**1.0 Introduction**

1.1 This is the Rebuttal Statement of Sir David Adjaye OBE addressing the Proof of Evidence of Rowan Moore (CD: D17) in relation to APP/X5990/V/19/3240661. Please note that I have not sought to rebut all areas of disagreement between us, and my lack of mention of other matters raised should not be construed as my implicit agreement to them

**2.0 In response to Rowan Moore’s 4.1 statement**

***2.1 ‘If there are to be both a memorial and a learning centre, why was this site chosen, which is too small to accommodate both uses*** ‘

The site is suitable for our concept – we purposefully chose for the Learning Centre to be underground. Our intention is to create a space where 100% of the visitor’s focus is drawn to the content of the Learning Centre. With no views, we create the immersive experience which forms an integral part of our concept. We have created a skylight which brings one point of natural light into the underground space and acts as a moment of reflection for the visitors, before they ascend upwards on leaving. Above ground we have maintained all the uses of the park and have improved existing facilities.

***2.2 ‘The decision to combine a memorial and a learning centre in a single architectural object has practical consequences, such as security and access considerations, which conflict with both the character of Victoria Tower Gardens and the potential for creating a memorial that is both impactful and contemplative.’***

We have spent a significant amount of time developing thorough security and access systems with specialist consultants to ensure the highest level of security function that do not dominate the visitor’s experience. The security process has been designed with a seamless quality and a subtlety that will neither hinder nor mark the visitor’s experience. Through the ticketing strategy, developed by specialist ticketing consultants, we can ensure that the number of visitors is monitored and is in keeping with the capacity of the park. The curated journey that we have purposefully created allows Memorial visitors to experience the Memorial and Learning Centre in tandem with the park’s surroundings. The journey, as well as the form, provide an impact and prepares the visitor for contemplation. For instance, the Memorial courtyard is slightly sunken which reduces the noise from within the park as visitors prepare to enter the Memorial and descend into the Learning Centre.

***2.3 ‘There seems to be little profound thought about what it means to create a Holocaust Memorial in this time, about 80 years on from the Second World War, and in this country. There should be good answers to these questions, but there doesn’t seem to be a serious attempt to find them, beyond a well-intentioned wish that it would be good to commemorate the Holocaust in some way. There is little sign of a strong guiding idea of the kind that is characteristic of the most successful memorials.’***

A considerable and significant amount of thought, research, survivor engagement and public consultation has been undertaken. Our concept for the UK Holocaust Memorial and Learning Centre centres on an approach that encompasses both traditional memorial architecture, with reflection and remembrance, but also focuses on teaching, understanding and a call to action to prevent the hate and lack of tolerance that is still so prevalent in our country today. This project is about commemoration, learning and reflection, with a view to how we apply that learning to combat intolerance and introduce acceptance as the way forward.

**3.0 In response to Rowan Moore’s 4.2 Flaws in the design**

***3.1 ‘The proposed memorial and learning centre are too large to go on this site. Victoria Tower Gardens is a small, intimate and informal public space. As a consequence, considerable financial and creative expenditure goes into concealing the true scale of the project.’***

The size of the site accommodates this project; the underground nature of the Learning Centre was always intentional and integral to the visitor's journey and our concept and has not attributed to *‘considerable financial and creative expenditure’* beyond that anticipated. Our ticketing strategy will regulate the visitor numbers and our improvements to the playground and café kiosk will service existing park users.

***3.2 ‘The power of the memorial’s forms is also reduced by the number of different elements crowding in on it.’***

The Memorial is not crowded by extraneous elements; all detailing and the inclusion of railings (which follow suit of all Royal Parks), surrounding the Memorial courtyard have been intentionally softened with planting to suit the immediate surroundings. The journey points are also sufficiently spaced, for example the entrance pavilion is 40m from the Memorial.

