28. What specific changes would you suggest to improve the process in future co-design projects

A satisfactory co-design process would require at least the following:

- A codesigned brief:
- A continuing community discussion space:
- A monitoring process for learning & subsequent evaluation:
- Real support for traders and businesses:

29. Is there anything else you would like to say about the co-design process?

- Co-design is collaboration.
- Placatory v real codesign:
- Discussion of the report:
- Further work:
- Wider issues

********************************************

23. Which aspects of the co-design process do you think did not go as well as they could have?

Peckham Rye Station Gateway

Phase one 2014 - Ash Sakula

- Origins of the co-design suggestion
- The definition of the tender brief.
- September – October 2014 based at the station forecourt.
- The Phase one digital process was poor.
- Atlas of Aspirations
- The community built model.

Selection of Architects for Station Gateway Phase two

Phase Two 2015 - Landolt & Brown

- The 4 workshops.
- Traders.
- The Planning application September 2015 to March 2016

Community Public meetings during phases one and two

Peckham Library Square & 91/93 Peckham High Street.
December 2014 – October 2016

25. How do you feel about the final designs? Please explain your response.

Station Gateway

- Disappointed
- Arcade:
- New Square.
  - Bus stops:
  - Rail arch canopies:
  - Paving:
  - Seating.
  - Planters
  - Public realm:
  - Pick up & drop off places for taxis and other vehicles:
  - Letter box:
  - Integrated approach to its design

- Public toilets:
- Blenheim Grove:

Peckham Library Square

- The Arch removal:
- New High Street buildings:
- Mountview:
23. Which aspects of the co-design process do you think did not go as well as they could have?

25. How do you feel about the final designs? Please explain your response.

The detailed answers to these questions follow the answers to questions 28 and 29 below.

28. What specific changes would you suggest to improve the process in future co-design projects and why?

A satisfactory codesign process would require at least the following:

- **A codesigned brief:** My comments in response to the other questions show that the codesign processes that were adopted for both the Station and the Library Square projects were not designed appropriately enough to create the working conditions for genuine partnership and collaboration. This led to substantial objections to the resulting planning applications. This is not consistent with a successful codesign process. A number of the problems resulted from the lack of codesign of the process itself which is essential for real codesign. That is, the brief itself must be codesigned with the community affected, otherwise the brief is imposed and the contradiction sets the scene for a mismatch between expectations and a failure to link well enough to local community dynamics and communications.

- **A continuing community discussion space:** Include in the brief the requirement to create:
  - a well managed community discussion process providing a system and a space both physical venue or venues, and also
  - digital forms including a discussion forum for continuing community level interaction with the ideas and information being created by the codesign process, and
  - the process for linking the community discussions to the work of consultants, professionals, architects etc in developing the ideas and the plans.

The development and creation of these processes require professionals in community development and collaborative community systems and engagement to work with active members of the community and collaboratively create them.

- **A monitoring process for learning & subsequent evaluation:** There was no data collection from the participants on how the process was being experienced and perceived. This carried on through the whole exercise right up to the planning application/permission and so valuable information was lost on how to assess the effectiveness of the process, and little if any learning was achieved to feed into the process as it was evolving. As a different concept in bringing together citizens and public authority, compared with the usual consultation, and requiring significant shifts in understanding and process, further codesign projects will require well designed monitoring and evaluation processes to catch the experience of the participants on all sides as it happens.

- **Real support for traders and businesses:** What was needed by the small traders affected directly by the Station development was personal support from soon after the issue of seeking vacant possession of the site was discussed in public (April 2013). This needed to be at a minimum a visit by someone able to communicate sensitively with the traders of varying ethnicities and languages, identify with each of them the issues they may have to face and the best way to liaise with them as the project developed. This would enable them to get any questions answered whenever they arose, and news could be imparted directly and a sympathetic contact for them arranged to seek clarity on any news.

