

GLA80868 - Lot 10

Lot 10 - Heritage and Conservation		
Company / Organisation	TOTAL OUT OF 70%	Overall Discussion Notes on Lot 10. MODERATED CONSENSUS
AECOM Infrastructure and Environment UK Limited	0%	N/A
MOLA (Museum of London Archaeology)	0%	N/A
TREHEARNE ARCHITECTS	0%	N/A
Aedas RHWL	11%	whilst demonstrating a complex project, the subject project is described in terms of its overall masterplan, rather than the heritage aspects requested for this lot
Child Graddon Lewis Ltd	11%	an attractive scheme is illustrated and the board is well composed, but the heritage skills that this lot calls for that relate to developing this project are not sufficiently evident from the information included on the board
Hamilton Architects	11%	the scheme as described does not demonstrate the heritage sensitivity that we would expect from a heritage specialist, and the heritage appraisal work is not evident in the submission
HTA	11%	the information is rather thin in comparison to other submissions, and broadbrush on heritage issues, rather than demonstrating detailed heritage skills required for the lot
POW Studios	11%	Much space on the board is used up on graphics that do not describe the heritage approach of the project, or demonstrating the skills required for this lot.
Ove Arup and Partners Ltd	15%	light on information compared to other submissions, much space on the board is used for graphics that do not describe the project in heritage terms.
John McAslan + Partners	15%	most of board taken up with not relevant material, which is not authored by this practice but other consultancies. The heritage analysis demonstrated is cursory.
Allies and Morrison	52%	the example illustrates masterplanning being influenced by clear historic appraisal, that works on a number of scales (urban fabric and building detail)
Acanthus LW	56%	the example illustrated is a good example of masterplanning being influenced by clear historic appraisal
Alan Baxter Limited	56%	well chosen example demonstrating strategic as well as detailed understanding of heritage assesment as applied to a scheme
Avanti Architects	56%	well put together project board, balancing cultural and physical heritage assesment within the illustrated scheme
Carmody Groarke	56%	compelling example, with heritage appraisal skills clearly evident, alongside sensitive design work
Donald Insall Associates	56%	excellent analysis in the detailed submission, which is based on a complex but realistic scheme that is well representative of the kind of work that would be forthcoming from public sector clients
Giles Quarme and Associates	56%	well laid out detail of heritage appraisal work then leading to a clearly heritage sensitive proposition
Haworth Tompkins	56%	well chosen case study, demonstrating clear heritage skills in relation to high quality building adaptation
Lyndon Goode Architects	56%	well structured submission with clear and detailed description of the heritage focus of the approach
Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios	63%	Example responds well to the lot criteria, demonstrates strategic as well as detailed understanding of heritage assesment as applied to a scheme

Lot 1 - Urban Strategies, Spatial Policy and Research		Quality of the proposal in relation to the Lot question (30%)		Clarity and quality of the proposal's illustrations and visual communication (20%)		Clarity and quality of the proposal's written statement (20%)	
Company / Organisation	TOTAL OUT OF 70%	Score	Comment	Score	Comment	Score	Comment
DK-CM Limited	70%	25	Excellent proposition, clearly communicated bringing forward ideas in a direct and engaging style. Choice of topic felt fresh, relevant and forwards looking.	25	Excellent overall, clear in its communication. Very well set out proposal - good balance between the different sections of the board. Very nice use of photography to show mock up of the policy wording at the top and good comparator images which bring the proposal to life.	25	Excellent and well written giving a clear description of the issue and their response. Shows a depth of thinking as well as some new ideas/fresh thinking.
We Made That LLP	63%	25	Excellent overall. Clear explanation of the issues and challenges. A well reasoned and thought-through approach to tackling these.	25	Excellent overall, Well designed board with a good level of detail and structuring of information.	16	Clear, well set out written statement which covers the issues and challenges and links clearly into their approach and proposal.
Hawkins\Brown	56%	25	Strong proposal, fresh ideas communicated clearly and supported by clear urban design guidance. The proposal is tangible and is clearly communicated.	16	Engaging and well designed board.	16	Well written description - clearly sets out the issues, findings and explains their proposition in a way that could stand alone without the rest of the board and still communicate the proposal well.
