

Evaluators name: Adriana Marques								
Evaluation Criteria	max points	weighting						
alignment with project objectives:								
1. alignment with LLDC priority themes esp 'promoting convergence and community participation'	5	10%	3	5	0	4	2	5
2. build local ownership inc links between local artist and resident communities	5	10%	3	3	1	5	3	3
3. opportunities for education, learning, culture and innovation inc business development	5	10%	3	4	0	5	2	5
4. To make visible and raise the profile of the creative and artistic strengths of the local area and to attract external visitors	5	10%	3	4	1	5	3	4
5. contribution to positive relationship between HWFI communities and QEOP/LLDC projects	5	10%	2	4	1	4	2	4
Deliverability of proposals within timescales and resourcing identified	5	30%	4	4	3	3	3	3
previous experience esp of working within HWFI and 6 host boroughs	5	10%	4	4	0	4	2	4
understanding of the brief and quality of response	5	10%	3	5	0	5	3	5
sub total		100%	66	82	24	82	52	78
any additional comments			Unclear as to whether they would need to occupy the whole site for 12 weeks, or if they only need the site for 2 weeks in October. If the latter, it could run alongside [REDACTED]	While a very solid and innovative proposal, worry that it targets very specific audiences (albeit important and often hard to reach audiences) and does not have the flexibility to expand or grow into other areas. Would planning permission be needed? Crucial to delivery schedule.	Blunt commercial opportunity, with little regard or interest in community engagement	Remains very flexible with opportunity to grow and develop over the summer and collaborate with others. List of partnerships is already impressive and presents a 'shared' space proposal.	With some further development could work very well with [REDACTED]	A solid and thorough proposal, but concerned that the aim of engaging with local communities is too conceptual and does not actually consider the active communities already in existence. Timeline also shows a physical presence will only manifest in October. Therefore could this run alongside [REDACTED]

Evaluators name: Daniel Fordham								
Evaluation Criteria	max points	weighting						
alignment with project objectives:								
1. alignment with LLDC priority themes esp 'promoting convergence and community participation'	5	10%	3	4	1	3	2	5
2. build local ownership inc links between local artist and resident communities	5	10%	4	2	1	3	2	4
3. opportunities for education, learning, culture and innovation inc business development	5	10%	4	4	2	4	3	4
4. To make visible and raise the profile of the creative and artistic strengths of the local area and to attract external visitors	5	10%	2	2	2	3	2	4
5. contribution to positive relationship between HWFI communities and QEOP/LLDC projects	5	10%	4	2	2	4	3	4
Deliverability of proposals within timescales and resourcing identified	5	30%	2	1	2	2	1	4
previous experience esp of working within HWFI and 6 host boroughs	5	10%	3	2	1	5	2	5
understanding of the brief and quality of response	5	10%	5	4	0	3	2	5
sub total		100%	62	46	30	62	38	86
any additional comments			Good proposal with impressive experience of delivering similar projects. Short period of occupation proposed - could/should work alongside other projects. Key concern is budget - implausibly low costs, and not clear how even these would be met.	Exciting proposal in some respects, but some concerns about inclusivity - relatively narrow appeal of activities, and esp. entrance fees for participation. No info on costs/budget gives rise to concerns about deliverability, esp. given implied costs in staffing, security etc. Also given period of project, possible need for planning permission - change of use and structures?	Although inclusion of local food suppliers is positive, very limited engagement with brief.	Interesting project, and impressive track record and list of partners, but currently feels a bit vague/unformed - no real sense of what this would look/feel like. In need of further development, in particular around activation of space and engagement of communities. Also concerns about discrepancy between identified costs and funding.	May offer potential, but proposal is underdeveloped and needs more work to provide clarity about what the project would deliver and how. With that additional work, could perhaps be one of a number of projects accommodated on the site.	Very strong proposal - the only one that clearly describes what would be delivered and how (including realistic costs and funding). Presumably would not require planning permission as structure would only be in place for part of October. May also have potential to accommodate/work alongside some of the other stronger projects.

Evaluators name: Karen West									
Evaluation Criteria	max points	weighting							
alignment with project objectives:									
1. alignment with LLDC priority themes esp 'promoting convergence and community participation'	5	10%	3	5	0	4	2		3
2. build local ownership inc links between local artist and resident communities	5	10%	3	3	1	4	3		3
3. opportunities for education, learning, culture and innovation inc business development	5	10%	3	4	0	5	2		2
4. To make visible and raise the profile of the creative and artistic strengths of the local area and to attract external visitors	5	10%	3	4	1	4	3		2
5. contribution to positive relationship between HWFI communities and QEOP/LLDC projects	5	10%	3	5	1	4	2		4
Deliverability of proposals within timescales and resourcing identified	5	30%	4	5	3	3	3		3
previous experience esp of working within HWFI and 6 host boroughs	5	10%	4	4	0	4	2		4
understanding of the brief and quality of response	5	10%	3	5	0	5	3		4
sub total		100%	68	90	24	78	52		62
any additional comments			Unclear as to whether they would need to occupy the whole site for 12 weeks, or if they only need the site for 2 week sin October. If the latter, it could run along side [REDACTED]	good links with our policy objectives and volunteering opportunities, not sure it will be an iconic facility but good sustainable objectives and portable, proposal strongly aligns to sporting outcomes and exssiitng projects, technical issues to be clarified and good experience of previous projects, good links with artisit possible. Check admission charges are affordable to local sand accessibilty messaging eg surface, worry that it targets very specific audiences (albeit important and often hard to reach audiences) Would planning permission be needed? Crucial to delivery schedule.	Tone and pitch too commercial - lacks community focus in terms of LLDC priority themes - little activation for participants, no links with existing projects	sponsorship tbc - does this mean risk of delay/day time only , security and staffing ?	With some further development could work very well with [REDACTED]	very specific proposal, good link with convergence and green agenda, too much down time before the projects starts to deliver any real activation but could share the space	

