Quality

in Canada's Built Environment:

Roadmaps to Equity, Social Value and Sustainablity

Second annual convention of partners and representatives of stakeholders across Canada

Final student reports on roundtables

Online, December 2022

Edited by Jean-Pierre Chupin, PhD
Scientific Director of the SSHRC Partnership on Quality

Canada Research Chair in
Architecture, Competitions and Mediations of Excellence

FINAL STUDENT REPORTS ON ROUNDTABLES

Second Annual Convention, Online

December 2022

SSHRC Research Partnership
(#895-2022-1003)

Edited by Jean-Pierre Chupin, PhD, CRC-ACME, Université de Montréal

Roundtable 1a – UCalgary & UToronto & DalhousieU – Dec 1
Thursday, December 01, 2022, from 14:45 to 16.15.

Authors of the summary:
- Sonia Kamal, Mplan student (University of Calgary)
Date of submission: 2023 / 01 / 09

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

*Researchers***:**
- **Brian Lilley**, Dalhousie University
- **Martha Radice**, Dalhousie University
- **Derek Reilly,** Dalhousie University
- **Brian Sinclair**, University of Calgary

Citizen groups:
- **Meaghon Reid**, Vibrant Communities Calgary
- **Joan Lawrence**, Calgary Alliance for the Common Good
- **Kevin Ng**, Rick Hansen Foundation

Cities and procurement:
- **Jeanie Gartly**, Canadian Association of Heritage Professional
- **Leah Perrin**, Halifax Regional Municipality
- **David Down**, City of Calgary
- **Amanda Lapointe**, PSPC

Award organisations:
- **Susan Speigel**, Ontario Association of Architects (OAA)
- **Samuel Oboh**, Alberta Association of Architects (AAA)

Students:
- **Sneha Mandhan**, University of Toronto
- **Theo Page-Robert**, University of Montreal
- **Stavros Kondeas**, Dalhousie University
- **Nooshin Esmaeili**, University of Calgary
- **Sonia Kamal**, University of Calgary

The meeting mainly focused on sharing experiences and discussing about some of the challenges that researchers are facing and exchanging ideas about the how each of the cities are perceiving the respective solutions.

See the Research Though Community's Eyes

For Calgary team, the template for analyzing the case studies which was too formal and largely based on the aesthetics of Architecture and landscapes. In October, A meeting was held in the Federation of Calgary communities where the attendees reminded that it was intimidating for them, as there were high level theoretical presentations. The participants strongly opposed the idea of university doing theoretical research and telling them the outcome and suggested that researchers should include the citizen and see the research though the community's eyes. There were discussions about the important of lived experience and how often academics view things from a very high level and observe and make decision rather than talking to the people they need to talk to. Message received from community partners: Build the trust, establish relationships, create a safe & ethical space and then move forward with the research.

Move Slowly and Make Sure That the Partnership is Working

Researchers discussed that figuring out the set of value is more important that collecting data. The lesson so far is move slowly and make sure that the partnership is working. The first step should be finding things that matter to people. Qualitative research is all about exploring people's idea and feelings and association with spaces.

Create a Common Language for Everyone

One of the major issues identified by the Calgary team that, architects assume someone with different background would understand their technical vocabulary and there has been a dire need to create a template for better engagement in something that architects are in control of. Participants agreed that, without capacity building people do not feel included and they can't say what they need and get what they want. To be inclusive, architects should take a step back and create common jargons that goes beyond the disciplinary boundaries.

Documenting a good solid process that is accessible to communities

Team Toronto discussed about assessing neighbourhood park in terms of climate change, social and cultural use perspectives. Idea have been bounced about documenting a good solid process that is accessible to communities which would like to advocate for improvements of Neighbourhood parks. Community members can use those parameters and access their needs and request for improvements to the city.

