

Response to the Bishop Review

May 2011

Introduction

The design challenges for the built environment have never been greater. We already know that we cannot continue to simply reproduce buildings and public spaces on the models we have used in the past. We know that our natural environment provides us with irreplaceable ecosystem services, and that we must find ways of sustaining and enhancing these in the fabric of our urban areas as we plan for the future. We know that we need to develop less energy-intensive approaches to construction, and that we must both capture more energy in our buildings, and use less in them. We must find ways of managing water resources more effectively, to reduce our reliance on major infrastructure to deliver us safe, clean water and minimise the risks of flooding.

If we respond to these challenges merely with a series of technical fixes we may go some way towards meeting them, but we will also produce a human environment which is not very pleasant to live in. If the places we build for ourselves to live, work and take our leisure in are not well-designed we will all be the poorer. When design is at the heart of our thinking in the built environment, there are benefits for the developer, the client, and the broader public. Nevertheless the value of design in the built environment is still a contested topic, despite more than a decade of valuable contributions from CABE.

CABE has been abolished and economic pressures are driving developers and their clients alike towards solutions which may appear to be the cheapest available, in the short term at least. Against this backdrop we believe it is vitally important that the Design Council act as the independent, authoritative voice advocating the importance of design in the built environment. The Landscape Institute (LI) supports the need for the Design Council to act as the national leadership body that stewards, advocates, advises and educates the public and private sector in the use of good design in the built environment.

If we seek to improve the quality of the built environment through design, then we cannot begin our intervention at the stage where an individual building is being proposed. Design thinking must begin with the site, the context and the space in which something is to be built. We therefore strongly advocate the view that the Design Council must champion open space and green infrastructure as a central built environment issue. The Design Council approach needs to focus on enabling the procurement of designs that are capable of delivering a tangible difference to the quality of people's lives as well as putting the design agenda at the centre of community life.

We appreciate that the agenda for the current review has been defined around planning, policy, development design, design support and enabling. However we also wish to state that:

1. The Design Council should be a standard bearer that takes a high level view above these specific delivery targets, and leads nationally on the development of capacity at a local level with the specific focus on optimising the quality of procurement and design outcomes.
2. The Design Council should specifically and actively affect the delivery of design quality in planning and design at all scales from region to city and from neighbourhood to street

and block. This means being an organisation that facilitates, educates and advocates high standards in sustainable quality design issues for masterplanning, public space and facilities, as well as for architecture.

The LI supports the need for linked up thinking and active involvement with other professional bodies in the pursuit of putting efficient delivery of inspirational good design at the heart of the local and national built environment agendas.

The LI had a close and valuable alliance with CABE, sharing with it a number of policy and design agenda platforms. Our professional members in the private, public and third sectors have acted as Commissioners, Design Panel Members (National, Crossrail, Ecotowns, LDFs and Major Infrastructure panels), and individual and corporate enablers in all fields of planning and design, not just landscape design or greenspace design. The LI members who sit on design review panels have always made a contribution which went beyond talking about the public realm or open space. They contributed to the entire discussion on the built environment.

We wish to continue to work closely with the new body as it develops and sets this agenda and would be prepared to support The Design Council initiatives as much as our resources allow. We are very pleased to be able to contribute to the work of The Design Council by serving on the new Advisory Group.

1. The introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the systematic reforms of the Localism Bill will create a different national planning landscape for design policy. What are the key issues of planning policy that Government should take into account in order to deliver on their promise good design through the new planning system?

Design in planning policy has been seen less as a matter of national policy and more as something to be delegated to local planning authorities. THE LPAs have then taken advice from national, regional and local design review panels in a non-statutory advisory role. The LI thinks the planning system must explicitly address the principles of good, distinctive place-making and fitness for purpose. It must ensure that all development (as defined in s.55 of the 1990 Act) should be sustainable and should aim to result in a net benefit in environmental, social and economic terms.

We consider the NPPF will need to include:

- focus on the creation and enhancement of **places** as the underpinning design strategy that enables and empowers local planning authorities to use design policies
- requirements for planning applications to set out design statements that cover the wider context of a development
- the prevention of sprawling and unsustainable development and the creation of places with identity and form with good, long term environmental, economic and social credentials

- consideration of impact on climate change and health as well as the appearance of our villages, towns and cities
- a means of drawing together national agenda items, traditionally delivered by separated policies on transport, housing, energy, open space etc
- grounds for refusal for inappropriate design. This may require more weight to be given to comments arising from Design Review Panels and/or Building for Life assessments – e.g, becoming a material consideration
- measures for enforcement which cover landscape as well as building requirements.
- A mechanism for recognising and strengthening the design support provided by the Design Council.