29. Is there anything else you would like to say about the co-design process?

- **Co-design is collaboration.** Collaboration is not consultation. ‘Co-design consultation’ as described on the Council’s website is an inherent contradiction, and is a misunderstanding of co-design. Collaboration and co-design require a shift in the way of working between citizens and council. This needs an acceptance by the council and members of the community that the co-design process is not
an off the shelf technique but one which has to co-evolve with the participants and is underpinned by key principles.

- **Placatory v real co-design**: The process as experienced in the Station square and Library square projects has left with some, maybe many, a lingering feeling of distrust, alienation and scepticism about the council and its community engagement process. This is deeply damaging to our local democratic fabric. It was so unnecessary. This is described well as ‘placatory’ consultation in an essay by Jeremy Till in ‘Architecture and Participation, ed: Jones, Petrescu & Till (2005). A real co-design process would have been able to bring out with the community contributions and genuine interaction with the other contributions, how in these two projects which ideas were feasible and which were not feasible and why not, so that most could have been satisfied with the outcome. But such a process cannot be left to council and their paid consultants. It needs to be developed with active members of the community who understand how their community processes can work well, and with strong support from community specialists.

- **Discussion of the report**: Some I know who have completed the survey on-line have done so in haste because of time constraints and the deadline. They like me will have had little or no time to check details in our comments, or discuss our thoughts with other participants in the process. This is essential for clarity because: it helps to remind us of the details and our experience which started over two years ago; and it also helps to clarify our thinking to share our thoughts in mutual discussion. Some of us would still appreciate being able to do this. I suggest that as part of the codesign review report being made available, before it is finalised, it is accompanied by an event where people who wished to could come together with the consultants to discuss the findings, and correct any misunderstandings of what has been said in response to the survey.

- **Further work**: There are many aspects to a successful codesign exercise which need a shift from well practised consultation methods. This needs further exploration between the council and the community in the mode of a collaborative (codesign) process before the details are implemented across the borough. This should be linked to the development of the borough strategy for the collaborative working with the voluntary and community sector which has been conducted recently. The use of codesign processes is part of that overall framework. The reviews I have suggested can be conducted within similar parameters.

- **Wider issues**: Community infrastructure needs to be strengthened over time to improve the ability of the community to take part in these kinds of exercises. Also the need for learning about collaborative processes is spread widely and there is scope for exploring how this borough could help spread that wider learning. In particular, matters that would benefit from further study from the benefit of Southwark’s own learning would include:
  - the future definition, use and development of ‘co-design’ processes.
  - the development of appropriate training for local government, architecture and other professionals engaged in co-design processes.
  - the development of appropriate support infrastructure for local communities to enable effective participation in co-design processes.

******************************************************************************

23. Which aspects of the co-design process do you think did not go as well as they could have?

**Peckham Rye Station Gateway**

**Phase one 2014 - Ash Sakula**

- **Origins of the co-design suggestion**
  - This was my account written at the time: [http://www.peckhamvision.org/wiki/Peckham_Rye_Station_Gateway/Jan-Sep_2014#Network_Rail_plans_reveal_total_demolition_18th_January_2014](http://www.peckhamvision.org/wiki/Peckham_Rye_Station_Gateway/Jan-Sep_2014#Network_Rail_plans_reveal_total_demolition_18th_January_2014)
  - and what was then proposed as the use of a co-design process to enable partnership with the community: [http://www.peckhamvision.org/wiki/Peckham_Rye_Station_Gateway/Jan-Sep_2014#Council-community_partnership_for_station_scheme_25th_February_2014](http://www.peckhamvision.org/wiki/Peckham_Rye_Station_Gateway/Jan-Sep_2014#Council-community_partnership_for_station_scheme_25th_February_2014)

- **The definition of the tender brief.** This was imposed without any discussion, which was a contradiction to the concept of collaboration underpinning co-design. Some of the problems this caused were:
The Phase one digital process was poor.

