Panel since 2007, is chair of LB Newham's Design Review Panel and is a member of the London Legacy Development Corporation Quality Review Panel, appointed as Vice-Chair in April 2016.

Previously he was architectural advisor and independent member of London Thames Gateway Development Control Committee. Metropolitan Workshop are also design advisors to the GLA and are often asked to provide third-party design review for private developers and social housing providers. Neil has taught and lectured at architectural schools and Universities in the UK including Oxford Brookes, Queens, and the Bartlett at both degree and post-graduate levels.

### **Oliver Richards, Orms**

Oliver Richards founded Orms in 1984 and is co-owner of the practice with John McRae and Richard Warwick.

Oliver has been closely involved with projects of all kinds throughout the practice's history, but has since the early 1990s specialised in finding new uses for former commercial buildings. His passion for architecture of all ages has informed a nevertheless contemporary design approach.

He says, "Throughout my career I have worked closely with both end users and developers to establish the principles and motives upon which a strong project can be created, resulting in major commercial, mixed use and residential schemes for Derwent London, Redevco, Great Portland Estates, Abstract Securities and Aviva. This collaborative approach has underpinned Orms' work in the education sector, on projects at Highgate School, The American School in London, Uppingham and Tonbridge schools. Understanding how to draw the best out of a team of consultants has enabled us to consistently produce projects of exceptional quality."

Oliver served as Vice President for Education at the RIBA from 2009 to 2013 and chaired the Education Committee which is responsible for validating architectural courses at universities in the UK and overseas. In this role he chaired the juries for the

RIBA student medals. He previously sat on the CABE/ Design Council review panel for schools. He has also chaired the Development Sub Committee at New Islington and Hackney Housing Association and was a School Governor at the transition to Academy status for Islington Green School.

## 11.2. Panellists

Hiro Aso (*Gensler, Head of Transport and Infrastructure*)

David Bickle (*Victoria & Albert Museum, Director of Design, Exhibitions & FuturePlan*)

Harbinder Birdi (*Hawkins Brown, Partner*)

Darryl Chen (*Hawkins Brown, Partner*)

Jim Coleman (*Buro Happold, Head of Economics*)

Tom Coward (*AOC, Founder&Director*)

Russell Curtis (*RCKa, Founding Director*)

Nick Hayhurst (*Hayhurst & Co, Founding Director*)

Wayne Hemingway (*Hemingway Design, Founder*)

Donald Hyslop (*Tate, Head of Regeneration & Community Partnerships*)

Barbara Kaucky (*Erect Architecture, Founding Director*)

Richard Lavington (*Maccleanor Lavington Architects, Founding Partner*)

Holly Lewis (*We Made That, Co-founding partner*)

Laura Mazzeo (*Farrells, Partner*)

Jo McCafferty (*Levitt Bernstein, Director*)

Christopher McCarthy (*Battle McCarthy, Managing Director*)

Tim Murphy (*Waterman Infrastructure, Principle Heritage Consultant*)

Hugh Pearman (*Journalist; RIBA Journal, Editor*)

Daniel Rea (*Periscope, Co-Founder*)

Biljana Savic (*Academy of Urbanism, Director*)

Prisca Thielmann (*Maccleanor Lavington, Associate Director*)

Glynn Tully (*Levitt Bernstein, Associate Director*)

## Panellist Bios

### Hiro Aso, Gensler

Hiro is a chartered architect and spearheads Gensler's railway transport and infrastructure projects while adding to its global aviation and transportation expertise with more than 20 years of architectural design and project leadership experience.

As the Firmwide leader of Gensler's Aviation & Transportation practice area, he recognises, values and promotes transport architecture as 'cultural infrastructure' at its most socially important and economically dynamic role in shaping, influencing and reflecting our culture.

An award-winning authority on the design of regenerative transport hubs, Hiro is one of the leading figures in the U.K.'s transportation sector with a portfolio that includes a range of major domestic and international projects. He was a leading figure in the delivery of some of London's most high-profile schemes, including the award-winning modernization of King's Cross Station, the extensions of the East London and Northern lines and Bond Street Station.

Hiro supports the UK Trade and Investment as a panel member of the Strategic Railway Advisory Group and a promoter of the UK Creative Industries. For the Mayor of London's Greater London Authority he is an expert design panel member supporting the London Borough of Lewisham.