If Design Review has both merit and value it should not be possible for planning authorities to ignore design panel comments in coming to a decision in respect of granting or refusing planning consent. In taking a planning decision in which design review has played a part it should be an obligation on a planning authority to clearly state why it has taken a different view to a design review panel. This may help an applicant decide how to approach a revised application or appeal. It may also be potential grounds for a costs claim if a planning authority has wilfully ignored design advice which is subsequently ratified and endorsed on appeal.

One of the challenges of the Localism Bill is that planning becomes more locally driven with communities and neighbourhoods, market towns and rural villages all participating. Delivery of design is a policy issue as well, and as LPAs bring in policies that commend 'good design' we need tools to measure this that are accessible to informed non-professionals. We are aware that there are tools like "Community Building for Life", but it will be important that training and information for local communities is easily available. It is also essential that localism is not used as a way of merely applying conservative design policies which may favour local pastiche and ignore the benefits of good contemporary design.

A local community is likely to be confused by the raft of potential "plans" and processes available to it. (Neighbourhood Plans, Neighbourhood Development Orders, Community Right to Build, Community Right to Buy etc). Many local communities that have already participated in community-led planning (Parish Plans, Market Town Health Checks etc) will not necessarily appreciate the importance of starting again, or using the existing information to fit into the new system. There is a requirement for clear explanatory information from an authoritative central source. It is crucial to emphasise the importance of working with the LPA in this regard as it is the LPA which still has the overarching policy context. Local authorities need to adjust to the removal of the regional layer which previously set targets. This will be a challenge in some areas, particularly for the elected members.

In terms of planning policy on design, the LI welcomes the role that Design Council will take and considers it will need to be at the vanguard of:

- defining good design in development as well as in urban design policy and practice - enhancing the practice of collaborative design and continuing use of measures like Design Review Panels and 'Building for Life' that allow local interpretation.
- addressing how the planning and design of our green, and grey infrastructure, as well as individual developments, have an impact on health, quality of life and on energy generation/use, waste and climate change.
- how the open space can be best shaped, integrated and managed – with design as a key influence on long term delivery, management and maintenance and acceptance by local communities
- explaining that at a time of austerity it makes sense to increase the multi-functional use of land, both private and public, showing how we can achieve more 'bang for our buck' and optimise land use. Taking a multifunctional approach to the way our land is planned, designed and managed will deliver a wide range of benefits for society, the economy and the environment.¹
- showing how design policy and control can be enacted collaboratively at a number of local levels – city, town and village

2. In your experience, what are the specific issues affecting the delivery of well-designed development? Are there any particular issues at the moment?

The tendency is for design approval to be given by non-designers. Planning is often driven by policies that preserve and prevent. However they often do not deal well with what should be provided in development design other than long lists of aspirations. These often have little practical vision or are open to wide interpretation, making subsequent decisions about design quality more difficult. The pressure to cut quality when resources are tight is increased and design control needs better and more collaborative tools. The Design Council is well placed to provide these and act as the national centre for 'design thinking'. The Design Council could also have a positive impact on the quality of the built environment by promoting a balanced view of the relationship between architecture and external/public realm spaces through a focus on place, urbanism and sustainability.

Delivery of well designed development includes:

- adopting design processes like those set out in guides such as 'Sustainable Cities', 'Creating Successful Masterplans' and 'Large Scale Urban Design'. These emphasise the collaborative nature of design, not just between professions but also with communities
- ensuring that new materials, techniques, and approaches which will contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation are quickly adopted and disseminated through new developments
- understanding the regional landscape character and landscape resources in determining the suitability of land for development
- recognising the value of local character and the capacity of the landscape to absorb change

¹ Green Infrastructure: connected and multifunctional landscapes, Landscape Institute 2009

- due consideration of the strategic masterplanning framework
- due consideration of green infrastructure, and other environmental issues
- engaging with local people to ensure a scheme has their support
- maintaining the benefits of successful masterplanning such as 'Building for Life' and ensuring its development and stewardship.
- continuing to disseminate lessons from overseas – (many lessons have been learned from Malmo, Vauban, etc)
- improving our suburbs and retrofitting sustainable development into the large housing estates of the late 20th century. Place making often involves significant contributions from highway and other public authorities. It is rare to see a scheme by a local authority for the public realm submitted for design review. This creates an unnatural division between the effects of the design activities of the public and private sector, with the presumption that the public sector needs to be subject to design review but that the public sector does not. This is a false premise.

