

MAYOR OF LONDON

COMMISSIONING CO-DESIGN

PROCESS NOTE

GOOD GROWTH BY DESIGN

**THIS PROCESS NOTE HAS BEEN CO-PRODUCED
BY THE FOLLOWING HANDS AND VOICES:**

KATE BATCHELOR, PEABODY
RUMI BOSE, REGENERATION CONSULTANT
SARAH CONSIDINE, GLA REGENERATION
DEBORAH EFEMINI, DECK SOCIAL
DAISY FROUD, CO-DESIGN FACILITATOR & MDA
MELLIS HAWARD, ARCHIO
RIINA HEINONEN, GLA
CLAIRE JAMIESON, CONSULTANT EDITOR + WRITER
NICOLA MURPHY-EVANS, GLA ENVIRONMENT TEAM
MATT RUDDY, GLA REGENERATION
ROSE SHAW, CITY OF WESTMINSTER
ASHMI THAPAR, BELL PHILLIPS ARCHITECTS

WITH SIGNIFICANT INPUT AND LEARNING FROM WIDER
TEAMS AT BELL PHILLIPS ARCHITECTS, GROUNDWORK
LONDON, LONDON BOROUGH OF HOUNSLOW, MUF
ARCHITECTURE/ART, PEABODY THAMESMEAD, AND FROM
THE SOUTH THAMESMEAD COMMUNITY DESIGN
COLLECTIVE.

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Principles	10
Practice	24
Resources	34

INTRODUCTION

This Process Note is about writing the brief for better community engagement.

Co-design is an increasingly widespread approach taken by commissioning authorities who wish to go beyond consultation and involve communities as partners in decision-making. Great co-design processes allow a diversity of knowledge and experience – both professional and lived – to shape a project from its fundamentals. As a result, community ownership is recognised, grown, and sustained.

Owing to its growing popularity there is no shortage of information and guidance on a range of collaborative approaches – not just co-design, but also the related processes of co-production, co-clienting and co-creation. The meaning of these different terms is explored by texts in Part B of the Resources Section – where we also compile some of the best current co-design guidance.

This Process Note however focuses on a common early stage of commissioning co-design: preparing to commission a consultant design team to deliver

your co-design project, and drafting the brief that will sit at the heart of a traditional procurement process.

Decisions taken and structures put in place at this early stage will have a fundamental impact on your capacity to deliver successful co-design later. Getting this right will ensure you have the right team in place, the right resources allocated – and enough of them – and appropriate governance processes underpinning your project. Well-established foundations help to build trust and positive relationships with community partners, in turn helping to avoid delays and thwarted expectations. This means a greater chance of achieving strong project outcomes and nurturing sustained relationships in the longer term.

This guidance has been written collaboratively by practitioners with experience of commissioning co-design and writing briefs, as well as those involved with delivery. It is intended to accompany you while you take those important initial decisions, put fundamental structures in place, and write your brief. Principles are outlined in an order

that aligns with the steps normally taken as a project is devised. However, processes are rarely linear, so we suggest you consider them in the round.

This guidance aims to provide one possible pathway to commissioning co-design, but should not restrict what co-design can be. There are many different ways for co-design to happen. This note focuses specifically on commissioning from within the current parameters of public sector procurement, where co-design projects must find ways to be responsive and flexible inside fixed, top-down structures. Co-design can of course also be initiated by communities themselves in a more bottom-up way, enabled by local authority seed-funding and/or partnering with them once underway. Commissioners using this process note are encouraged to experiment and look for new ways to normalise these ways of working, and to reflect on their own organisation's power dynamics and processes using the lessons learnt from co-design.

The principles herein contribute to the Mayor's wider priority of creating diverse and accessible local places and economies. Without properly working with communities and ensuring their voices are not only heard but play an active role in shaping places, the built environment risks excluding groups and exacerbating inequalities. The principles of community collaboration at the heart of co-design are key tools towards realising a more inclusive city for all Londoners.

PRINCIPLES



1. Decide whether co-design is the right approach for this project

Before embarking on brief-writing a decision needs to be taken: is co-design the right process, or would a different form of engagement suit the project better? Co-design is an ambitious form of engagement involving sharing power and committing to changing organisational culture. This can lead to unexpected outcomes: priorities may be different to those initially imagined, questions may be asked that you weren't expecting, and ideas for outputs may differ from initial assumptions. Organisationally, you need to be open to this.