A member of the U.K.'s HS2 Design Panel and an expert panel member for the Greater London Authority, Hiro advocates transport architecture as a crucial cultural and economic catalyst, helping shape and influence the future evolution of towns and cities for the benefit of all.

### David Bickle, Victoria & Albert Museum

David was appointed Director of Design, Exhibitions and FuturePlan at the Victoria and Albert Museum in May 2015. He is responsible for the physical manifestation of the V&A 'brand' from printed material and posters to the new V&A Museum within the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. David also leads the museum's public exhibition programme.



Prior to joining the V&A, David was a Senior Partner at Hawkins\Brown Architects. He has more than 20 years experience of leading award-winning projects within the education, commercial, arts and regeneration sectors, working across the studio leading dialogue, debate and design review. Collaborating with developers Urban Splash and design partners Studio Egret West, David was responsible for the regeneration of the Grade 2\* listed Park Hill estate in Sheffield which was shortlisted for the Stirling Prize in 2013. One of the last projects that he directed was Here East, the repurposing of the former Olympic Press, Media and Broadcast Centres within the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.

David has taught at a number of universities and regularly lectures and writes for the architectural press. He has chaired a number of competition and jury panels including Forgotten Spaces Sheffield and Regional RIBA Awards. He was invited by the British Council to participate in the selection of a curatorial and design team for the British Pavilion at the 2014 Venice Architectural Biennale. David recently chaired the jury of an International Design Competition to select an architect for a new Museum of Contemporary Art in Riga.

He is an external examiner at the University of the Creative Arts and is part of Lewisham's Design Review Panel. He sits on the boards of Oily Cart, S1 Artspace and Tannery Arts. He is a patron of the Drawing Room and more recently was invited to become a member of the London Festival of Architecture's advisory panel.

### **Harbinder Birdi, Hawkins\ Brown**

Harbinder is an Architect and Partner at Hawkins\ Brown. He leads the transport and infrastructure sector and is a champion for good design on both complex engineering-led and civic projects.

He is currently delivering the architectural designs for two of London's largest infrastructure projects, Crossrail 1 and Thames Tideway. He is the principal architect for the design for Tottenham Court Road, Bond Street and Liverpool Street stations, three of the central section stations for the new Elizabeth line and is also the principal architect leading the designs for the public realm of the central section of Thames Tideway. He was responsible for design of the practice's first bridge,

where in collaboration with Croydon council developed designs for which was launched across an operational railway at East Croydon.

Harbinder collaborates extensively with artists on in-situ installations within the practice's buildings, most notably with artist's Daniel Buren, Douglas Gordon and Richard Wright for Tottenham Court Road Station and Hew Locke for the RIBA award winning New Art Exchange Gallery in Nottingham.

He is also a previous winner of '40 under 40', a prestigious design award recognising the best young architects under 40.

Harbinder is a visiting critic and examiner at a number of universities including the UCL, Royal College of Art and Manchester School of Architecture where he lectures both in the UK and internationally on professional practice, architecture and multi-disciplinary design. He is currently an external examiner for the Masters in Architecture at Oxford Brookes University.

He is a RIBA Part III professional examiner, is on the RIBA validation panel and is a member of the RIBA education committee. Harbinder has also spent several years practicing in northern India designing mixed use developments and has designed one of the region's first psychiatric care facilities.

### **Darryl Chen, Hawkins\ Brown**

Darryl has demonstrated expertise through more than 12 years of professional practice, promoting good design as a practitioner and thought leader, within the field of urban design. He is a partner at Hawkins\ Brown and leads the urban design and research studio, delivering masterplans for brownfield sites, campuses, science parks, housing estates and districts. Darryl has both a client-facing role developing new business and a hands-on design role translating complex briefs into practical design solutions.

He champions innovation within the practice under the auspices of the &also think tank, a research vehicle that informs project briefs, explores new markets and speculates on future directions for architecture and urbanism. Darryl regularly writes and speaks on innovation and urban design. Notably in 2012 he was invited to exhibit at the Venice Biennale, and in 2014 was invited to speak and judge at the World

Architecture Forum.

Darryl was named in Blueprint magazine in “25 who will change architecture in 2010”. For 2 years he led design studios at the Architectural Association and Bartlett Schools of Architecture; and has been guest critic at the Architectural Association, Cambridge, Columbia Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, Syracuse and Oxford Brookes universities.