3. What are the existing sources of design support across England? How accessible are they? Who delivers them? Who accesses this support? Will this need to change in response to the localism agenda, and if so how? How effective are these means of support, and at what point in the planning and development process are they best delivered?

Local authorities and developers rely on their staff or consultant teams. In a pressured economic climate the resources for these are squeezed and local authorities are reducing skilled staff in design, conservation and green space.

Local authorities do not always need ongoing design support and some share staff (e.g. Teignbridge and South Hams DCs) or buy in consultancy services as needed. In-house staff are sometimes urged to provide consultancy to other public sector bodies. London has led the way with a strong design team and panel of enablers and design reviewers replicated in various similar ways by other core cities and sub-regions.

There is often a need to provide a high quality design professional to assist with local and effective design policies in the LDF and strategies, masterplans and action plans that may not be an everyday skill within the authority and may need to be bought in. Design review panels, as well as some of the regional panels specifically set up to look at the design policies in LDF documents have provided a useful (free) critical friend for many authorities and have resulted in changes to documents. Use of these panels early on in the process is important.

For some work, local authorities use framework consultants or their sub-contractors (perhaps using their own panel, the HCA consultant panel or a local panel run by a partnership of public authorities) or OJEU tender to procure consultants. This process offers a threshold of financial standing and assurance to the authority and can provide good design outcomes as well. However it frequently excludes many excellently-qualified professionals in smaller practices, including many who are locally-based. We have doubts that it always provides best value for money.

Design support also came from CABE, English Heritage, Natural England and the Environment Agency but all are depleted in their resources. There are some quasi consultancy public sector bodies such as the Homes and Communities Agency ATLAS and their Skills and Knowledge Academy and support may be available locally from ACNs and Planning Aid and from voluntary groups like civic trusts, heritage and wildlife groups etc. but this is sporadic and sparse outside major cities.

Communities (small towns, parishes and neighbourhoods) tend to look for more local and cheaper support including RTPI Planning Aid (limited to RTPI members so not really sufficiently design focussed), local civic societies, Action with Communities in Rural England /Rural Communities Action Network and Councils, and Action for Market Towns. Many small professional practices, the Community Planning Network, and the Prince's Foundation also provide consultancy in community planning and design for a fee that may be discounted for community groups or provided at low cost due to their charitable status.

Support in the area of education, design guidance and training is also available from bodies such as Design for Homes, Town and Country Planning Association, the Academy of Urbanism, Historic Towns Forum, Association of Small Historic Towns and Villages, Common Ground, Civic Voice, Public Realm Information and Advice Network but these tend to be very small scale subscription membership and interest groups and have low resource levels for any design support.

All design services and procurement of design services needs to be considered very early in the planning and development process. The process is already becoming more complicated with pay-per-pre-application discussions as well as the localism agenda. Local authority staff need to understand when the need for advice arises and what type of advice may be called for. The plethora of competing consultants, enablers, advisors, institutions, membership and interest groups makes the choice of design procurement daunting. There is therefore a need for some kind of generally-accepted, understandable and authoritative source to help local authorities determine what they need and how best to procure it.

The LI considers that The Design Council should

- Provide a network hub so that local authorities can access outside support, preferably free of charge, that is politically independent from officers and procurement restrictions
- Be a public sector design champion to push design support into some public services that supply and manage the infrastructure of space and land that traditionally are weak in design (highways, utilities etc)
- Provide a hub for communities and neighbourhoods to access design support on how to procure or challenge design
- Nurture the setting up of and advice provided to accessible and well publicised local design support – pools of design resource
- Lobby for the current DCLG neighbourhood planning contract to supply neighbourhood design and masterplanning, landscape and ecology, building, street and transport design, and community consensus building, not just planning.