A project is ideal for co-design where there is not only a genuine desire to respect and engage with the knowledge, imaginations and experience of community participants, but also – essentially - the possibility of, and commitment to, real power sharing i.e. community participants and representatives having an active voice in decision-making.

If conditions for successful co-design are not in place, high quality consultation, for example, may lead to better outcomes and a stronger working relationship with participants. Or, if a project overall is not suitable for co-design, there might still be specific strands of work or sub-projects where you can specify it.

A selection of references that can guide commissioners on whether their project is suitable for co-design can be found in Section C of the Resources.

2. Secure institutional support for co-design before commissioning

Co-design processes disrupt 'business-as-usual' and can encounter challenges and pushback. It's therefore important that whoever is operating 'on the ground' receives strong institutional backing, particularly from senior leadership, and that there are robust support systems in place from the beginning.

Consider the following early on, before you write your brief:

- Is the risk and experiment inherent to co-design something that people in your wider organisation will support?
- Can internal champions at a sufficiently senior level be identified to help build support and champion you throughout the process?
- Can your institutional decision-making structures (e.g. a local authority's constitution) accommodate co-design e.g. what kind of decision-making power will they allow those who don't belong to your organisation to have?

It is recommended to undertake internal workshops and training with stakeholders – including those with decision-making authority in your organisation - to ensure alignment on what you mean by 'co-design' as an institution, and what change you are trying to enable through doing it. These could also be an opportunity to firm up the Client Team structure, agree who will write the brief, and map out some project success criteria.

3. Map out the likely resource and capacity needed to meet your co-design ambition

Co-design does not always require huge amounts of resource, but it often takes more than standard consultation, particularly in the early stages. So, as early as possible start to weigh up and articulate what is probably needed to deliver the project you are imagining and the outcomes you aspire to, and who you think will best take responsibility for providing it.

Your brief can then clearly set out the project's ambition, underpinned by a realistic and well-communicated assessment of both human and project resources required, and the contribution you expect bidders to bring to the table. It should also detail the support you have in place or intend to offer client-side e.g. will you be responsible for forming a Community Design Group or similar, and communicating with them, or are you asking the design team to do this? This puts consultant teams in a position to cost accordingly, with experienced teams able to constructively challenge your assumptions and suggest alternatives in their pitch.

Try to avoid displacing wholesale any 'capacity gaps' or resource needs onto consultants to work out or to provide, particularly if you are requiring their bids to be competitively costed.

Key questions to ask yourself around capacity and resource include:

- What roles would it be most cost effective to provide institutionally, rather than pay consultant fees for – for example project management, communications and publicity support?
 - What capacities, resources, skills and knowledge can you draw on from within your wider organisation? Co-design projects can be good at breaking down institutional silos and fostering collaborative working.
 - Does your team structure need to change to effectively manage a co-design process and make the most of in-house skills?

- Are there opportunities for training and mentorship to bring in new skills and develop existing staff or community members?
- And where will it be of benefit to have 'outsider' eyes and expertise? Are there roles for potential third parties in this? e.g.
 - What skills and expertise might already or potentially sit within communities involved in the project and how can they be brought in effectively (with appropriate remuneration)?
- Might an independent chair, facilitator or 'critical friend' be useful to support everyone through the co-design process, as a separate commission?
- What project resources would it be most effective or economical to provide client side e.g. provision of venues, equipment and support for events, and financial support for participants. Again here, there may be providers within the community that you wish to support or commission.
- How much time do you have? Is your programme realistic, in terms of allowing your ambitions to be met? Programmes – and therefore projects – can be constrained by factors such as political cycles, timings of school holidays etc.

In an iterative process like co-design, nobody expects every detail of this to be fully worked-out at the start, but clearly communicating your expectations, assumptions and ambitions as far as possible at the start, and actively avoiding ambiguity, will help to set a project up well.