- The ground boundaries of the site for the exercise were not clear until after the end of the Ash Sakula first phase.
- The rest of the site ie Holly Grove buildings, Dovedale Court, station and platform accessibility all disappeared from any kind of relevant discussion.
- There was no discussion on how to work well with community communication systems including Peckham Vision’s extensive one linking with several thousands of people at that time.
- Ash Sakula’s process between June and September2014 was weird and frustrating as they would not discuss properly with any of us what the plans were for the ‘codesign’ process.
- We later discovered that during this time that part of the Ash Sakula team had been visiting our events and taking notes from our information displays without saying they were connected with the project.
- It felt for those of us in Peckham Vision, and keen to work well with the project, that we were being intentionally sidelined and excluded.

**September – October 2014 based at the station forecourt.** This potentially was a very good place as a base because it captured the attention of all the pedestrian traffic at the station. It didn’t work well in these ways:

- The Ash Sakula publicity did not link them to Southwark Council. We discovered during the process this was deliberate because they didn’t want to deter people taking part.
- As Peckham Vision had for 10 years been the main initiator of community engagement and discussion about Peckham Rye station, the local people thought we were conducting the process. So while we were sidelined they took advantage of the fact that the local community were used through our work to talk to people about developments around the station.
- This phase was far too compressed into too short a time and with the wrong brief.
- The daily events in the forecourt seemed childish as they catered often for children. But at that stage of the process where ideas about the site had to be formulated in a few weeks was that the right process? Also it deterred some people from engaging as they thought it was for children.
- The Ash Sakula staff managing the forecourt process appeared to be all students and with very little if any experience relevant to handling a sensitive and complex community project.
- The Weeklies exercise was seriously misjudged, and the editing process was unprofessional. It achieved three weekly reports which had no time to have any traction in the area for feedback in the 8 weeks. It had been a key idea of their proposal to process the information in a dialogue. But to work it needed to be monthly or 6 weekly or bi-monthly, or even quarterly, spread over a longer period up to 6-12 months not 8 weeks. Some useful information was produced. But it was variable quality in terms of accuracy, analysis and coverage. It did not contribute to the announced interactive analysis of the information that was a key part of the co-design proposal. It was a major flaw in the information gathering and processing heart of the ‘co-design’ project.
- The Weeklies was the only place for regular info about the project and ability to hear what was happening and raise issues. So it became a gathering point for that and interfered with the original publishing purpose of the weeklies. This meant that the discussions not only interfered with the prime purpose of the meeting but were highly unsatisfactory as regular participants were more interested in producing a publication than discussing the project and issues arising.

**The Phase one digital process was poor.**

- This was compounded by the poor website which prominently displayed uninformative pictures of ‘co-designers’ which turned out to be a gimmick, as it just meant people on an email list, who may or may not be engaging. And not everyone who was engaging was on the list. Then the phrase was and is constantly used to refer to an unclear list of people, which also sounds excluding if people think they are not one of the ‘co-designers’.
- The CommonPlace map was a good idea very poorly executed. It seemed we were used as a test bed rather than offered a well tested product. It gathered information that the users could not interact with and have a digital conversation developing thoughts. It was very frustratingly poorly designed.
o Difficult to remember now two years later the detail of the other flaws in the digital process, and missed opportunities, as we were given no chance to give feedback on the process as it unfolded.

- **Atlas of Aspirations**
  o I have no idea if this was part of the original plan but I recall feeling it was a process that evolved in the vacuum left by the failed Weeklies exercise. It was done in a rush at the end. It created a long list of different aspects which were reshuffled at the last minute and added apples, pears, DIY tools and uncle tom cobley and all together, and asked us to rate them by a simple system which seemed full of flaws. It had only a tenuous link with what had been the original purpose of rethinking the plans for the Station Gateway site.