- Use influence and education to ensure public and third sector bodies use their positions to harness community, private and public sector professional networks in design and planning.
- Maintain and promote case studies and knowledge.

4. Design Review: CABE's Design Review service provides free expert advice on the design quality of schemes in England that will have a significant impact on their environment. There are also eight independent sub-national design review panels that are affiliated with CABE, forming a network that provides consistent and good quality design advice across the country.

a. Have you ever been involved in Design Review? If so how many roles - as a panellist, a design team member, developer?

Our members are members of Design Review panels at national (CABE), sub-national (regional panels such as Places Matter (north west) or Creating Excellence (south west), sub-regional (groups of adjoining local authorities) and local level with individual planning authorities.

We have local authority members who have attended DRPs run by CABE, sub-national and local panels.

Our members have also been members of design teams whose plans and proposals for developers have been reviewed by CABE or by sub-national, sub-regional and local panels.

b. In your view does DR work best as a final seal of approval at the end of the planning application process, or as part of an iterative process with multiple engagements with the panel from pre application discussions through to the final decision - or both?

An iterative process is the best DR process but it is resource intensive and rarely happens. Early pre-application DR is most helpful as it can test and challenge the vision and conceptual design strategies and highlights where the design team needs to take action before large decisions are made that impact the scheme design downstream. The LPA is then well placed to see if the final application has met the Panel comments.

There should be greater use of a design panels as a sounding board for emerging concepts to assist design teams in developing schemes which address perceived challenges and opportunities. This can also be done within the scheme development programme without causing delay and when the client and design team are more responsive to design panel comments.

c. Is this still a valid model of support for good design?

While design panels will mostly need to be convened on a local basis, we think there is a need for a single UK-wide register of suitably qualified individuals with a wide range of expertise. Local authorities in any part of the country would then be able to constitute their design review panels by drawing, if they wished, on individuals on that register.

This would offer the best combination of local decision-making and consistency of advice.

Other considerations:

- Accountability and openness – clear records available at planning application stage.
- Conflicts of interest – no panellist should be an officer of the particular local authority in which the development is planned
- Reasonableness – DR panels should consider the resources of the applicant
- Highways – where relevant, the highway authority which can demand a certain design standard within a proposal should also be present to answer questions as effectively they are part of the design team

d. Given the increased role of local people in developing proposals, do you think that there should be community representation as part of the design review process? How might that work?

We consider there is a potential role for design review in helping local communities to develop neighbourhood plans.

For some schemes it may be appropriate for community representatives to attend the design review sessions. With the increased requirements that will come out of the Localism Bill for evidence of consultation and evidence of taking on board comments on larger developments (200 houses+), developers may see design review sessions as one of their tools for providing evidence of community engagement.

e. If payment for Design Review were to be introduced, what charging mechanisms might be appropriate? Can this be reconciled with perceived and actual conflicts of interest?

The LPA could pay the cost of DR (as a consultancy service on pre-agreed rates) and recover this from a planning application scaled tariff on all applications. Payment by developers may be appropriate in some cases – although this will bring perceived conflicts of interest. We believe there should certainly be no direct payments, i.e. that a developer should not be able to in effect commission their own design review. Although the developer may pay for design review, the establishment of the review panel must be undertaken by the local authority or other relevant public body entirely independently.

Paying for good advice and avoiding wasted time in developing schemes with unresolved problems is highly cost effective exercise. Costs for feedback at initial scheme stages should be readily recovered. There is a difficulty when, as has happened in the past, a scheme is referred to CABE when the developer originally had no intention of talking to CABE. It would be impossible in these circumstances to make a reluctant client pay for criticism of a scheme.

f. What are the factors that led you to use Design Review?

Our members who have used DRP have done so to obtain objective independent skilled peer review for proposals that are controversial, large scale or innovative. They have

also used it on quite small scale schemes where there were differing opinions between, for example, an engineering department and other design departments for local authority led schemes.

In other instances, where enabling support has been provided, attendance at a design review panel has been written into the brief.

g. How do you assess which Design Review panel service you will use?

LI members who have used the service commented that they went to the sub-national panel because they knew people there and that panel had the conversation with CABE as to whether it was (then) regional or national. This proved quite satisfactory.