4. Use clear and consistent terminology in your brief

Your brief should state precisely what you mean by co-design in the context of this project and the approaches to engagement and participation that you expect. Without this definition there is a risk that a bidding team may bring their own quite different one into play, and plan and resource accordingly.

Throughout the brief, remain consistent with language, avoiding casually switching between terms like 'consultation', 'engagement' and 'co-design'. It may well be that some aspects of your project will be done through consultation rather than co-design, so it's important to maintain and make use of helpful distinctions.

Consider including a glossary of terms that can act as a shared reference and be added to throughout the project – the Glossaries signposted in the Resources section of this process note can be used as a starting point

5. Map out your project stakeholders and power structures for bidding teams

Your brief should aim to clearly communicate your internal and external stakeholder landscape: who is already involved in your project, who needs to be involved, and to what degree, as well as their relationships to each other. Stakeholder or community mapping and organograms (including 'power maps') are all more effective and useful ways than lists to convey client-stakeholder-consultant dynamics. Decide which are most helpful for you.

Preparing an organogram or power map – see part D of the Resources – can be a useful process to identify and communicate core relationships to yourself and colleagues or partners, even before you share these with potential consultant teams. It may require some reflection and research, and even lead to a decision to adjust or create new structures or communication flows. Depending on the scale of your organisation or project, you may want to bring in other voices or commission an expert third party to act as a 'critical friend' to help reveal and challenge any unconscious and conscious bias or assumptions. You may need to examine who currently influences decision-making within your organisation at a granular level in order to reveal dynamics that are not obvious on existing governance charts.

Community or stakeholder 'mapping' exercises are the best tools for communicating the wider groups and voices who will have an interest in or be impacted by the project, and who should therefore ideally be involved. You should at least set this out in headline form in your consultant brief, with clarity on whether you will require a more thorough 'community mapping' as an early-stage task from your consultants, or whether this is something you will do or have already done.

Aim to set out the following in your brief:

- Who the clients are – while you may be the formal client, others such as community members will have significant influence and ownership.
- Where power will lie within that expanded client body and what this means for everyday project roles, responsibilities and decision making.
- The wider groups and voices who will be interested in or impacted by the project, alongside any known gaps in representation or knowledge e.g. of seldom heard groups, and clarity on whether you will expect your consultants to undertake outreach or build new relationships on your behalf.
- Any aspirations you have for how your project will shift or redress existing power dynamics.

6. Communicate the governance structures you aspire to, and what is already in place

The best co-design briefs explain to bidders how decisions will be taken throughout the project and the agency that community voices have in this. They also make clear expectations for bidding teams regarding their roles and tasks within decision-making, including around potentially complex areas such as collaborative sign-offs. This allows teams to make realistic assumptions around baseline resourcing such as numbers of meetings or workshops, additional printing etc. as well as timescales, and associated staff time.

Unless your organisation is already experienced in co-design, or you are working with an existing fully-representative community group, your project will likely require a new and specific model of governance such as a steering group or board to enable shared decision-making. Consider who will be responsible for (a) designing (b) establishing and (c) managing/administering any new structures. This could be done internally by your team or be specified as a task for the consultant team. However, appointing an expert independent third party can be a better way to ensure an effective and fair structure.

Thinking about the following can help to develop an appropriate governance structure:

- Who should ideally be involved in taking project decisions? (Use your stakeholder and power maps to help you identify this).
- What decisions will need to be taken over the project's lifetime, and which of these are most significant or meaningful in terms of project outcomes:
 - Which will be seen as most important by your organisation?
 - Which are like to matter most to community voices? (Think about this at all scales: a theoretically 'small' decision – such as where and how to publicise events – may sometimes matter as much, both symbolically and practically, as some of the core project delivery ones.)

- How can your governance structure prioritise collaboration around these?
- What decisions have already been taken, and on what basis? Are these fixed, or could they be revisited if they matter to participants?
- What are the requirements or constraints of existing institutional power structures? Your governance structures need to be designed and articulated to maximise participant agency within this framework. There may well be some decisions that voices outside the formal organisation cannot be part of.
- Even within what's possible, what kinds of decisions are your leadership team comfortable with handing over to the co-design process?
- Can you see any possible conflicts that might arise, based on existing or historic tensions, project constraints, or differences of opinion on the approach – how can your governance structure pre-emptively accommodate or be ready to flex to these?