- **The community built model.**
  o We decided to initiate a community built model of the Station gateway site and its central Rye Lane context in May as we waited for details of the CoDesign process: [http://www.peckhamvision.org/wiki/Peckham_Rye_Station_Gateway/Jan-Sep_2014#Community_model_Station_Gateway_site_June_2014](http://www.peckhamvision.org/wiki/Peckham_Rye_Station_Gateway/Jan-Sep_2014#Community_model_Station_Gateway_site_June_2014)
  o The main aim was to continue our community work to engage local people in an interesting and useful way to contribute to clarity and understanding of the role and context for the Station Gateway site and the issues that had arisen in the previous year, and to thinking about the changes in more detail in the buildings directly in front of the station building and alongside it and behind it.
  o But the model was never used in the process during either the first or second phases under the two different architects. So throughout the process while the community model was admired it was resolutely kept away from any role in the Council CoDesign process.

**Selection of Architects for Station Gateway Phase two**

- **November 2015 – January/February 2016**
  o There was no discussion about the brief for the new contract for the second phase.
  o At my suggestion the Council held a briefing meeting on 9th November with the architects who had been invited to tender. This was in our Peckham Vision Bussey studio (a previous larger one where our community model was displayed). Some of the residents who had been taking part in the codesign process were invited by the Council to meet and talk with the architects. I had hoped that this would help to introduce more of a collaborative process with the Council and the architects they appointed but it changed nothing.
  o The Council invited residents (maybe those on the mailing list of the Weeklies meetings) to say if they would like to take part in the selection process for the new architects. The Weeklies were still continuing. They had now moved to All Saints Church Hall, still organised by What-If but now as a voluntary project in an attempt to complete the 8 weeklies publications.
  o 4-6 residents put themselves forward for the architects’ selection but the process was very obscure, and there was little information about it, or feedback about it. Good practise was not followed on transparency or other matters. For example conflicts of interest were observed by some of us but there seemed to be no Council process for even enquiring about them.
  o In January, 2016 I spoke to Alistair Huggett about some proposals for introducing a community level discussion process on a continuing basis alongside the architect’s formal process, and followed this up in writing to him and Neil Kirby for some informal feedback. After waiting for too long without a response, when I asked I was told that it was too complicated. But all I had wanted was an informal exchange of thoughts to refine the proposals. They were not interested in thinking collaboratively about how to make the process more appropriate for community contributions to a genuinely collaborative process.

**Phase Two 2015 Station Gateway - Landolt & Brown**

- **The 4 workshops.**
  o These were spread over March to July. Generally, they did have potential for a useful contribution to a co-design process, albeit by now definitely a very limited exercise compared with what had been the remit when it was first agreed as a follow up to the rejection of the Weston Williamson plan. But they were too heavy in long detailed PowerPoint – which was
not digestible. And the presentations were followed by very short discussions with no opportunity to reflect and come back on them.

- The workshops were too few, with nothing in between. On their own they made it very difficult for most of those there to feel they had made a useful contribution. They were not designed for us to raise the many issues that people needed to air and discuss.
- At the last workshop July 2015 after a solid 2 hour presentation, we had just ½ hour for a table discussion with maps and drawings we had not seen before. I have seen this reported as a success in Council pronouncements. I noticed that the table that was full and engaged in discussion had a preponderance of student architects. As a non architect or designer, I found it very difficult to engage with the material because of the way it was presented and the process adopted. I heard others expressing the same feelings.
- Adam Brown said that he considered there should be no discussion outside what he called “my co-design forum”, which appeared to be the 4 ‘workshops’ he arranged. Since there was no process for discussions between those, that meant there was no way for people to have useful discussion with each other between events directly related to the co-design process.