5. Enabling / Local Design Support

Enabling seeks to affect people's thinking at local and regional level and thus project by project develop knowledgeable and inspirational clients that can then deliver the next project without it. Enabling as an economic, flexible and high-impact way of dealing with the design agenda and it should remain an important focus of Design Council efforts. We need to have an enabling pool that is more widely available, covers a wider range of people and is supported by a wider network of organizations in the professional sector, the national and local authority sectors and in the community and voluntary sectors.

Have you been involved in enabling, if so how?

Over 70 LI members have been individual CABE/CABE Space Enablers. Several Registered Landscape Practices have been Corporate Enablers at CABE. Our members have been involved with enabling across the full spectrum of CABE's work including:

- procurement including design competitions and competitive tendering
- brief writing
- advice on policy, strategies and design guidance writing at national and local levels (large scale urban design, masterplanning, street design, open space, public realm, environmental improvement, Green Infrastructure etc)
- support for programmes: Housing Market Renewal, Rural Masterplanning, Sustainable Cities,
- open space and public realm strategies
- town centre redevelopment proposals
- Manual for Streets
- local authority officer and member training in design of parks, public space, and streets, procurement, masterplanning
- community and neighbourhood design workshops
- stakeholder workshops for strategies
- Sustainable Cities website on core city sustainable design
- Growth Point and Strategic Growth Corridor masterplanning
- creation of the Building for Life tool
- Building for Life assessments
- rural masterplanning policy, guidance and workshops

- urban forestry
- management and maintenance agreements for parks and open spaces

Our members have also been involved with the formulation of green infrastructure policy and design advice on behalf of CABE and the LI together. They have contributed to Start with the Park design and management advice, on Spaceshaper toolkit formation and written publications ranging from 'Paving the Way' to 'Decent homes need decent spaces'.

Our members are also involved in regional enabling networks such as for some Architecture Centres, Ignite NE, Creating Excellence, etc.

a. What is the relationship between local delivery agencies, such as architecture centres or civic societies and a more central resource such as Architecture Centre Network, Civic Voice, or Design Council CABE in terms of providing support to local authorities and communities?

A national body is far better placed to act as a facilitator of enabling/design support that is remote from local political concerns. It can draw on expert individuals with national and international experience who may nevertheless live and work locally. Local networks alone can lean towards a parochial view or interest, and they do often need access to an independent voice from outside the area, even if only one or two, to break through this. National enabling panel members are located all over the country and bring a range of skills and experience from a wide geography, many also including overseas experience.

Our view is that The Design Council, Architecture Centre Network and other national providers of similar services, for example, Rural Communities Action Network or Civic Voice, should avoid duplication of services and should share resources and platforms where there is agreed joint purpose. We would hope a round table forum might facilitate this.

Communities, local authority members/officers and professionals need to be able to access resources from their local architecture centre or sustainable communities body. These need to address design across the planning spectrum in terms of urban design, place making, healthy communities and environmental performance. They might widen their remit to 'Place Centres' or 'Urban Design Centres' – hubs of focus for community members, planners, landscape and other designers, artists, developers and qualified interested lay people to dialogue.

b. Should a central body be providing hands on support to local groups, or more indirect support such as pooling best practice?

Enabling is quick, efficient and low on bureaucracy. A national body like The Design Council should be the command and control portal to the enabling pool that may be operationally managed by sub-national panel chairs.

The LI would support new ways of enabling including by local or sub-national panels working through well qualified and openly accountable bodies in the third or community sector. Local authorities and communities need to be able to access these services easily and have confidence in their credibility. Hands on support should be provided for

projects of national or trans-regional significance such as new towns, major infrastructure projects etc.

Using Social Media and interactive communications more imaginatively and effectively may be one way of making the an enabling pool more responsive and open to communication with local partners, making best use of national expertise as adjuncts to local networks.

c. Do the requisite skills exist at local level to support the localism agenda?

Local design skills are insufficient to support the Localism planning agenda. There are skills locally but they will not all be suitable or available or want to be available for design enabling or support. Local authority budget constraints and regional expertise loss means LPA's design resources are unlikely to be available for local support.

Communities, neighbourhoods, businesses and LEPs on the other hand are realising their increased powers under localism for plan making and want to be able to control their destiny appropriately. The LI believes that communities will need to have access to a wide range of skills – not planning alone, but also in greenspace, economics, transport, and group and community facilitating.