Consider establishing any community panels or boards ahead of consultant procurement. This not only means that you have the governance structure in place from Day 1, but also allows for community participation in brief setting and the consultant appointment.

Further material on developing governance structures for co-design can be found in the Resources, section D

7. Give a clear indication of what kind of design team you are looking for

Your brief should be specific about the skills and experience you require, as well as the philosophy and approach you are looking for from a consultant or design team. This might be quite different to that for a conventional architectural project, or for one that only involves basic consultation: they will need to be good designers, but they will need other skills and mindsets too.

It will pay off to research practices working in the co-design field and speak to clients who have experience working with them. You will need to think about how the consultant team will complement the client team and ensure that your assessment criteria are tailored to match the design team you are hoping to appoint.

The following steps are helpful when preparing your brief:

- Have early conversations with your procurement team, look at available frameworks, and speak to contacts at other organisations about teams they have had a positive experience of working with.
- Develop your assessment criteria. There will likely be set categories around technical requirements, quality, commercial, EDI and social value – discuss with your procurement team how these can be adapted to ensure your co-design priorities are reflected in the scoring.
- Consider involving community participants in setting interview questions, and/or inviting them to be part of the interview and assessment process.
- Based on your assessment criteria, set useful and challenging questions without being overly onerous in terms of time and effort required from bidders. For instance, given the flexible nature of co-design processes it is usually more effective to ask for examples and reflections on previous work, rather than to require teams to write a lengthy methodology for this project.
- Give teams the chance to explain their culture of practice and

sensibility towards the project more broadly - ask open questions such as what their ideal co-design process involves, or what they think about the brief and what they would change etc.

- Site visits and walkabouts can be useful at the bidding stage for potential design teams to meet the client team and community stakeholders and develop a richer understanding of the project.

8. Describe how bidding teams are expected to work with the commissioning organisation and any subconsultants

The brief should be specific about the services you require from bidding teams, and the wider delivery structures within which they will sit. This includes how they will work with sub-consultants and community representatives or participants. This information will allow bidding teams to not only assemble an appropriate team, but to ensure that adequate resource and fee allocation comes with them.

Your brief should aim to cover the following areas:

- Be explicit when outlining the skills and resources you require. Will you ask the lead consultant to bring all necessary specialists on board as part of their sub-consultant team or will appointment and management of these lie with you? Appointing the whole team in one go has appeal but reduces your control over who the sub-contractors are, and what proportion of the fee is assigned to them.
- Be clear on requirements around project and communication structures, including meetings and their frequency, preferred project management tools and communication methods, and the role you see consultants playing in these.
- Detail any more unusual project requirements that your co-design approach involves, for example additional meetings or sign-offs necessitated by governance structures.
- Share any useful information about relevant knowledge or experience among participating communities, along with any skilling-up, capacity-building or support they may require to fully participate, and who will be responsible for that.

9. Strike a balance between a clearly defined process and space for creativity

A good co-design brief is direct about what bidders are expected to provide in terms of services and deliverables for the fee, while not over-defining the process. This ensures the expertise of bidding teams can help shape the initial project approach and then, vitally, the process can evolve in response to context and circumstance once underway. The first stage of this will be consultants inevitably revising initial assumptions and ideas once they meet participants.

Your brief can provide useful clarity to bidders in the following ways:

- Ensure you articulate fixed and non-negotiable elements of the programme and process, while also clearly indicating areas which are more flexible or where the bidding team's creative thinking is actively required. State explicitly that you welcome challenge, asking teams to suggest approaches that might benefit the project.
- Ask bidding teams to provide itemised costs and resource allocations for an assumed indicative process, but explain that there will be evaluation at the end of each RIBA stage to reallocate resourcing for the next stage if necessary. Tracking resourcing minimises misunderstandings and can foster imaginative collaborative working and problem-solving.
- Provide details about any particular needs or priorities of participating communities with resource implications. For example, do you require 'non-professional' versions of all or any documents to be regularly prepared as well as standard ones.
- Outline tools likely to be required for the project e.g. graphic materials, digital tools, physical spaces to meet etc. Be clear to bidders what you will look after, and what you expect them to cost for and provide, and/or what they can offer for the fee.