### **Jim Coleman**

Jim is Global Head of Economics at BuroHappold Engineering, based in London. He is a highly-experienced economist specialising in local and regional economic development and urban regeneration. He has expertise in a wide range of fields including local/regional economic competitiveness, labour markets, business and sector development, enterprise and SME support. He is a specialist in the economics of cities: covering economic strategy, large-scale urban development projects, industrial development & clusters, and urban regeneration. His 20 years of experience include studies in economic competitiveness, labour markets & skills, industry-sector development, FDI (foreign direct investment), business modelling and feasibility studies. Jim has particular expertise in the planning and development of Special Economic Zones, economic infrastructure platforms, major urban development schemes, ports, airports, urban technology & innovation districts. He has extensive experience in the UK, Europe, USA, China, Russia, the Middle East and Africa.

Jim previously established and headed up the London office of Regeneris Consulting and also spent significant time with AECOM and DTZ (now Cushman and Wakefield). Prior to this, he was a lecturer in the Economics Department of Durham University. Jim is currently a Professor of Professional Practice in the School of Architecture and the Built Environment, University of Westminster and is also an Honorary Senior Research Associate at the Bartlett School of Planning, University College London. He was previously a member of the CABE Expert Panel on Strategic Urban Design and has advised the Town and Country Planning Association on the economics of eco-towns.

### **Tom Coward, AOC**

Tom Coward is a British architect based in London and co-founder of AOC. Established in 2005 with Geoff Shearcroft, the practice is best known for designing public and cultural buildings within historic and politically-sensitive contexts. It has won numerous awards and been internationally exhibited, including at the Victoria & Albert Museum, the Royal Academy, the British School of Rome and the Venice Biennale.

Completed projects include the Bishop building at St Saviours & St Olaves Secondary Girls School, Southwark Park Primary School, a complex refurbishment and extension of a listed London Board School, and recently Judith Kerr Primary school – repurposing a former biological laboratory building into a new bilingual free school. Current projects include family housing and apartments for sale at Nunhead Green; Working with All of Us – on interior architecture for a new standard in dementia care in the UK; Walk Elephant a community green links and quiet routes public realm strategy; and littleBIG house, a custom build housing prototype at Heartlands in Cornwall, the UK government's largest custom build housing pilot.

Tom studied architecture at the University of Nottingham and the Royal College of Art, where he was awarded the Alsop Architecture Prize. He has taught and lectured widely in Europe and USA, and is currently leading a masters unit at Kingston University with Simon Henley. In 2011 he was the Louis I. Kahn Visiting Professor at Yale researching public access to archive collections. Tom is a RIBA registered architect, a member of the Southwark Design Review Panel, Croydon Place Review Panel, and a local assessor for the Civic Trust.

### **Russell Curtis, RCKa**

Russell is a founding director of RCKa, a London-based architectural practice that specialises in innovative residential, community and commercial projects. The practice has twice been a finalist for Young Architect of the Year, and in 2014 was the recipient of an RIBA National Award for its TNG Youth & Community Centre as well as winner of the inaugural RIBA London Emerging Practice of the Year.

Before founding RCKa in 2008, Russell worked on



a range of projects across the UK and Europe that included the Stirling Prize-shortlisted Sainsbury's Greenwich and Shell's EpiCentre project in Rijswijk, The Netherlands. In 2008 the practice won the prestigious European 9 international housing competition for a site in Stoke-on-Trent, followed by an RIBA competition for a new housing scheme in Preston, Lancashire. RCKa is now working on a range of innovative residential developments for developers including PegasusLife and Pocket Living, as well as numerous community and housing projects for London Boroughs including Brent, Camden, Harrow and Lewisham.

Russell is a past chair of the RIBA's Procurement Reform Group. He is also a founding member of Project Compass CIC, a not-for-profit research organisation that campaigns for better procurement of public buildings, and a member of the LLDC Quality Review Panel.

### **Nick Hayhurst, Hayhurst & Co.**

Nick is an architect and Founding Director of Hayhurst and Co.: a multi-RIBA award winning practice focusing on schools, housing and buildings for the community. He studied architecture at Edinburgh College of Art, the Architectural Association, the Bartlett School of Architecture and the British School at Rome.

Nick's practice has won 4 RIBA awards in the last 5 years including 2 for schools projects in Croydon. In 2013, Hayhurst and Co.'s Hayes Primary School in Purley also won the NLA Best Education Building Award and Overall Winner. His 'Whitehorse Manor Schools' project in Thornton Heath also won the 2014 AJ Retrofit Award (Education) and was also the recipient of the prestigious 2015 Architectural Review Schools Award later dubbed by the AJ as the 'Best School in the World'.