In the first instance communicating the essential elements of the Localism Bill and what that might mean for neighbourhoods interested in developing their own plans will be an important aspect – which could be run centrally or sub-nationally.

e. What types of design support are required e.g. for communities procuring new buildings and spaces, neighbourhood planning, local authority support in incorporating emerging neighbourhood plans into core strategies etc?

We would envisage a need for

- Co-design skills
- mentoring, facilitating and negotiation skills
- community strategic visioning,
- collaborative policy and objective setting,
- masterplanning design
- community 'Building for Life' assessment,
- brief writing, procurement and design competitions advice
- procurement method/ selection of design consultants by clients through education/training by example, i.e. by connecting future clients with good practice examples of similar projects in cost and complexity done by others elsewhere in the UK or mainland Europe.

The skills needed would need to include design and regeneration of places with an understanding of the planning, movement design, architecture and landscape design of places.

f. Given the multiple providers of design support / enabling, is there a need for guidance to ensure consistency of quality and approach?

The LI thinks that The Design Council should look carefully at 360 degree feedback it has received for enabling in the past and learn lessons from enablers, clients, developers and partners. Clear and consistent guidance is essential for both enabler and client as the effectiveness of the commission is susceptible to misunderstanding or to not having the correct parties involved on the client team.

It is important not to add to the cost of setting up enabling, and the purpose of having highly skilled and experienced panellists is their ability to read the situation and probe adequately and professionally, understand the politics and build up trust quickly without huge amounts of briefing.

Our view from our own experience, is that The Design Council should:

- clearly define the potential and appropriateness of enabling with the client before starting,
- have a short one page brief where the purpose of the enabling project is clear, for example, raise design aspirations of client or a range of partners, indicate to them how to increase capacity to deliver design quality etc
- avoid from the outset misconceptions about the relationship between the client body and enablers (for example: enablers are not necessarily proactive designers but mentors and partners offering guidance) Be clear on liability limitations
- clearly state the obligation of the client towards the enablers i.e. to make commitment to communicate before during and after the enabling takes place
- require the client to provide feedback to The Design Council and the enabler on their performance and assistance to the client
- empower enablers to walk away from supporting bodies where the desired outcomes are not going to be achieved – spend the money/time where it is appreciated
- support enablers in their role reporting market intelligence to the Design Council. This is a key part of the relationship and achieves wider understanding of the country as a whole and issues
- Keep the system simple.

6. Are there any other key issues that you think should be considered as part of this review?

The LI is aware that there is a need for a refresh of the approach formerly taken by CABE in what is a new political and fiscal age. LI members can support a new approach and not just a cut down service delivered through increased pre-application fees.

Partnering

The LI would be prepared to partner with Design Council CABE in initiatives that support development generally and specifically; landscape, green infrastructure, sustainable development and public space design. The LI has a branch network nationally with local representation. More use of branches would be mutually beneficial to the LI and The Design Council.

Selling Enabling

The Design Council might consider procurement of enabling services for LPAs and communities – a new enabling pool operated with a standard fee made available to a wider audience for instance:

- Voluntary services – an expenses paid only service for maximum of 1 day advice on briefing/ project set up etc
- Rural Community Action Network – placing skilled enablers through the RCC network
- ACRE/ AMT; Civic Voice, etc – making enablers available through these bodies to their members at a third sector fee rate
- making enablers available through the CLG Neighbourhood Planning contract

The Design Council may consider selling enabling panel services abroad to Middle East, US and BRICs nations. This might also cover advice on setting up DC CABA type organisations for design review and enabling.

Local voluntary initiatives

The Design Council may consider using a small amount of public sector funding and fees to create and support local design initiatives setting up. Learning from the self help methods of Transition Towns and Civic Societies, harnessing local support to create new initiatives.

Knowledge base

There is a need for continuity in the transition. We need to keep the library of collective knowledge and networks accumulated by CABA alive and up to date or it will become stale and lose the respect of those looking to it.

LI Members who have been part of the CABA network believe that it is hugely important in terms of the unpaid contributions that panelist and enablers put back into the organisation. The networking opportunities and training days provide benefits for both sides, making links and connections. We appreciate that budgets will be tighter – but the ability to make these events happen is an important part of the overall relationship between the panel members, enablers and Design Council.

Landscape Institute
Charles Darwin House
12 Roger Street
London
WC1N 2JU

Tel: 020 7685 2640