10. Provide clear and meaningful feedback to all bidding practices following ITT evaluation

Providing feedback for bidders is an important part of the commissioning process, particularly for less established practices who will be able to use it to review their approach and improve. As social value and EDI technical components are a relatively new part of design procurement processes, it is also important to provide specific feedback on these elements of the bid.

PRACTICE

Case Study 001 - Convent Way Estate

Key facts:

- Who: LB Hounslow
- Funding: LB Hounslow (LBH)
- Partners: LB Hounslow/ Groundwork / Out of the Box / Mayor of London
- Project: LB Hounslow commissioned a design team for the comprehensive redevelopment the Convent Way Estate, following its identification as one of six priority estates in the borough needing regeneration.

Actions:

1. Establishing community ownership early on

An active and open conversation was established with residents at the earliest stage to explore development options, this included:

- A Resident Steering Group of 36 volunteer residents was established via an open call before the architects were appointed. The group was demographically reflective of the local population and supported by a resident liaison officer, who helped to provide training and capacity building for the group.

2. Involving residents in the commissioning process

Instead of a traditional tender exercise, Hounslow took a design competition approach, which involved the Resident Steering Group (RSG) throughout the process of commissioning in the following ways:

- A series of workshops (in-person and virtual) took place with the RSG to identify residents' priorities and aspirations for the design competition.
- The brief was developed with the RSG, ensuring that local issues and priorities were informing consultants' perceptions about the project from the start.
- Representatives from the RSG formed a panel with council officers to shortlist three teams from a preselected list. The RSG then worked with the shortlisted teams to develop their initial designs.

- The designs were presented at a public exhibition, online and via a printed brochure, with feedback obtained from a broad range of residents.
- The RSG representatives played a role in designing interview questions and selecting the winning team. The residents scored independently, with their scoring mirroring that of the council officers.

3. Applying co-design principles without the terminology

The team at the council did not explicitly use the term co-design, preferring to use more common terms such as 'consultation' and 'engagement'. This ensured less opportunity for varying interpretations and avoided over-promising early on. The following steps were taken:

- The team articulated their ambition through the description of tasks required and their outputs, stating that high quality engagement was a requirement.
- The preferred engagement process was described and defined by the council in advance of the three shortlisted bidders commencing their work. This included a convening the Resident Steering Group, outlining the requirement for several workshops and public exhibitions to be held, and that the proposal would face a judging panel.
- The winning design team, Bell Phillips, decided not to use the term co-design to avoid raising expectations and because they knew, given project constraints, that residents were not going to be given the final say. However they built on the relationship successes that LBH had seeded, and very much saw the community 'as client'.

4. Uniting council teams from the outset

The housing management and regeneration teams worked as one team from the start of the project, bringing together a mix of skills, experiences, and relationships to inform how the project brief was set. This was enabled through the following steps:

- Joint weekly meetings held to plan and implement a holistic and integrated approach to community engagement and day-to-day

housing management of the estate. Being present on site weekly and developing relationships with residents created a positive and space for the design teams to come in and work closely with communities, already identified and keen to be part of the regeneration process.

5. The use of competition for the appointment of design teams

LBH gave three design teams to be part of this design competition. With the expectation that they would hold two workshops with residents. The first being a pitch, and the second a refined concept having taken on board community feedback. This allowed the communities involved to better understand what the design teams were like and how well they listened to them.

LBH gave an honorarium to each design team to cover their time. This was a risk to the studio's bidding as they could be working for no / low cost. The time between the two workshops was quite lengthy leading to expectations that the design teams would produce significantly developed concepts. If this gap had been shortened, the studios could have minimised the work they did for no / low cost.

