

LONDON

REVIEW PANEL

██████████
Capel Manor College
Bullsmoor Lane,
Enfield,
EN1 4RQ

January 2019

██████████
London Review Panel: Capel Manor College Crystal Palace Project

Please find enclosed the London Review Panel report following the review of the proposals for Capel Manor College on 9th January 2019. On behalf of the Panel, I would like to thank you for your participation in the review and offer the Panel's ongoing support as the scheme's design develops.

Yours sincerely,



David West
Mayor's Design Advocate

cc.

All meeting attendees

Jules Pipe, Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills

Lucy Owen, Executive Director of Development, Enterprise and Environment, GLA

██████████, Senior Project Officer, Regeneration, GLA

██████████, Principal Strategic Planner, GLA

LONDON
REVIEW PANEL

Report of London Review Panel meeting
Capel Manor College, Crystal Palace Project (Anerley Rd and Farm sites.)

Wednesday 9 January 2019
Crystal Palace National Sports Centre, Ledrington Rd, London SE19 2BB

Held alongside London Review Panel meeting of the Crystal Palace National Sports Centre.

London Review Panel

David West (chair)
Sowmya Parthasarathy
Rory Hyde
Irene Djao Rakitine

Attendees (including Capel Manor College presenting team)

██████████	GLA Regeneration (Panel Manager)
Patrick Dubeck	GLA Regeneration
██████████	GLA Regeneration
██████████	GLA Regeneration
██████████	GLA Regeneration
██████████	Capel Manor College
██████████	Fielden Fowles Architects
██████████	Fielden Fowles Architects
██████████	Fusion Project Management Consultancy
██████████	Fusion Project Management Consultancy
██████████	LB Bromley
██████████	Hawkins Brown Architects
██████████	Hawkins Brown Architects
██████████	Consortium Sports Consultants
██████████	Kinnear Landscape Architects

Apologies / report copied to

██████████	GLA Regeneration
██████████	GLA Regeneration

Report copied to

Lucy Owen	GLA
Jules Pipe	Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills
██████████	GLA

Confidentiality

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

Project name and site address

Capel Manor College

Farm Site

Crystal Palace Park Farm
Ledrington Road
London
SE19 2BS

Anerley Hill Site

Land to the East of Crystal Palace Park Museum
Anerley Hill
London
SE19 2BA

Presenting team

██████████	Capel Manor College
██████████	Fielden Fowles Architects
██████████	Fielden Fowles Architects
██████████	Fusion Project Management Consultancy
██████████	Fusion Project Management Consultancy

Capel Manor introduction

Capel Manor College is a leading education provider offering vocational land-based and environmental courses. The College currently has 3,500 students, ranging in age from 14-60+ years. Full and part-time courses lead to nationally recognised qualifications up to degree level, alongside traineeships and apprenticeships to obtain professional training. Courses on offer include horticulture, animal care and management, dog-grooming, groundsmanship, floristry and arboriculture.

The College has a positive impact on young people and adult learners, who travel from all over London to attend courses. The buildings can be used out of park hours so need to be welcoming, safe and secure. The status of the project is RIBA stage 2, leading to a pre-application submission in the near future. The scheme has undergone several iterations including the consideration of an alternative site. This has been discounted for buildability reasons. The Crystal Palace Park Trust and LB Bromley Council have previously given views on earlier massing, positioning and programme split between to the two sites that have shaped the schemes as they are presented today.

Design Review Panel's views: Overarching

The London Review Panel commend the unique and wide-ranging opportunities the College provides for Londoners and view the College's position at Crystal Palace Park as fitting and of great benefit to the park, local area and wider community of South East London. The Panel support the project and are enthused by the well-matched methodology of the design team and the admirable ethos of the College. The Panel agreed the co-location of park and college resonates with the original intentions of Paxton's park; to impress, educate, entertain and inspire, and should be celebrated. The Panel welcome the proposal to reinstate the historic education provision in the currently degraded Anerley Hill site, and of the continued provision of a city farm at the farm site.

The Panel would encourage a stronger and more confident approach to the architecture of both sites, with a greater consideration of the wider park setting. There is a unique opportunity to demonstrate and test a new model of park management; an ideological approach integrating active learning from Capel Manor College with an exemplar of park maintenance. The Panel feel the new College buildings should reflect this aspiration, through the architectural language used and through the interface with the landscape. As design work continues for both sites, the Panel would encourage a review of the balance between park, landscape and built form, and what distinctions, or lack of distinctions, these should have.