Kinnear Landscape Architects Limited	52%	16	Strong concept which approached the brief from a different perspective. Clear recognition of flood risk as a critical issue and well communicated approach to tackle this.	25	High quality and evocative graphics. Clear and well communicated concept. Good arrangement of information on the board and the right level of detail provided.	16	Well written description communicating the issue and a clear strategy to address it. It would have been good to have more information provided regarding how their proposal would interact with the wider urban area.
5th Studio Ltd	45%	16	Very Good - The submission demonstrates a specific, individual, characterful, solid and well-crafted proposal	16	The proposal is of a high quality graphically and supports the wider proposition with a helpful layering of information from city scale zooming in to the detailed example area plan.	16	Very Good - The written statement raises some important and relevant issues however the recommendation could have gone further to address these challenges.
Maccreeanor Lavington	45%	16	Some good, interesting and very relevant ideas raised in this submission, however the form of the submission and the heavy reliance on descriptive text means that the overarching message gets lost and the proposal loses clarity. Would have preferred something less reliant on text and much more visual and engaging.	16	The board is well organised and clearly structured however it is brought down by the density of text and use of small images.	16	The written proposal is clear and sets out their concept successfully.
muf architecture/art	45%	16	Some very interesting ideas proposed although in practical terms as a strategy this may be very difficult to achieve. The simplicity and social focus of the proposal is clear, legible and overall very good.	16	Overall, the board is well communicated however displays some lack of attention to detail with multiple typos and errors in the text.	16	Generally clear and well explained proposal which confidently puts forward a different way of approaching the question posed in the brief.
Publica Associates	45%	16	A tangible proposition which puts forward some good ideas. The recommendations are varied in terms of their potential impact but the temporal recommendations are strongest.	16	Overall, the presentation is clear and well communicated but the opportunities are not as clearly linked to the recommendations as they could be.	16	Clear statement setting out the intent, the issues and their approach to addressing these
Gort Scott	45%	16	Good clear approach to setting out the issues - the pressures diagram is very successful in communicating what this proposal is addressing.	16	Clear and well set out board with the structure defined by the use of colour. Good use photography however the maps were too small on the board and as a result lacked impact.	16	Well written description however the separate 250 word summary does not go into any detail about the actual recommendations. That said the quality of all the written material provided is high.
AECOM Infrastructure and Environment UK Limited	39%	16	Good communication of the issues they and their response to this. Some of the other elements of the board let them down a bit.	16	Clear and well set out board with the structure defined by the use of colour. Good use photography however the maps were too small on the board and as a result lacked impact.	9	The written statement is clear, but could better articulate the spatial issues.

Architecture 00 Ltd	25%	9	The proposal takes trends that we are already beginning to recognise and expands upon these to make some interesting propositions. Not all of these are resolved and some of the proposals pose more questions than they answer. Unfortunately as a proposal the concept doesn't come through as clearly as we'd have hoped.	9	High quality output in terms of the illustrations however the key messages could be drawn out and expanded on more clearly. The layout of the proposal could be made clearer to really draw out the recommendations. More detail on the recommendations would have been appreciated.	9	The written statement goes some way to addressing the question but it focuses more on scene setting and a big idea than a solution or proposition.
LDA Design	25%	9	This is a proposal of mixed quality. Visually it is compelling and engaging and the points they seek to address have the potential to be very interesting and relevant however they fail to elaborate or flesh out their proposal so it doesn't come across as an idea that is fully resolved. They fail to highlight the 'how'	9	Attractive and engaging design of the board however some elements lack explanation as to why they are relevant to the proposal.	9	Some interesting ideas but not well communicated. The text goes some way to getting the proposition across but it needs to be clearer about what they are actually proposing and how.
East Architecture landscape urban design	25%	9	Some sound but fairly standard ideas which fail to fully set the scene and really sell their proposal. Submission is lacking a clear concept.	9	Simple, clean and crisp layout but lacking detail resulting in a proposal which is not very compelling. Although we appreciate the simplicity of the board some additional elements which brought the proposal to life would have helped.	9	The text sets out broadly the approach they are tackling however they fail to really sell their proposal in the text - it focuses more on scene setting.