Outcomes:

1. Bell Phillips Architects won the design competition and progressed the process of developing the design proposals alongside the council and residents. Involving residents in the commissioning process gave the council confidence that they had local backing for the winning team, and they were selected in part due to the way that they engaged with residents and understood the area. A public ballot followed in Summer 2021. The ballot saw a turnout of 85%, of which 80% of eligible residents voted in favour of the Council's regeneration plans.
2. The decision to use design competition process was only taken after teams were shortlisted – leading to a more time-consuming approach than originally envisaged. Although this worked well for broader project outcomes, it was un-costed and mostly provided by the design teams' goodwill. To repeat this process, budget should be allocated to account for the design teams' time, thus not excluding smaller practices who are unlikely to be able to absorb the cost.
3. Collaboration between the housing management and regeneration teams brought an existing familiarity with residents, the estate and its issues, and a continuity that allowed the project to address housing management problems, alongside regeneration engagement through the appointment of an appropriate design team.



CGI of proposed project and public realm - Image credit Bell Phillips

Case Study 002 - South Thamesmead Garden Estate

Key facts:

- Who: Peabody, in partnership with the GLA and Groundwork London
- Funding: £3.9m investment from Peabody, plus support from GLA/ Clever Cities
- Partners: The GLA/ Mayor of London, Clever London, Groundwork London, the CDC (Community Design Collective), muf architecture/ art, TSIP.
- Project: Peabody commissioned a design team to work with residents to plan and create better green and landscaped spaces around homes in South Thamesmead. As part of Peabody's wider regeneration and redevelopment of the 1960s estate, this experimental collaboration is applying principles of co-design, alongside nature-based solutions to benefit biodiversity and mitigate climate change, to transform more than 3 hectares of underused space into useful and pleasant parkland over which residents feel ownership.

Actions:

1. Agreeing a definition of co-design from the outset

It was important to ensure all partners were imagining and aiming for the same process and outcomes for the project in terms of a co-design approach. Developing a shared definition early on also helped to build institutional ownership for the project by involving senior management. The following steps were taken:

- A day-long workshop led by an independent facilitator at the start of the project enabled the team to create a definition of co-design and set aims and ambitions for decision making before a design team was procured.
- A second workshop was held once the design team was in place. The definition of co-design was reviewed and revised, and activities and methods were discussed.

2. Establishing a community-embedded governance structure

The project team developed a loose scope for a community panel to partner in the co-design process prior to appointing a design team so that it could be written into the consultant brief. Once appointed, one of the first tasks for the design team was to establish the Community Design Collective, a demographically representative group of adult residents. The Community Design Collective is paid London Living Wage for all their work, something that had been costed for in advance, to help enable equitable participation of residents from all socio-economic backgrounds.

3. Mapping out the project's key decisions

A clear set of decision-making moments set out at the start acted as a spine for the project, helping to foreground the project's power dynamics, enabling better and more conscious critical reflection about who should be part of key decisions, how they should be taken, and how resources should be allocated. This mapping shaped the process in the following ways:

- The commissioning team produced the first version of this roadmap as part of an early workshop, ahead of writing the consultant brief. This helped in thinking about the type of design team required, and the balance of responsibility for stewarding decision-making between internal team members and appointed external experts
- The focus on decision making continued throughout the project, enabling the design team to better plan for the co-design process and the community panel to design which decisions they wanted to be involved in. It was also clearly communicated to the community panel where there were constraints on decision making.
- While the structural aspect of the decision making was set out clearly, the co-design process was left deliberately open for the design team to propose and run in an iterative way.

4. Ensuring ongoing evaluation and reflection

Continuous evaluation was designed into the project – both as a funding requirement and as an essential of good co-design practice. This ensured expectations across all stakeholders and progress towards the project's desired outcomes were regularly reviewed, and adjustments made as necessary. Learning was also captured to be shared more widely into the Clever Cities initiative. This aspect of the process and its potential time implications (e.g. regular workshops) was made clear from the outset, in the briefing materials, allowing design teams to account for it in their fee.

Outcomes and Lessons:

1. At the time of writing, there have been two years of collaborative work in South Thamesmead, with distinct elements such as an Edible Garden already implemented. As part of the evaluation process, the Community Design Collective members have provided tangible examples of their ideas, opinions and feedback shaping the designs for the site. In response to concerns around maintaining the integrity of the approach throughout the delivery process, the scope of the community panel has been extended to allow for a collaborative value-engineering process – with the contractor being required to engaged with and report to the group.
2. The Community Design Collective has been integral to the project, with high retention rates – 9 members have decided to continue into Phase 2 (delivery). The group has so far invested over 1000 hours over the two and a half years since they were appointed. One key lesson learned is that setting up the community panel prior to appointing the design team meant that the group was still finding its feet during important early stages of the project. This is backed up by evaluation from the group, who found trying to understand the complex power structure challenging and participating in training sessions in parallel to co-design activities difficult. The group also provided feedback that fundamental project decisions had been taken before their appointment and trust in the process and the organisation took time to build.