Nick is a Senior Lecturer at Brighton where he has taught for 12 years and is a frequent critic at UK schools of architecture. Nick was runner up and awarded 2nd place in BD Young Architect of the Year Award (YAYA) in 2012, was runner up in the RIBA London Emerging Architect of the Year Award in 2014 and in 2016 featured in the Architecture foundation's New Architect's 3 - 100 Emerging Practices.

The work of Hayhurst and Co. has been widely published and Nick has sat on awards and competition juries and contributes to architectural journals. Nick also sits on the RIBA Validation Panel and is currently a member of the Southwark, Brighton and Hove, and Design South East Design Review Panels.

### **Wayne Hemingway, Hemingway Design**

For over 35 years Hemingway Design has conceived creative concepts and social design projects for an impressive roster of major brands and agencies.

Wayne co-founded Red or Dead with his wife Gerardine starting with a small stall at Camden Market selling second-hand and customised clothing. Wayne & Gerardine built up their business into an international fashion label and now operate a multi-disciplinary design agency led by two generations of the Hemingway family and a wider team of talented designers.

From affordable and social design such as Staiths South Bank on Tyneside, to Dreamland Margate, and work with clients including Graham and Brown, Coca Cola, John Lewis, Sky TV, Sony, Transport for London, Virgin Trains, G Plan, Vintage, the 2012 Olympics and Unite Students, Hemingway Design are recognised worldwide with a core philosophy of aiming to "improve things that matter in life"

### **Donald Hyslop, Tate Galleries**

Donald is an Urbanist, Head of Regeneration and Community, Tate Galleries and Chair of Trustees of Borough Market. His work is at the forefront of thinking and applying the role culture, architecture & museums can play in the regeneration, place making, economic and social development of cities and communities.

He leads an ongoing urban renewal strategy based around social value which has put Tate Modern and Borough market at the centre of a cultural and social model of regeneration in London. He also Chairs Better Bankside Business Improvement District, is a Built Environment expert for CABE/Design Council and acts as advisor in Thamesmead.

### **Barbara Kaucky, Erect Architecture**

Barbara Kaucky is a founding director at Erect Architecture, a London based architecture and public realm practice with a reputation for people-centric designs for leisure, education and community projects and a strong commitment to social value, health and wellbeing.

Her interest in how the built environment can contribute to healthier, happier urban living has led her to work on pilot projects such as Lambeth Early Action Partnership. The BIG Lottery funded project aims to improve outcomes for young children in four Lambeth Wards. The Capital Works comprise extensions and adaptations of schools, community buildings and green spaces to make them welcoming, support bottom up parental action and volunteering activities, multi-agency co-working and healthy living. All Leap projects are co-designed with stakeholders and users and accompanied by an evolving research project that explores the role of design in achieving health and wellbeing outcomes.

Prior to moving to London in 2001 Barbara lived and worked in Vienna, Berlin and Los Angeles. She maintains an interest in the central-European way of urban planning. Seeking alternatives to the London housing crisis Barbara currently embraces the role of mini-developer in an inner city co-ownership housing development in Vienna. Barbara enjoys the capacity of small practice to be agile, innovate and experiment and believes more should be done to promote diversity in architecture. In 2013 she joined the RIBA Small Practice Panel, where she co-organises the annual Guerrilla Tactics conference, focussing on innovation and business skills for young and small practices. Barbara is a member of the Camden Design Panel, lectures and is a visiting critic at the University of Bath. She is delighted to be joining the Croydon Space Review Panel.

### **Richard Lavington, Maccreeanor Lavington Architects**

Richard established Maccreeanor Lavington Architects with Gerard Maccreeanor in 1991 in London. Working from offices in London and Rotterdam the experience of the practice is extensive, covering a wide range of

sectors. Projects range in scale, and complexity, from individually designed houses to large-scale urban projects. He has led the practice on many award-winning projects including Accordia, Cambridge; Saxon Court and Roseberry Mansions, Kings Cross; the H10 Hotel Waterloo; and the Lux, Hoxton Square, as well as a number of housing projects in London and the Netherlands. He is a board member of Design for Homes and is on the steering group for the Housing Design Awards. He is currently a member of several London Design Review Panels and has previously served as a CABE enabler. Richard has been a Studio Leader at the University of Bath where he was responsible for running the final year Masters studio and has taught at many schools of architecture including Cambridge, Nottingham, Canterbury, Belfast and the Mackintosh School of Architecture.