Ove Arup and Partners Ltd	25%	9	A new, innovative idea raising some important issues around intensification of land use and quality of life and productivity, however I had some concerns about the practical application of the concept. They raise some interesting ideas but don't necessarily put forward an appealing response to these.	9	Clearly set out board with the concept well communicated.	9	Well written statement although it doesn't address some of the bigger issues but still a good, sound response.
Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design	25%	9	Overall, satisfactory. We liked the overall concept and found the presentation clear and legible however we felt that the proposal could have been expanded on.	9	The board lacked the detail shown by other submissions and some of the illustrated material did not add a great deal to the overall communication of the concept.	9	The issues and their impacts are well communicated however the proposed solution could be communicated in a clearer way with more detail provided.
Urban Movement	25%	9	An interesting and original idea which addresses the requirements of the brief, however I would have liked to have seen greater detail around the proposal, potentially supported by some more detailed visual outputs.	9	The board follows a clear structure and narrative which was appreciated. The four spatial conditions could have been communicated in a neater way and greater detail could have been added to bring the proposal to life.	9	Clear description that covers all aspects of the proposal and the context behind it clearly and concisely however this doesn't feel fully resolved and could have gone further as a proposition.
Inner Circle Consulting	21%	9	This proposal unfortunately wasn't very well communicated unfortunately. There are some good ideas there but too little explanation is given to them to really bring them alive and create a compelling proposition.	4	The balance of information on the board is wrong - too much emphasis is placed on the map in the centre with much less emphasis on the key bits of information that make up the proposal.	9	The written statement fails to really communicate the issue they are responding to resulting in a statement that lacks clarity, grounding and doesn't necessarily do justice to their idea.
Foster + Partners	21%	9	Overall satisfactory. This proposal had some positives but also some elements that brought it down. While they have chosen a topical and important issue they appear to have just touched on this and the submission as a result lacks the detail needed for this to be a well communicated, well crafted proposal.	9	The board is very clearly structured with the right level of information to make the concept accessible and help to communicate it clearly. The level of information lacks depth and detail and as a result is hard to really engage with the concept.	4	Written proposal - covers all aspects in a clear and concise manner.
Allies and Morrison	17%	9	Overall we felt that the proposal lacked detail and clarity and didn't go far enough to challenge the norm and propose something new and fresh.	4	Elements of the board were interesting and engaging however the links between the datasets mapped and the proposal were not made clearly enough and the cross section	4	The written statement is a little confusing as it doesn't necessarily help to explain what has been provided on the board - the submission feels a little disconnected.
Fluid Design Ltd	17%	9	This proposal has some interesting aspects but it lacks clarity and fails to elaborate on the recommendations sufficiently to really apply them in a compelling way.	4	Whilst the arrangement of elements on the board is well considered and the central ring helps to communicate the thinking, the map lacks clarity and some elements identified on the key are hard to find or appear to be missing. The annotations are quite generic in places.	4	The written statement lacks clarity and as a result fails to really engage the reader.
Child Graddon Lewis Ltd	11%	4	Examples are mostly masterplan and not area wide strategic examples. The bidder hasn't appreciated the complexity of the issue. Some of the more detailed workings and illustrations suggest a lack of appreciation for the complexity of some of the challenges and trade offs associated with mixing uses in this way.	4	The board is of mixed quality with some elements coming across clearly such as the exploded axonometric in the centre, while other elements are less clearly communicated and therefore less convincing.	4	The written statement lacks clarity and as a result fails to really engage the reader.

Lot 1 - Urban Strategies, Spatial Policy and Research		Quality of the proposal in relation to the Lot question (30%)		Clarity and quality of the proposal's illustrations and visual communication (20%)		Clarity and quality of the proposal's written statement (20%)	
Company / Organisation	TOTAL OUT OF 70%	Score	Comment	Score	Comment	Score	Comment
DK-CM Limited	70%	25	Excellent proposition, clearly communicated bringing forward ideas in a direct and engaging style. Choice of topic felt fresh, relevant and forwards looking.	25	Excellent overall, clear in its communication. Very well set out proposal - good balance between the different sections of the board. Very nice use of photography to show mock up of the policy wording at the top and good comparator images which bring the proposal to life.	25	Excellent and well written giving a clear description of the issue and their response. Shows a depth of thinking as well as some new ideas/fresh thinking.