Evaluators name: Lindsey Scannapieco									
Evaluation Criteria	max points	weighting							
alignment with project objectives:									
1. alignment with LLDC priority themes esp 'promoting convergence and community participation'	5	10%	3	4	2	4	3		4
2. build local ownership inc links between local artist and resident communities	5	10%	4	3	3	4	2		3
3. opportunities for education, learning, culture and innovation inc business development	5	10%	3	4	2	4	2		3
4. To make visible and raise the profile of the creative and artistic strengths of the local area and to attract external visitors	5	10%	2	4	1	3	3		2
5. contribution to positive relationship between HWFI communities and QEOP/LLDC projects	5	10%	3	4	1	4	2		3
Deliverability of proposals within timescales and resourcing identified	5	30%	4	4	3	3	1		3
previous experience esp of working within HWFI and 6 host boroughs	5	10%	4	3	1	4	2		4
understanding of the brief and quality of response	5	10%	2	4	2	4	2		4
sub total		100%	66	76	42	72	38		64
any additional comments			Active use only proposed for 14 day period in September. Potentially could work along another proposal as ideally will be activated immediately.	Planning permissions would be required which may be difficult on the programme timescale. Could be an active, engaging use, and visible to both local residents and visitors via Overground.	Only operational during Gamestime and does not lead to longer term engagement. Due to previous conversations, seems there is frustration which may be difficult to manage/mitigate.	Interesting proposal that could be engaging for local community. Cost seems high for quality delivered.	Proposal not thoroughly developed and does not seem acheivable to secure [REDACTED] in project programme.	Proposal does not activate site until September and therefore could maybe work alongside another proposal. Approach seems similar to [REDACTED].	

Evaluators name: Rosie Holcroft									
Evaluation Criteria	max points	weighting							
alignment with project objectives:									
1. alignment with LLDC priority themes esp 'promoting convergence and community participation'	5	10%	3	5	2	4	2		4
2. build local ownership inc links between local artist and resident communities	5	10%	3	3	1	4	2		3
3. opportunities for education, learning, culture and innovation inc business development	5	10%	3	4	1	4	2		4
4. To make visible and raise the profile of the creative and artistic strengths of the local area and to attract external visitors	5	10%	2	4	1	4	2		3
5. contribution to positive relationship between HWFI communities and QEOP/LLDC projects	5	10%	3	4	1	4	3		3
Deliverability of proposals within timescales and resourcing identified	5	30%	2	3	2	3	1		2
previous experience esp of working within HWFI and 6 host boroughs	5	10%	4	3	1	3	2		4
understanding of the brief and quality of response	5	10%	3	4	1	4	2		3
sub total		100%	54	72	28	72	36		60
any additional comments			Activity mainly off-site, with occupation for 10-14 days in October. Small scale and could work with another proposal?	I like the proposal, but would need careful management to engage some of the residents who are older. Would have scoerd higher if brief included more on sport [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Scored 3 as made links with providers working in the area	Food outlet, but what happens in the space? How local people engaged? How creative community engaged? Could hinder relationship with local people as doesn't engage them and may not be a good neighbour e.g. Noise, waste etc	V good project idea. Strong collaborations. Outreach / opening event maybe need to encourage local residents to participate. [REDACTED] and intergenerational work. Volunteers could link into timebanking scheme and small project cost should be put against volunteers to cover expenses (travel, food)	Nice concept, but not best use of space and project needs a lot of development.	Could build on mapping your manor. Good concept but only 2 week occupation of site, plus timetable to re-use materials from the site - would need to test deliverability, if feasible, could be considered on another site? Budget needs review & confirming	

Evaluators name: Eleanor Fawcett								
Evaluation Criteria	max points	weighting						
alignment with project objectives:								
1. alignment with LLDC priority themes esp 'promoting convergence and community participation'	5	10%	3	5	2	5	2	4
2. build local ownership inc links between local artist and resident communities	5	10%	3	4	1	4	3	2
3. opportunities for education, learning, culture and innovation inc business development	5	10%	2	4	3	3	3	3
4. To make visible and raise the profile of the creative and artistic strengths of the local area and to attract external visitors	5	10%	3	4	3	3	2	2
5. contribution to positive relationship between HWFI communities and QFOP/LLDC projects	5	10%	3	4	2	4	3	4
Deliverability of proposals within timescales and resourcing identified	5	30%	3	5	4	3	3	3
previous experience esp of working within HWFI and 6 host boroughs	5	10%	3	3	2	4	2	5
understanding of the brief and quality of response	5	10%	3	4	3	4	2	4
sub total		100%	58	86	56	72	52	66
any additional comments			doing work with the yard, potential to link with the project anyway? Only a 2-week use of the site in October (or sept). They have a dome. £2k needed.	good proposal and seems viable and with decent experience. Good links to new audience. No apparent connections with the area - link with streets united potential?	attitude towards LLDC in application is very worrying - not promising for a good working relationship. Feasibility of F+B given status of utilities etc? Unclear concept - indian food or local cafes? Do we need more cafes?	good proposal, very good local connections and links, excellent range of users. to education. Funding issue? They would need to source materials etc - check realism. Concerns over weather dependency.	could share, Sept-mid Nov. Compatible with other uses? Can provide shed.	materials to reuse not available in time? Sept-oct - not long enough to be worthwhile? 1/3 of site needed - could be part of another project. Good to build on youth panel etc. Meets objectives.
AVERAGE TOTAL			63	74	36	73	47	72