***3.3 ‘The designs do not “fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings” (NPPF 131). They do not “add to the overall quality of the area,” and are not “visually attractive [or] sympathetic to local character and history”.’***

Our design is based on the surroundings of the Royal Park – the intention has always been to celebrate the park, improve its current facilities and retain the uses of the park for visitors to enjoy. We have stated before that the underground Learning Centre is an intentional aspect of the journey and helps retain park use. Our material choice has been taken directly from materials already used in the park, and bronze, stone and planting can all be found in the existing memorials in the park. The only material which is a new introduction is the crimpled stainless steel located on top of the fins; however, the nature of this material is reflective, which follows one of our concept themes of reflection, and the bronze of the fins will be reflected off the steel.

**4.0 in response to Rowan Moore’s 4.2.2 The parts - both the spaces and the objects - don’t relate to each other.**

***4.1 ‘The applicants state that “memorials are most successful when they are contextualised in the history they represent” (DAS 4.1.2 p92). This is highly debatable’***

We believe that the power of this memorial is defined by its ability to facilitate remembrance and learning, which we think the memorials of the future could be capable of. Daily visitors to the park can view the Memorial from various aspects of the park if they so wish, and ticketed visitors will have the full experience of the Memorial and Learning Centre. Both opportunities allow contemplation and the location reinforces the responsibility of a working democratic process to protect all citizens.

***4.2 ‘A learning centre and a memorial offer very different forms of remembering. They are different in experiences and mood. A memorial is typically quiet and reflective, where visitors develop their own thoughts and emotions. A learning centre usually includes recorded sound and moving images; it directs your thoughts. A memorial tends to use natural light for its effect, a learning centre tends to be an enclosed black box with artificial light.* *Memorials are usually not ticketed but allow people to approach them unhindered. In this case the combination with the learning centre destroys such openness.’***

We are actively encouraging different forms of remembering. The journey through the project will allow visitors to have their own thoughts and emotions, and the entrance pavilion and Memorial courtyard provide the space to prepare and readjust to the surroundings. The Memorial courtyard acts as the place of pause that you find in other memorials, to look up at the Memorial; it invites you stand or sit and reflect at the Memorial. The descent to the Learning Centre through the Memorial is purposefully visceral and the underground space will inform and bring into focus the content that is provided. A skylight brings an element of natural light into the underground space which provides visitors with a moment of reflection. With the ascension back into the park, into the natural light and the open space, we hope that evokes feelings of hope and clarity for the visitors. The international significance of this Memorial requires a considered and responsible approach to its openness to ensure it is treated respectfully. This Memorial has international reach and thus the increased interest that brings; however, everyday park users will still be able to observe and appreciate the Memorial from various views within the park. We have also worked to ensure the existing memorials are highlighted within the park to inform the many people who are not aware of their existence or significance. The existing memorials in the gardens have allowed people to enjoy the space and respect their presence.

***4.3 ‘It is of course possible to have spaces of different moods in the same complex, but it requires some architectural manoeuvring to make the transition from one to the other. Lack of space makes this more difficult: the danger is that the memorial will function as a portico to the learning centre, a place of transition rather than one where you pause and contemplate. The progression from one to the other is likely to be abrupt.’***

The entrance pavilion and Memorial courtyard serve as appropriate transition spaces, so the full power of the Memorial and Learning Centre can be experienced. The progression is gentle and, with a 40m distance, should not be considered abrupt. The noise is reduced in the Memorial Courtyard due to being slightly sunken; however, we did not wish it to be completely silent and when you enter the Memorial the sense of stillness starts to heighten.

***4.4 ‘The choice of site necessitates the retention of the children’s playground. It is unusual to have such a thing next to a major memorial of international significance, for the obvious reason that the noise and activity of child’s play creates an opposite mood to that of solemn remembrance.’***

The playground will not hinder the experience within the Memorial and Learning Centre, and similarly the playground will not cease to entertain children due to their positioning and proximity. The playground has been a success even with the existence of the original memorials, and although ours is of international significance we believe that the playground will still hold that attraction for the children. We have actively, since the start of this design process, encouraged that the use of the park remains intact.