- **Traders.**
  - This was so for all of us, and especially for the traders who were directly affected by the plans. Support for the small businesses around the station had been promised by the Council explicitly from the time we first raised our concerns in April 2013.
  - However, the support arranged via GLE (Greater London Enterprise) was very unsatisfactory. Well into 2015, the traders came to us in Peckham Vision and the Rye Lane Traders Association (which we help to facilitate) to find out what was happening. It was very disappointing and for me unbelievable given what had happened in 2013, 2014, and 2015 and that we were now in a ‘codesign’ process, to discover that this support was so inadequate.
  - We put a lot of effort in to encouraging the traders we were in contact with on the Gateway site to attend the workshops, but they were not designed to enable those kinds of concerns and questions to be aired and responded to, (as was the case for a number of other issues from residents). Their names and contact details were taken eg by Cllr Mark Williams but no follow up action happened.
  - At the last workshop someone asked a question about the lack of involement of the traders in the workshops, and Adam Brown’s response was that they had all been invited. There was no recognition that a different process was needed for their participation. The architects were probably the wrong kind of occupation/profession to handle this. We could have contributed to the analysis of what kinds of communication and support was needed for different participants if we had ever been treated as real partners and collaborators instead of sidelined.
  - At some stage in 2015 the Council appointed Something & Son to work directly with the hairdressers in Blenheim Grove to persuade them to sign up to accepting a new location on Bournemouth Close so they could be moved out. But the whole process was deeply unsatisfactory. We weren’t informed of what was happening so as usual had to find out by accident and try to fit what we were doing with it without any discussion.

- **The Planning application September 2015 to March 2016**
  - All discussion stopped until the planning application was published in October 2015. The dissatisfaction in the designs and the apparent disregard of many comments and suggestions on a design level, stimulated Michelle Shaw, a resident of Highshore Road who had taken part in all the processes since the September 2014 phase, to arrange a public meeting in All Saints Church Hall and attended by Cllr Mark Williams, the council officers and the architects and others who had been involved. (I was unable to get there so have only oral reports to go on). But I heard that there were significant concerns aired about the designs and about the process that had been adopted in this phase two in the design of detail, some concerns I shared.
  - The meeting resulted in the Council allowing the public to see the model that had been produced by the architects of the planned designs, which had not been shown to any of the public. This was displayed for a few days in the former Chinese medicine shop on Rye Lane right near the station entrance. There was no publicity around the station encouraging anyone to come and see it. Maybe the only publicity was to the people on the email list. Another real failure in communications.
o We discovered by accident in early 2016 through the Planning application process (filed amongst dozens of documents) that there had been an investigation in 2014 & 2015 for Equality reasons, and a report produced. This was revealed to no one and many of us had a great interest in this. In a co-design process, surely this should have been shared and discussed?

Community Public meetings during phases one and two

- We arranged four Peckham Vision events during the codesign process in an attempt to engage with the process at a community level. They were 23rd July 2014, 7th October 2014, 16th October 2014 and 8th April 2015.
- They were in the style of community public meetings which we have held for 10 years about town centre matters, especially the area in Central Rye Lane. We displayed the community built model and arranged talks and participative processes to help people explore the ideas about the developments in front of the station in the context of the Gateway site and the context for that in Central Rye Lane.
- We were unable to achieve any collaborative discussion with Ash Sakula in phase one. By phase two and the rejection of our attempts to discuss with council officers how the community process could engage with the official codesign process, we did not attempt that for the fourth event. But architects, officers and councillors were invited. This event was the one which stimulated Adam Brown to say that no discussion could take part outside his codesign forum, and disrupted the second part of our meeting as a result. We found that very shocking and the final realisation that codesign interpreted by the council and their architects bore no resemblance to anything we had thought it could mean.

Peckham Library Square & 91/93 Peckham High Street.