3. Key lessons were learned around commissioning the design team, in particular around the expectations of services beyond design, given the adaptive nature of the process. Specific areas identified in evaluation by both the design team and commissioning team included asking for more clarity at the start from the design team on resource committed for the fee, making clear the expectation for resource to be flexibility applied and reallocated. Any involvement of the design team in monitoring and reporting on co-design activities should also be articulated clearly in the brief so they can be costed for.



Thamesmead consultation day - Photo credit Richard Heald Photography

RESOURCES

A. CO-DESIGN OVERVIEWS

Resources offering straightforward introductions to co-design with practical advice.

Archio: Co-design Toolkit

[\(Available by request from the Archio website\)](#)

A leading practice in the co-design field, winning awards for their architecture as well as praise for their process. This guidance shares their proven tools and approaches with the aim of 'demystifying co-design'.

Tom Greenall, Jane Wong, Lydia Toohey: Towards Spatial Justice: A guide for achieving meaningful participation in co-design processes (2023)

[\(Available from the DSDHA website\)](#)

Supported by the RIBA, UCL and architecture practice DSDHA, this guide provides rigorous reflection on the philosophy and practice of co-design and its connections to wider social and political contexts. It includes case studies, practical checklists and guidance.

Kelly Ann McKercher: Beyond Sticky Notes: Co-design for Real: Mindsets, methods and movements (2020)

<https://www.beyondstickynotes.com>.

Book containing guidance, tools and templates from a pioneering practitioner. Not specifically focused on architecture or planning, but the information translatable.

B. LANGUAGE AND TERMINOLOGY

Definitions and glossaries of co-design and associated processes.

Tom Greenall, Jane Wong, Lydia Toohey: Towards Spatial Justice: A guide for achieving meaningful participation in co-design processes (2023) – Pages 50-54.

[\(Available from the DSDHA website\)](#)

Supported by the RIBA, UCL and architecture practice DSDHA, this guide includes a detailed glossary of co-design terms, attitudes and activities.

The Co-production Network for Wales (2022) Glossary of Engagement Terminology.

[\(Available from the Co-production Network for Wales website\)](#)

A community of practice focused on co-production and citizen involvement, sharing guidance and support for practitioners in the field. This glossary explores terms around engagement, co-production and co-design.

C. CHOOSING CO-DESIGN

Deciding whether co-design is the right process for your project is a vital stage that requires detailing questioning (see Principle 1). The resources explore this further.

Beyond Sticky Notes (Kelly Ann McKercher): But is it co-design?

[\(Available at Beyond Sticky Notes website\)](#)

An interactive tool that leads you through a series of questions, underpinned by years of expertise in research and delivery of co-design.

The IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation

[\(Available at the IAP2 website\)](#)

A framework used internationally to help determine the level of participation required for the public's role in a public participation process. Further discussion and explanation by research and evaluation experts Scarlatti here.

Think Local Act Personal: Ladder of Coproduction

[\(Available from Think Local Act Personal website\)](#)

An exploration of the spectrum of participatory processes from co-production to coercion by Think Local Act Personal – a national partnership of more than 50 organisations committed to transforming health and care through personalisation and community-based support.

D. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES AND ORGANISATIONAL DYNAMICS

Resources to help you think about how power is shared on your project, how decisions are taken, and how this sits within your wider organisational delivery.

Campus Compact Minnesota: Power Mapping (2022)

[\(Available from the Campus Compact Minnesota website\)](#)

Thorough instructions – in the form of a workshop plan – to help with preparation of power maps. A useful process both to think about how power is held now, and by whom, and what kind of power dynamics might be necessary to effect change on a future-facing project or issue.