Design Review Panel's views: Farm Site

Massing, Positioning and Visibility

- An uncertain approach to the corner element of the main building was noted by the Panel, who queried the current architectural position for this. A stronger sense of arrival and visual intention for the entrance is encouraged.
- This volume should be viewed as a beacon or landmark in the park, an orientation and recognition point with the remaining buildings adopting a more functional massing.
- The Panel noted how the existing massing on the site is very prominent, if unwelcoming. There is the potential for a new structure to be bold and visible.
- The hierarchy of the site and buildings need definition. The Panel likened the scheme to a village or a farm; a cluster of buildings that relate to each other. The design team are encouraged to define what these relationships are and how that is expressed architecturally.

Entrance, Arrival and Public/ Private division

- The Panel find the proposed public and private divisions make sense within the site boundary, but how these relate to the wider park and arrival routes is less clear.
- More could be done to address the public/ private interface, mixing routes and entrances to fully engage the public with the work of the College including the animals without compromising security.
- The Panel applauds the proposed meandering public arrival experience from the station and supports the pavilions and route. The differing characters and significance of these are appropriate.
- The Panel feels the site would also benefit from a generous civic arrival experience, and that the proposed tall structure and change in level near the Paxton pond could provide this if further developed.

Connectivity

- The Panel commended the clear circulation and arrival from the station and queried how accessible the site was from other means of transport.
- If the beacon or landmark proposal is further developed, the Panel feel that the circulation of the wider park needs to be linked and connected to the site.
- The edge condition of the site should be considered further, how the 'farmland' borders to the 'parkland'.
- The topography of the site could be played with more to connect with the wider park, or to increase built form.
- The relationship with the National Sports Centre should be reinforced, with the landscape designed to create a more permeable connection.

Architectural Identity

- The Panel encourages the design team to establish a confident identity for the scheme, to reflect the robustness of both the retaining elements found within the site and the industrial activity it relates to. The architectural language should reflect the recent history of the park, and not appear too agricultural or too timid as the built-form context of the sites are urban, industrial and modernist.

- The Panel finds the 'farmhouse' distinction of the main building of interest, if this was expressed as a solid, cornerstone volume. The Panel suggested the building materials need not be vernacular in nature, even if the forms are.
- The 'spine' buildings are articulated differently and appear to be much lighter in a framed expression. These diminish in scale and significance which the Panel find appropriate.
- Differing schemes and design iterations were identified by the Panel, with various versions of massing and roofscape shown in the presentation and model. Confidence in intent is encouraged by the Panel.
- The Panel would welcome a reflection of the playful park elements which sit adjacent to both sites; the Victorian dinosaurs and sphinxes. The balance between playfulness and seriousness is an interesting and enjoyable thread to pursue.

Design Review Panel's views: Anerley Hill Site

Massing, Positioning and Visibility

- The Panel questioned the layout of the 3 volumes on the site in the 'L' shape configuration and would encourage further testing of the positioning of built form.
- The relationship of the buildings to the site, landscape and wider park should reflect the building programmes; where workshop, classroom and studio denote different environments and are aligned with their immediate context.
- A more linear proposal would be welcomed by the Panel, one which reflects or utilises the existing hard boundary to Anerley Hill.

Connectivity

- The Panel would like to see the scheme hold a much stronger connection to the park setting and would welcome a more porous boundary between the site and park.
- The scheme would benefit from a clearer link to the station.
- The Panel feel a visible and civic presence of the College on Anerley Hill would be positive.

Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and Landscaping approach

- The Panel were very supportive of using the historical horticultural terraces of the former Crystal Palace as a design precedent, both utilising the existing topography of the site in the form of a stepped building volume and applying a planted landscape to the roofs of the buildings.
- The Panel suggested a conceptual move of bringing the park into the site and designing the whole as an extension to the landscape would be successful.
- The Panel considered whether this could be argued as no loss of MOL, or at least beneficial to the argument, particularly as the site is inaccessible to the public, of poor quality and offers no amenity in its current condition.
- An 'unstitching' of barriers to the park would offer greater opportunities to strengthen the narrative of the building use within the park setting.