**5.0 in response to Rowan Moore’s 4.2.2.2 Objects:**

***5.1 ‘Adjaye Associates and Ron Arad Architects have strongly contrasting architectural styles and personalities. Here the memorial and the entrance pavilion take very different approaches’***

The team won the competition, part of this was based on their relationships with one another and their response to one another. Each practice has expressed as part of their ethos that experimentation, environment, cultural heritage, and a sculptural ability have formed an integral part of their individual design process. As a team we have always embraced a fluid and honest dialogue which strengthens our ability to work and design collectively. Every aspect of this design has been coordinated, created, and celebrated as a team – where all of our collective experience, expertise and style has formed a project that we are all proud of. The differences you see in the project are considered moves to ensure that the pieces fulfil their purpose and reflect the concept and realisation devised by the team. Where some may see differences, we see a strong collaborative piece of architecture that illustrates a multi-faceted journey. The memorial fins are the focal point of this project above ground. This was agreed and determined when the team came together in 2016/2017 for the competition. The entrance pavilion, Memorial courtyard and landscaping are softer, strategic elements that facilitate the Memorial and which in turn introduces the Learning Centre. There is no conflict in these pieces; this is a considered and connected piece of design.

***5.2 ‘There is also powerful and distinctive existing architecture on and near the site – especially the Buxton Memorial Fountain and the Palace of Westminster.’***

***‘The use of the two new and contrasting styles exacerbates what was in any case a challenge with this project, the potentially cacophonous combination of different types of architecture.’***

There are many examples of new and old architectural styles working cohesively together, for instance Portcullis House that sits opposite the Houses of Parliament. All of our materials, with the exception of the limited use of reflective crimpled stainless steel (see 3.3) and references for the project have been instructed by existing structures and local vernacular of the area. There is a strong and cohesive dialogue between the old and the new.

***5.3 ‘The handling of the Buxton Memorial Fountain is awkward.’***

The interaction between the Buxton Memorial and the UK Holocaust Memorial has been strengthened by their position. Our memorial is lower in height than the Buxton Memorial to aid this sensitive collaboration, making the dialogue between the two memorials stronger. Previously the Buxton Memorial was situated in the middle of the park, with little relationship to the other memorials and with no opportunity to sit and reflect. With the reorientation of the Buxton Memorial we have brought it into a cohesive relationship with the memorials and created a space, with seating, where visitors can take their time to view and reflect.

***5.4 ‘The image at DAS Addendum 2.2, p15, “View from Lambeth Bridge”, shows the disparate nature of the elements quite clearly.’***

Our material elements are intentional and have a relationship with their surroundings. The railings emulate all Royal Park railings and the bronze and stone are featured in the other existing memorials. The planting represents the park landscape and the limited use of glass affords transparency and views. These are muted palettes that surrender themselves to the natural surroundings.

**6.0 in response to Rowan Moore’s 4.2.3 The designs are generic.**

***6.1 ‘The most powerful memorials are singular responses to singular situations.’***

This project demonstrates a different approach to memorial design. We believe that its benefits can be found in its immersive and revelatory experience. The success of memorials is not only determined by what has been created previously. We have taken from those designs and created a new approach which aspires to be interactive and a call to action to ensure that remembrance can also attribute to positive change.

**7.0 in response to RM’s 4.2.5 Detailed observations**

***7.1‘The depth of the learning centre also requires wheelchair users to take lifts, although a ramped exit route is available to them. I would submit that there is little that is spiritual or reflective about a ride in a lift: if the downward passage between the bronze fins is a fundamental part of the proposed experience, wheelchair users will only have access to an inferior version.’***

The lift available is glass, so the experience of the descent will still be visual for those who need to use it.