December 2014 – October 2016

- This exercise started in December 2014 in between phases one and two of the Station Gateway codesign experience. By this time, I and others had much reduced expectations. This was reduced further when I heard at the first events that the architect’s plan was to produce a planning application by April 2015, even though there was no requirement to do so. This showed little grasp of what would be involved in a codesign process.
- I had hoped that the new project with new architects would have learned from the previous process that something different was needed in terms of engagement. But this indicated it was going backwards with not even a serious attempt as community engagement. At least the station phase one had been a serious, though flawed, attempt. Nevertheless I put some effort in to engaging with them in the first month or so giving suggestions about the communications process. While they seemed to be more personable and receptive than the inaccessible Ash Sakula team in their run up to the exercise, it was to no avail, though they soon discovered that attempting a planning application by April was inappropriate.
- No community discussion had taken place at all in the run up to this new ‘co-design’, which was an idea that came out of the blue with no discussion with anyone as far as we knew. We in Peckham Vision had never had the capacity to do community development work in this part of the town centre, though we knew it was crying out for some sustained work as we had done for several years in central Rye Lane. There were major development sites there, and serious unresolved pedestrian, traffic and public realm issues. But the ground had not been tilled or nurtured at all. So the early workshops were poorly attended. I and others never got the impression that the thousands of people who use the Library Square regularly had any idea there was anything being designed or afoot.
- The seven Carl Turner workshops were spread over nearly 11 months; longer than their original plan, and longer than the combination of phases one and two of the Station Gateway which had been in total 8 months engaged with the public. They did take up my suggestion at one of the workshops to have a walkabout in the Square to talk about the proposal in situ. But there was still nothing in between the workshops for continuing community learning and dialogue.
- The most contentious idea of the final plan – the removal of the Arch – seemed to have been taken about three or four months in to the exercise. But there was no explicit process for this or ability for local people to discuss it with their councillors or themselves. With the relatively poor attendance at the workshops at that point it inevitably resulted in continuing and increasing
dissatisfaction and opposition to the process, in what was promoted as a codesign exercise. It also meant that some other important aspects of the plans were neglected in community attention because of the upset around the Arch.

25. How do you feel about the final designs? Please explain your response.

Station Gateway

- **Disappointed:** Mainly I feel sad and very disappointed, first of all in the failure of the process to cover the Gateway site and the place of these changes in that and also in the context of Central Rye Lane. That was mainly perhaps a failure in phase one. But leaving that to one side, I was also deeply disappointed in the poor process which continued into phase two. I know that many people were unable to get their ideas expressed and discussed so we could not all see what the options were. I wrote a considered comment about all aspects of the process at the end of Phase one, and points relevant to writing the brief for phase two, which I have just reread. I feel so despondent at the work I and others put in which was clearly enough the management and maintenance of the site and the place of these changes in that and also in the context of Central Rye Lane. That was mainly perhaps a failure in phase one. But leaving that to one side, I was a despondent at the work I and others put in which was very unsatisfactory and a failure of the codesign process that the case for both for and against did not spell out clearly enough the management and maintenance of the station or set of beach huts that has dropped out of the sky.

- **Arcade:** The ideas that several people had about ways to redesign the front of the station without demolishing the whole of the Arcade were never able to be aired or discussed. This has left a lingering feeling of distrust, alienation and scepticism about any council process deeply damaging to our local democratic fabric.

- **New Square.** These are the details I recall after several months have now passed:
  - **Bus stops:** design doesn't deal with the right location for the Rye Lane bus stops.
  - **Rail arch canopies:** objections to the design of these metal canopies because they were not flexible enough to be good use of space for the shop units were not addressed.
  - **Paving:** I recall that there were significant objections to the design of the paving and the material, including from the Victorian Society which I agreed with, were disregarded.
  - **Seating.** The arrangement of the seating is linked to the positions of the planters which introduced a lot of inflexible street furniture in the newly opened space.
  - **Planters:** the late introduction of these to respond to comments was not the sensitive landscaping many of us had hoped for.
  - **Public realm:** There is no overall public design for how the square fit into the public realm that is part of the Townscape Heritage Initiative (THI)
  - **Pick up & drop off places for taxis and other vehicles:** There was no clear design for this essential aspect for improving the station facilities
  - **Letter post box:** This is an essential facility I have asked for for years and again in this codesign process. This needed to be planned for now to ensure it was designed in but it was ignored.
  - **Integrated approach to design:** This new public space needed an integrated approach to its design and the design of the surrounding public realm. It didn't get it.

