

The entry by Katie Fisher and Daniel Duffield was selected as the winning canopy design for Beckenham Green. This was informed by feedback given during the 18<sup>th</sup> January 2018 BTCWG meeting and from the jury involved, this includes: Cllr Tickner, (Chair of BTCWG); Kevin Munnely, (LBB Head of Renewal and Recreation); Patrick Phillips, (Director of Parks Management Strategy); Robert Buckley, (LBB Principle Conservation Officer); Chloe-Jane Ross, (Chair of Copers Cope Residents' Association); Alan Old, (Co-Chair of Copers Cope Residents' Association); Dr. John Parker (The Beckenham Society) and Sylvia Ramos, (LBB Regeneration Project Planner).

Minor design changes will be required to ensure a long term low maintenance canopy. This includes: omission of the canopy's proposed pocket doors and potential of altering the cladding material. The omission of the pocket doors is solely based on the maintenance needs required to keep them moving i.e. cost of a mechanical function or if manual, the health and safety requirements and weight consideration for anyone who may be closing/opening the structure; and consideration of a key holder(s) which would limit the use and accessibility for the community to use it regularly.

The specified cladding materials as per the entry are: Charred Larch for the outer walls of the canopy and Siberian Larch for its internal walls. Following discussions with cladding specialists it was advised that larch wood is not as weather durable as other woods, namely accoya and kebono wood.

Consideration should also be given to how this wood may be affected by fire and graffiti. The use of a fire retardant would classify the wood at a Euroclass B standard, as outlined in table 1. The easiest form of removing graffiti from wood is painting over it; however this would likely have negative aesthetic effects on natural and charred wood. Another option is applying an anti-graffiti clear lacquer; however this will need to be deliberated further during the detailed design stage with the appointed manufacturer. Please note this option would still require cleaning for graffiti removal. Other low-maintenance material options will be discussed in more detail with the manufacturer.

Please find appended the full winning entry by Katie Fisher and Daniel Duffield.

**Sylvia Ramos—LBB Regeneration Project Planner**

21<sup>st</sup> May 2018

Table 1. *Indicative performance descriptions and fire scenarios for Euroclasses*

Class	Performance description	Fire scenario and heat attack		Examples of products
A1	No contribution to fire	Fully developed fire in a room	At least 60 kW/m <sup>2</sup>	Products of natural stone, concrete, bricks, ceramic, glass, steel and many metallic products
A2	“	“	“	Products similar to those of class A1, including small amounts of organic compounds
B	Very limited contribution to fire	Single burning item in a room	40 kW/m <sup>2</sup> on a limited area	Gypsum boards with different (thin) surface linings Fire retardant wood products
C	Limited contribution to fire	“	“	Phenolic foam, gypsum boards with different surface linings (thicker than in class B)
D	Acceptable contribution to fire	“	“	Wood products with thickness ≥ about 10 mm and density ≥ about 400 kg/m <sup>3</sup> (depending on end use)
E	“	Small flame attack	Flame height of 20 mm	Low density fibreboard, plastic based insulation products
F	No performance requirements	–	–	Products not tested (no requirements)