We Made That LLP	63%	25	Excellent overall. Clear explanation of the issues and challenges. A well reasoned and thought-through approach to tackling these.	25	Excellent overall, Well designed board with a good level of detail and structuring of information.	16	Clear, well set out written statement which covers the issues and challenges and links clearly into their approach and proposal.
Hawkins\Brown	56%	25	Strong proposal, fresh ideas communicated clearly and supported by clear urban design guidance. The proposal is tangible and is clearly communicated.	16	Engaging and well designed board.	16	Well written description - clearly sets out the issues, findings and explains their proposition in a way that could stand alone without the rest of the board and still communicate the proposal well.
Kinnear Landscape Architects Limited	52%	16	Strong concept which approached the brief from a different perspective. Clear recognition of flood risk as a critical issue and well communicated approach to tackle this.	25	High quality and evocative graphics. Clear and well communicated concept. Good arrangement of information on the board and the right level of detail provided.	16	Well written description communicating the issue and a clear strategy to address it. It would have been good to have more information provided regarding how their proposal would interact with the wider urban area.
5th Studio Ltd	45%	16	Very Good - The submission demonstrates a specific, individual, characterful, solid and well-crafted proposal	16	The proposal is of a high quality graphically and supports the wider proposition with a helpful layering of information from city scale zooming in to the detailed example area plan.	16	Very Good - The written statement raises some important and relevant issues however the recommendation could have gone further to address these challenges.
Macreanor Lavington	45%	16	Some good, interesting and very relevant ideas raised in this submission, however the form of the submission and the heavy reliance on descriptive text means that the overarching message gets lost and the proposal loses clarity. Would have preferred something less reliant on text and much more visual and engaging.	16	The board is well organised and clearly structured however it is brought down by the density of text and use of small images.	16	The written proposal is clear and sets out their concept successfully.
muf architecture/art	45%	16	Some very interesting ideas proposed although in practical terms as a strategy this may be very difficult to achieve. The simplicity and social focus of the proposal is clear, legible and overall very good.	16	Overall, the board is well communicated however displays some lack of attention to detail with multiple typos and errors in the text.	16	Generally clear and well explained proposal which confidently puts forward a different way of approaching the question posed in the brief.
Publica Associates	45%	16	A tangible proposition which puts forward some good ideas. The recommendations are varied in terms of their potential impact but the temporal recommendations are strongest.	16	Overall, the presentation is clear and well communicated but the opportunities are not as clearly linked to the recommendations as they could be.	16	Clear statement setting out the intent, the issues and their approach to addressing these
Gort Scott	45%	16	Good clear approach to setting out the issues - the pressures diagram is very successful in communicating what this proposal is addressing.	16	Clear and well set out board with the structure defined by the use of colour. Good use photography however the maps were too small on the board and as a result lacked impact.	16	Well written description however the separate 250 word summary does not go into any detail about the actual recommendations. That said the quality of all the written material provided is high.

AECOM Infrastructure and Environment UK Limited	39%	16	Good communication of the issues they and their response to this. Some of the other elements of the board let them down a bit.	16	Clear and well set out board with the structure defined by the use of colour. Good use photography however the maps were too small on the board and as a result lacked impact.	9	The written statement is clear, but could better articulate the spatial issues.
Architecture 00 Ltd	25%	9	The proposal takes trends that we are already beginning to recognise and expands upon these to make some interesting propositions. Not all of these are resolved and some of the proposals pose more questions than they answer. Unfortunately as a proposal the concept doesn't come through as clearly as we'd have hoped.	9	High quality output in terms of the illustrations however the key messages could be drawn out and expanded on more clearly. The layout of the proposal could be made clearer to really draw out the recommendations. More detail on the recommendations would have been appreciated.	9	The written statement goes some way to addressing the question but it focuses more on scene setting and a big idea than a solution or proposition.
LDA Design	25%	9	This is a proposal of mixed quality. Visually it is compelling and engaging and the points they seek to address have the potential to be very interesting and relevant however they fail to elaborate or flesh out their proposal so it doesn't come across as an idea that is fully resolved. They fail to highlight the 'how'	9	Attractive and engaging design of the board however some elements lack explanation as to why they are relevant to the proposal.	9	Some interesting ideas but not well communicated. The text goes some way to getting the proposition across but it needs to be clearer about what they are actually proposing and how.