- **Public toilets:** I welcomed the recognition of the need for and the provision for public toilets, a good result of the community campaign rejected under the Weston Williamson plans. But the designs did not spell out clearly enough the management and maintenance arrangement which should have been part of planning conditions.

- **Blenheim Grove:**
  - The two storey extension of the corner building destroys the important historical symmetry of the two storey buildings around the station and the cluster of Art Deco buildings in Central Rye Lane: [http://www.peckhamvision.org/wiki/Art_Deco_Quarter](http://www.peckhamvision.org/wiki/Art_Deco_Quarter).
  - It blocks the view of the station from some angles, and the important view from the station platforms of the Edwardian building at 133 Rye Lane.
  - The design looks like a bus station or set of beach huts that has dropped out of the sky.

Peckham Library Square

- **The Arch removal:** I was neutral on this and could see merits in the case both for and against. But it was very unsatisfactory and a failure of the codesign process that the case for both for and against did
not have an adequate airing, and discussed explicitly with many more users before the decision was taken by the Council in private to remove the Arch.

- **New High Street buildings:**
  - I don’t think the new buildings on the High Street on either side of what is currently the Arch ‘enhance the conservation area’ (Rye Lane Conservation Area (CA) Appraisal, para 5.2.1) because the new buildings are bland characterless blocks, which fail in my view to ‘respond to the characteristics of the earlier buildings’ (CA Appraisal 3.4.15) in this heart of the historic Peckham village, or to ‘respond thoughtfully to the character of the area’ (PNAAP Policy 29, section 8). They lack ‘the richness of the architectural detailing’ referred to in the CA Appraisal as ‘the characteristics of post war developments failing to respond to the historic buildings’ (CA Appraisal 3.4.1).
  - While I don’t object to a new building on the east side of the High St entrance to the square if the Arch is removed, I do object to the new building on the west side of that entrance. It disrupts the High Street historic terrace; it is too high with 4-6 storeys and is out of scale with the other 3 storey buildings on the north side of the High Street.
  - That building on the west side of the entrance to the square from the High Street does not resolve the conflict between pedestrians and commuter cyclists at that point and could make it worse.
  - Taken together with the new Mountview building behind the Library it makes the square become a wide boulevard rather than a square and creates an unsympathetic background to the historic terrace on the High Street. This visual image included in the planning application papers did not show the Mountview building which drastically changes the vista from the High Street. It creates a wall of tall buildings overshadowing the Surrey Canal Path.
  - I do not support the creation of new housing in what is probably the noisiest part of the town centre. It would have been better to have smaller buildings designed more sympathetically to the surrounding historic architecture and designed for commercial town centre use.

- **Mountview:**
  - Although I took part in most if not all the Mountview events, I am unclear if it was supposed to be part of the co-design process. It clearly had significant design interrelationship with the Library Square designs and they were just cursorily dealt with.
  - Although many welcomed the Mountview institution there were unresolved questions about the scale of the activity, its impact on the local cultural economy and the location in that place at that size, as well as design issues relating to the building itself and its juxtaposition with the Library. Excluding it from the codesign exercise and having them on separate timetables meant that the interacting overlapping aspects and issues could not be dealt with adequately.

Eileen Conn MA (Oxon) FRSA MBE
Co-ordinator, Peckham Vision
shop: Holdron’s Arcade, 135a Rye Lane, SE15 4ST
open Saturdays & Tuesdays 2-4pm
http://www.peckhamvision.org
http://www.facebook.com/PeckhamVision
http://twitter.com/PeckhamVision