### **Holly Lewis, We Made That**

Holly is a registered architect who studied at the Bartlett School of Architecture. Holly co-founded We Made That - an energetic architecture and urbanism practice with a strong public conscience - in 2006. Since founding the practice, Holly has gained extensive experience of architectural, public realm and strategic projects for the public sector, as well as directing the urban research portfolio of the practice.

Holly has taught architecture at the Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL and London Metropolitan University. She is a member of the Tower Hamlets Conservation and Design Advisory Panel, Bexley Design Review Panel, Tideway Design Review Panel and a guest member of the Greater London Authority Mayor's Design Advisory Panel. Holly is appointed as a Design Council CABE Built Environment Expert.

Holly is a trustee of The Architecture Foundation and was shortlisted for the AJ Emerging Woman Architect of the Year Award 2012.

### **Laura Mazzeo**

A partner for global architecture and urban design practice Farrells, Laura heads up a rejuvenated masterplanning team and is currently leading on major regeneration schemes in the UK, Europe and Asia where she aspires to generate exciting design schemes



for complex large scale mixed-use masterplans.

Key projects she has delivered high quality placemaking for include: the West Kowloon Cultural District in Hong Kong, St Giles Circus regeneration for TfL, GLA and LB Camden/City of Westminster, Bishopsgate Goodsyrd SPD for LB Tower Hamlets and more recently Old Oak Common across LB Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham, Meridian Water in LB Enfield or Northumberland Park and Wood Green Town Centre regenerations in LB Haringey.

By the nature of the projects Laura gets involved in, she has a high awareness and knowledge of policy but also the political dynamics of the operations of local government. She particularly thrives on dialogue with all segments of society: the community, decision-makers, thinkers, fellow designers, activists, artists, and many more to make things happen at the urban scale.

Laura is regularly invited to speak at industry events, most recently at the NLA to launch Farrells' Autonomous Vehicle vision for the future for Better Placemaking in collaboration with WSP through a debate with Richard Cook from Lendlease, Rachel Skinner from WSP, Lilli Matson from TfL and chaired by Adam Branson from Weekly Property.

Laura is highly engaged in supporting the empowerment of women in the construction industry through her active participation to female-led network Urbanistas and the RIBA FLUID mentoring programme where she has participated both as a mentor and a mentee.

### **Jo McCafferty, Levitt Bernstein**

Jo has been a Director at Levitt Bernstein since 2006 and leads a studio running major housing projects within the Practice. With vast experience of designing and delivering innovative housing, she is adept at steering schemes through complex planning processes and advising clients on design and quality standards. Her key role has been to champion imaginative design solutions in housing at masterplanning and detailed design scales – an approach that has been rewarded with numerous competition-winning schemes, which she has led through to completion. Most recently, Vaudeville Court, a social housing scheme for LB Islington, won an RIBA London Award. Currently, Jo is

leading two major regeneration projects in Southall and Poplar, as well as a number of other smaller housing schemes in the capital.

In addition to her project work, Jo has co-authored and contributed to several housing publications and is a design advisor for UDL design surgeries – assessing design proposals and draft policy documents emerging in the capital. She is a Built Environment Expert for DCCABE; sits on LB Lewisham and LB Hackney's Design Review Panels and is on a number of awards juries, including the Civic Trust Awards, WAN Residential Awards and British Homes Awards. She is also regularly invited to speak at events and conferences, for organisations from New London Architecture to Housing Futures in Sydney.

Jo has taught studios and lectured at a variety of architectural schools across the country for the last 16 years, including the University of East London, University of Sheffield, University of Newcastle, University of Cambridge and the Architectural Association. She is also currently an RIBA external examiner for Oxford Brookes University.

