



FOR INFORMATION PUBLIC OPEN SESSION

TO: Planning & Budget Committee

SPONSOR: Scott Mabury, Vice President, University Operations

CONTACT INFO: 416-978-7116, scott.mabury@utoronto.ca

PRESENTER: Gilbert Delgado, Chief University Planning, Design & Construction

CONTACT INFO: 416-978-6844, gilbert.delgado@utoronto.ca

DATE: April 26, 2018 for May 09, 2018

AGENDA ITEM: 5

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Design Review Committee: Annual Report, 2017

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

Planning and Budget Committee receives reports for information.

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. Planning and Budget [for information] (May 09, 2018)

HIGHLIGHTS:

During 2017, the Design Review Committee (DRC) reviewed several major projects that individually and collectively improve the physical beauty of the campus while providing for much needed new space and functional improvements. The projects represent new construction, as well as renovation and landscape projects demonstrating that a campus is comprised of quality buildings and open space that together contribute to the student experience. Additionally, the committee reviewed the campus's Secondary Plan Urban Design Guidelines to understand the context of future buildings and public spaces.

Between January and December of 2017, the committee met six times to review sixteen projects. Last year, the committee reviewed the following major projects across the three campuses:

St. George Campus

- Centre for Civilization, Cultures and Cities
- Robarts Library Commons
- Laneway Housing
- University of Toronto Schools

Mississauga Campus

• Meeting Place Project

Scarborough Campus

- Valley Land Trail Project
- Procurement Process for Design-Build Student Residence (special subcommittee to review design submissions from the proponents.)

Membership of the Design Review Committee as of December 2017:

Bruce Kuwabara (Co-Chair) KPMB Architects, Partner

Gilbert Delgado (Co-Chair), Chief, University Planning Design & Construction

Paul Bedford, Paul Bedford & Associates, Principal

Carl Blanchaer, WZMH Architects, Principal

Don Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects, Principal

Jane Pepino, QC, Aird & Berlis LLP (municipal lawyer & Governing Council member)

Richard Sommer, Dean Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design

Christine Burke, (Executive Secretary) Director, Campus & Facilities Planning

Costas Catsaros, Director of Project Development, University Planning Design & Construction

Adrienne De Francesco, Executive Director, Capital Projects Group, University Planning Design & Construction

Susan Senese, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto Mississauga Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief Strategy Officer, University of Toronto Scarborough

At DRC meetings, projects are presented by the design team for each project to the DRC. Teams present the projects at least twice and on an as need basis, additional presentations are reviewed. The first review occurs at an early schematic design stage. This is intended to establish that the proposed building and landscape concept is contextually appropriate to the site and campus and addresses urban design criteria and massing as delineated by the University's master plans as well as campus wide issues of parking, loading, traffic impact, accessibility and servicing. At this meeting, the DRC reviews building design requirements such as: internal functionality, opportunities to elevate student experience, flexibility/adaptability options and interconnectivity with other buildings.

A second review and follow-up discussions between consultants and the DRC occur when the project is in the design development phase where details of the building have been determined and are better refined.

The landscape plan is reviewed for the articulation of open space within the site, opportunities for synthesis with adjacent areas and interconnectivity to the wider campus. Finally the palette of materials and signage is considered. Throughout the process, the DRC review is considered within the budgetary framework of the project.

The DRC conducts reviews of the strength of ideas proposed and provides guidance to explore options that otherwise might not have developed. In its deliberations, the DRC is mindful of the difficult trade-off between expectations, budgetary reality and long term faculty goals, seeking a balanced approach to the resolution of design concerns. The DRC is not tasked with the design of the project, but to work with design teams to set high expectations for design, in all aspects.

Projects are also reviewed with respect to sustainability and environmental concerns as these continue to be more important in our built environment and impact the ongoing operating costs of our buildings.

The complete mandate of the Design Review Committee is defined in Design Review Committee Terms of Reference found on the University Planning Design and Construction website. This mandate was approved by Governing Council in June, 2014.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:		
None		
RECOMMENDATION:		
For Information		
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:		

None

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE 2017 ANNUAL REPORT

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE

MAY 09, 2018

CENTRE FOR CIVILIZATION, CULTURES & CITIES

DILLER SCOFIDIO + RENFRO & ARCHITECTS ALLIANCE















ROBARTS COMMON

DIAMOND SCHMITT ARCHITECTS

- Tenders came in higher than the budget, so significant cost cutting resulted in substituting glass curtain wall with more economical steel panel system,
- DRC reviewed the revised design and encouraged an approach to utilize glass more effectively,
- Project was carefully reconsidered and successfully tendered with the glass wall system











HURON SUSSEX LANEWAY HOUSING

BAIRD SAMPSON NEUERT ARCHITECTS











UTSCHOOLS

DIAMOND SCHMITT ARCHITECTS







UTM MEETING PLACE

MORIYAMA & TESHIMA ARCHITECTS







UTSC VALLEY LAND TRAIL

SCHOLLEN & COMPANY



UTSC STUDENT RESIDENCE

- Design-build approach required a rethinking of the DRC'S engagement,
- Some of the committee members were on competing teams,
- Design-build process does not facilitate an iterative design process that facilitates incremental design input from owner,
- So a subcommittee was formed to look at designs during the competition process and provide their scores to the evaluation committee



NOT THE DESIGN: MASSING DIAGRAM TO SHOW RELATIVE SCALE