East Architecture landscape urban design	25%	9	Some sound but fairly standard ideas which fail to fully set the scene and really sell their proposal. Submission is lacking a clear concept.	9	Simple, clean and crisp layout but lacking detail resulting in a proposal which is not very compelling. Although we appreciate the simplicity of the board some additional elements which brought the proposal to life would have helped.	9	The text sets out broadly the approach they are tackling however they fail to really sell their proposal in the text - it focuses more on scene setting.
Ove Arup and Partners Ltd	25%	9	A new, innovative idea raising some important issues around intensification of land use and quality of life and productivity, however I had some concerns about the practical application of the concept. They raise some interesting ideas but don't necessarily put forward an appealing response to these.	9	Clearly set out board with the concept well communicated.	9	Well written statement although it doesn't address some of the bigger issues but still a good, sound response.
Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design	25%	9	Overall, satisfactory. We liked the overall concept and found the presentation clear and legible however we felt that the proposal could have been expanded on.	9	The board lacked the detail shown by other submissions and some of the illustrated material did not add a great deal to the overall communication of the concept.	9	The issues and their impacts are well communicated however the proposed solution could be communicated in a clearer way with more detail provided.
Urban Movement	25%	9	An interesting and original idea which addresses the requirements of the brief, however I would have liked to have seen greater detail around the proposal, potentially supported by some more detailed visual outputs.	9	The board follows a clear structure and narrative which was appreciated. The four spatial conditions could have been communicated in a neater way and greater detail could have been added to bring the proposal to life.	9	Clear description that covers all aspects of the proposal and the context behind it clearly and concisely however this doesn't feel fully resolved and could have gone further as a proposition.
Inner Circle Consulting	21%	9	This proposal unfortunately wasn't very well communicated unfortunately. There are some good ideas there but too little explanation is given to them to really bring them alive and create a compelling proposition.	4	The balance of information on the board is wrong - too much emphasis is placed on the map in the centre with much less emphasis on the key bits of information that make up the proposal.	9	The written statement fails to really communicate the issue they are responding to resulting in a statement that lacks clarity, grounding and doesn't necessarily do justice to their idea.
Foster + Partners	21%	9	Overall satisfactory. This proposal had some positives but also some elements that brought it down. While they have chosen a topical and important issue they appear to have just touched on this and the submission as a result lacks the detail needed for this to be a well communicated, well crafted proposal.	9	The board is very clearly structured with the right level of information to make the concept accessible and help to communicate it clearly. The level of information lacks depth and detail and as a result is hard to really engage with the concept.	4	Written proposal - covers all aspects in a clear and concise manner.
Allies and Morrison	17%	9	Overall we felt that the proposal lacked detail and clarity and didn't go far enough to challenge the norm and propose something new and fresh.	4	Elements of the board were interesting and engaging however the links between the datasets mapped and the proposal were not made clearly enough and the cross section	4	The written statement is a little confusing as it doesn't necessarily help to explain what has been provided on the board - the submission feels a little disconnected.
Fluid Design Ltd	17%	9	This proposal has some interesting aspects but it lacks clarity and fails to elaborate on the recommendations sufficiently to really apply them in a compelling way.	4	Whilst the arrangement of elements on the board is well considered and the central ring helps to communicate the thinking, the map lacks clarity and some elements identified on the key are hard to find or appear to be missing. The annotations are quite generic in places.	4	The written statement lacks clarity and as a result fails to really engage the reader.

Child Graddon Lewis Ltd	11%	4 Examples are mostly masterplan and not area wide starategic exmaples. The bidder hasn't appreciated the complexity of the issue. Some of the more detailed workings and illustrations suggest a lack of appreciation for the complexity of some of the challenges and trade offs associated with mixing uses in this way.	4 The board is of mixed quality with some elements coming across clearly such as the exploded axonometric in the centre, while other elements are less clearly communicated and therefore less convincing.	4 The written statement lacks clarity and as a result fails to really engage the reader.
-------------------------	-----	---	--	--