### **Christopher McCarthy, Battle McCarthy**

Christopher has over 30 years' experience in the design of creative built environment. After working for ARUP Consulting Engineers for 13 years on high profile projects worldwide, in response to the UN Earth Summit Conference in Rio, 1992 Christopher established a world leading sustainable Consulting Engineers and Landscape Architects, Battle McCarthy, to focus on achieving; economic prosperity for all, health and well-being, low energy environmental quality through innovated integration of industrial and natural systems, as well as applied proven scientific invention. The engineering and landscape design consultancy specialising in sustainable masterplanning and building engineering, bases its work on fundamental engineering principles: Integration, Necessity, Simplicity

Christopher prides his capability for building constructive working relationships with all members of the development team. Christopher is a constructive collaborator, who has championed multi-disciplinary engineers and ecologists in search of achieving more through innovative integrations of both artificial and natural systems.

Christopher roles and responsibilities in sustainable developments include:

- Developing sustainable strategic plans for governments, cities, and local authorities
- Designing demonstration projects which fulfil these obligations
- Working with developers to achieve high environmental standards
- Working in collaboration with academia and industry in developing new green technologies
- Participation in education and professional training

Over the last 38 years Christopher has lead a multi-disciplinary Building and Infrastructure Engineering and Landscape Design service to provide economic, social and environmental sustainable settlements and individual buildings worldwide. Christopher is a leading expert in using hard and soft technologies to achieve smart development for public and private enterprises in the form of planning policy and development respectively.

Most recently Christopher is advancing the economic, social and environmental sustainable framework tools for developing future proofed sustainable development frameworks for urban renewal or new settlements as well as progressing the utilisation of vegetation to improve air quality of the neighbourhood, fresh air intake and recalculated air within buildings.

Christopher has extensive experience in high environmental quality and well-being residential, hospitals, laboratories, theatres, exhibition spaces and offices from which Christopher is able to transfer the engineering knowledge

### **Tim Murphy, Waterman Infrastructure**

Tim is a heritage consultant with extensive and varied experience over more than 10 years in the heritage sector, having worked in Ireland, Bahrain and throughout the United Kingdom.

Tim's undergraduate studies in archaeology formed the foundation for his career. Upon realising a passion for the historic built environment, Tim then undertook further post graduate qualifications in buildings archaeology and conservation. Tim has worked as a heritage consultant for a variety of practice types including conservation architects, archaeology

practices and he currently leads the built heritage service at Waterman Infrastructure and Environment, a multi-disciplinary environmental consultancy.

As a consultant and buildings archaeologist, Tim has been involved in all stages of the planning and development process. He has input into feasibility studies, prepared heritage masterplans, undertaken statements of significance and impact assessments, contributed to mitigation strategies and managed schemes of archaeological building recording.

In addition to his typical project involvement, Tim is also a committee member and treasurer for the Building Archaeology Group (BAG) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, and a member of the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.

Tim's success as a consultant is found in his practical approach to the historic environment. The basis of his work is formed around the fundamental understanding of what is significant, in heritage terms, and how this significance can be preserved, enhanced or further revealed through either sustainable, constructive conservation or viable development opportunities. With regard to regeneration and new development Tim is a firm believer that heritage should be a significant consideration in successful, sustainable place making. Our heritage always has a story to tell, and this story helps to create a sense of place within in which we interact, live and work, thereby contributing to the economic and social wellbeing of our communities.

### **Hugh Pearman**

Hugh has edited the RIBA Journal - the magazine of the Royal Institute of British Architects - since 2006. He is a contributor to numerous other print and broadcast media in the UK, elsewhere in Europe and the United States, ranging from Royal Academy Magazine via the Spectator to Architectural Record.

Hugh was architecture, design and art critic for The Sunday Times, 1986-2016, and is a national panel member of the Civic Trust Awards. He was visiting Professor in Architecture at the Royal College of Art, 2015, councillor and honorary vice-president at the Architectural Association, 2012 – 2016, and is a visiting critic for various other architecture schools and practices.



Hugh was Chair of Art for Architecture grants scheme (2000 – 2004) at the Royal Society of Arts, and served on the Arts Council's Architecture Panel (1992-95).

He helped found the Stirling Prize for Architecture, for the RIBA (also juror, 1996-1998). More recently at the RIBA Journal he has instigated the "Eye Line" architectural drawing prize and the MacEwen Award: architecture for the public good.

Hugh has acted as a competitions assessor and adviser for organisations including Urban Splash, Coin Street Community Builders, the South Bank Employers Group and the University of Durham.

His published books include Platform for Design (Crossrail Ltd, 2016); Airports – a century of architecture (Laurence King, 2004); Contemporary World Architecture (Phaidon, editions 1998 and 2002); and Equilibrium: the work of Nicholas Grimshaw and Partners (Phaidon, 2000).