Community Led Housing London: Co-Production in Housing and Regeneration: A Framework For Communities and Practitioners (2022)

[\(Available from the Community Led Housing London website\)](#)

Although focused on the more ambitious co-production, the guidance in this thorough briefing is equally applicable to co-design, and all framed within the lens of “re-shaping power dynamics”. Thoughtful advice on how to consider, and then establish, structures for decision-making, management, meetings etc.

Grassroots Collective: Using a Stakeholder Analysis to Identify Key Local Actors (2022)

[\(Available from the Grassroots Collective website\)](#)

Detailed guidance on preparing a stakeholder analysis – also known as ‘community mapping’ – from this community development volunteer organisation.

Sophia De Sousa (The Glass-House Community-Led Design): Engaging Communities in Design Decision-Making (2022)

[\(Available from The Glass-House website\)](#)

Reflections from the CEO of this long-established design charity, over a series of blog posts, on two decades of placing community voices at the heart of design decision-making. The wider website shared many case studies of their work.

ABOUT GOOD GROWTH BY DESIGN

The Mayor's Good Growth by Design programme seeks to enhance the design of the built environment to create a city that works for all Londoners. This means development and growth should benefit everyone who lives here. As such, it should be sensitive to the local context, environmentally sustainable and physically accessible.

The programme calls on all involved in London's growing architectural, design and built environment professions to help realise the Mayor's vision.

Good Growth by Design uses the skills of both the Mayor's Design Advocates and the wider sector. This includes teams here at City Hall, the London Boroughs and other public bodies.

The programme covers six pillars of activity:

SETTING STANDARDS & INFORMING DELIVERY

Undertaking design research and identifying best practice in architecture, urban design and place-shaping, to support the development of clear policies and standards, and improve the quality of London's built environment.

ENSURING QUALITY

Ensuring effective design review across London, including through the London Review Panel.

BUILDING CAPACITY

Enhancing the GLA Group's and borough's ability to shape new development that will deliver good growth.

SUPPORTING DIVERSITY

Working towards a more representative sector and striving for best practice while designing for diversity.

COMMISSIONING QUALITY

Ensuring excellence in how the Mayor and other public sector clients appoint and manage architects and other built environment professionals.

CHAMPIONING & LEARNING

Advocating for the sector and for best practice and evaluating the programme's impact.

THE MAYOR'S DESIGN ADVOCATES

The Mayor's Design Advocates are 42 built environment professionals. They were chosen for their skill and experience to help the Mayor support London's growth through the Good Growth by Design programme. They are independent and impartial, and provide support, advice, critique and expertise on London's built environment. The group includes practitioners, academics, policy makers and those from community-led schemes.

CONTRIBUTORS AND THANKS

This Process Note has been co-produced by the following hands and voices:

Kate Batchelor, Peabody
Rumi Bose, Regeneration Consultant
Sarah Considine, GLA Regeneration
Deborah Efemini, DECK Social
Daisy Froud, Co-Design Facilitator & MDA
Mellis Haward, Archio
Riina Heinonen, GLA
Claire Jamieson, Consultant Editor + Writer
Nicola Murphy-Evans, GLA Environment Team
Matt Ruddy, GLA Regeneration
Rose Shaw, City of Westminster
Ashmi Thapar, Bell Phillips Architects

With significant input and learning from wider teams at Bell Phillips Architects, Groundwork London, London Borough of Hounslow, muf architecture/art, Peabody Thamesmead, and from the South Thamesmead Community Design Collective

Copyright
Greater London Authority July 2023

Published by
Greater London Authority,
City Hall,
Kamal Chunchie Way,
London
E16 1ZE

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Regeneration Team
Greater London Authority,
City Hall,
Kamal Chunchie Way,
London
E16 1ZE

www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/regeneration/advice-and-guidance/about-good-growth-design

goodgrowthbydesign@london.gov.uk

For a large print, Braille, disc, sign language video or audio-tape version of this document, please contact us at the address below:

Public Liaison Unit	Telephone 020 7983 4000
Greater London Authority	Minicom 020 7983 4458
City Hall, London E16 1ZE	www.london.gov.uk

You will need to supply your name, your postal address and state the format and title of the publication you require.

If you would like a summary of this document in your language, please phone the number or contact us at the address above.