Hugh is an Honorary Fellow of the RIBA.

### **Daniel Rea, Periscope**

Daniel is Co-Founder of Periscope and is a chartered landscape architect (CMLI) with over fifteen years experience. He has worked with some of the world's finest landscape and architecture practices on large and small scale projects for public and private clients in Europe, the Middle East, Russia, Asia and the USA.

He studied at Leeds Beckett University/Wageningen UR, graduating with Distinction in 2004 having received the Landscape Institute prize for design excellence. His projects have won numerous awards, including a 2008 BALI Award for St Mary's Churchyard (with Martha Schwartz Partners) and a New London Architecture Award for Public Realm in 2012 (with Studio Egret West). Daniel has particular expertise in the design and delivery of technically complex projects on tight programmes with challenging budgets and with many stakeholders.

Daniel has been Landscape Institute Ambassador, he has sat on the committee of the Landscape Institute's London Branch and has been a guest critic at The Bartlett and Harvard GSD. Since 2015 Daniel has been a member of Lewisham Design Review Panel.

### **Biljana Savic, Academy of Urbanism**

Biljana Savic is an urban planner and architect whose career spans public and third sector advisory bodies, architectural, urban planning and construction management consultancies. She is a passionate advocate for creative, responsible and collaborative placemaking that benefits all.

As independent consultant Biljana provides urban planning and design, business and project management advice to public, private and third sector clients with built environment projects. She is a Non-Executive Director of the Academy of Urbanism; a Design Council Cabi's Built Environment Expert (BEE) and member of The Glass House Community-Led Design's enabling panel. Biljana works as a design studio tutor at Cardiff University's MA in Urban Design course. She is a Winston Churchill Fellow specialising in community engagement in placemaking and a Committee Member of Maida Hill Neighbourhood Forum, where she heads the Neighbourhood Planning Group.

As a Director of The Prince's Regeneration Trust she led a UK wide training and mentoring programme for not-for-profit organisations working to bring into use historic buildings and sites and managed a portfolio of capital and revenue projects ranging from the multiple award winning regeneration of Middleport Pottery in Stoke on Trent, to design, conservation and business planning consultancy for private and public sector clients across the UK. In the past she led a programme of support to communities piloting neighbourhood planning for The Prince's Foundation for Building Community and worked as Senior Advisor for the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). Prior to that she was a Director of spatial masterplanning consultancy Space Syntax Limited.

### **Prisca Thielmann, Maccreeanor Lavington Architects**

Prisca is an Associate Director at Maccreeanor Lavington where she has played a pivotal role in shaping and growing the office. The practice has won many architectural competitions and has received numerous prestigious awards for architectural quality, including the Stirling Prize for their Accordia scheme in Cambridge in 2008. She has worked on projects of

all scales, encompassing large strategic regeneration masterplans, residential projects of varying sizes and smaller very specific responses to tight urban sites and historic environment. Her more recent projects include the Saxon Court and Roseberry Mansions in the King's Cross Central redevelopment, recipient of an RIBA National Award in 2014 and she is currently leading a project for the redevelopment of part of the former Television Centre site in west London. Beyond practice Prisca has taught at a number of architecture schools and has been a regular critic at Kingston University, London Metropolitan University and Cambridge University and has led a study trip for London Metropolitan University to Rome. In 2007/08 she was the Rome Prize award holder at the British School in Rome, during which time she undertook independent research leading to several exhibitions and lectures.

### **Glyn Tully, Levitt Bernstein**

Glyn is an Associate Director at Levitt Bernstein and has over 20 years' experience as an urban designer and landscape architect. He heads up the Practice's urban design studio, leading the development of a number of town centre masterplans, estate regeneration schemes and urban extensions across the country. He has also led public realm strategies for several towns and delivered major components of public realm infrastructure. Importantly, he works closely with communities throughout the design and development process.

Focusing on the relationship between the built environment and quality of life, Glyn has an acute understanding of the relationship between people, place and design and the recognition that better spaces result in more activity and life. This approach has been rewarded with many competition-winning schemes and industry awards, most recently for the Ocean Estate in LB Tower Hamlets and Wormholt Park in LB Hammersmith & Fulham.

As testament to his commitment to the design of better places outside of his project work, Glyn is a Design Council CABE Built Environment Expert, a member of the LB Hackney design review panel and a Built for Life examiner.