Create public space for indigenous people that celebrates the culture in a deep way that connects to the land and their value system

Calgary team discussed about group of Indigenous elders expressed that there was no place where they felt comfortable. There is currently no place for urban aboriginal communities where they can connect with the land and their value system. To work together to creative quality and inclusive cities and communities - listening and learning is key and its about learning what do people value. Values are critical to understand in order to work towards what is defined as quality in our environments. It sounds simple but understanding values to even know how to respond is so important.

It has also been discussed that City of Calgary has committed for granting land to the indigenous community gathering place.

Story telling devices as a way forward

Halifax researchers discussed about story telling and how it is important for understanding culture and value. They have also developed their own criteria for assessing the schools rather than the criteria has been provided. There was a discussion about the social conditions of the schools and researchers discussed about going there and conduct interviews.

Measuring the Qualitative Aspects of a Place

A discussion eloped at the Federation of Calgary Community about taking all the community partners and some of the community members on a bus ride and taking them to all of the places they talk about and have their conversation in that space rather than discussing in the auditorium and showing just images of those spaces. This can be a potential way to measure some of the qualitative aspects of a place.

This roundtable discussion mainly focused on experiences and challenges for each team. Even though there were no specific discussion about examples of barriers to quality, one idea was shared about removing barriers to quality by inclusivity:

- It has been discussed by the researchers that, the criteria of assessments provided by Montreal has been highly based on aesthetics which are usually been practiced as awarding criteria. Calgary team particularly mentioned about Mayor's Urban Design award where jury criteria's were not surrounded by aesthetics, rather than focused on social conscience and community response of the project.

- OAA shared their experience about re-assessing their award criteria and mandated that all the awards need to be based on inclusivity, reconciliation, and

8

climate sustainability. They also relaxed the bar for experience and number of entries per person/company and that has brought fresh ideas and beautifully turned around the conversation of Architectural awards.

- Qualitative items can be measured in a very methodical way if certain criteria can be defined.

- There was discussion about a "sweep" method that inspired by observational research. The idea was bounced back about observing how people use the space and the proximity of their belongingness and how people are attached to a certain place.

- What we measure and to what extent and the type of communication needs to be contextual and based on the core purpose or application of the project.

- Idea of cognitive mapping were discussed as tool for school kids to express their feeling.

- Connection between sense of belongingness and mental health outcomes.

- How to measure quality such as inclusivity, accessibility, and some other qualities?

- Where do e want to be in one year from now. What outcomes researchers are expecting?

  o What is the purpose of their evaluation?

- How do we navigate through the communities?

  o How do we make sure that all the voices are being heard?

Roundtable 1b – UCalgary & UToronto & DalhousieU – Dec 2
Friday, December 2nd, 2022 from to 12:30 to 2:00pm.

Author of the summary:
- Sneha Mandhan, Doctoral student (University of Toronto)
Date of submission: 2023 / 01 / 09

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

*Researchers***:**
- **Enrica Dall'Ara**, University of Calgary
- **Susan Fitzgerald**, Dalhousie University
- **Jonathan Jucker**, University of Calgary
- **Brian Lilley**, Dalhousie University
- **Fadi Masoud**, University of Toronto
- **Martha Radice**, Dalhousie University
- **Derek Reilly**, Dalhousie University
- **Brian Sinclair**, University of Calgary

Citizen groups:
- **Joan Lawrence**, Calgary Climate Hub, Calgary Alliance of the Common Good
- **Kevin Ng**, Rick Hansen Foundation

Cities and procurement:
- **David Down**, City of Calgary
- **Leah Perrin,** Halifax Regional Municipality
- **Amanda Lapointe**, PSPC
- **Rei Tasaka**, WaterFront Toronto

Award organisations:
- **Jeanie Gartly**, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals
- **Susan Spiegel**, Ontario Association of Architects
- **Elsa Lam**, Canadian Architect Magazine

Students
- **Coco Wang**, University of Toronto
- **Traci Berg**, University of Calgary
- **Nooshin Esmaeili**, University of Calgary
- **Belle Gutierrez-Kellam**, University of Calgary

- **Stavros Kondeas,** Dalhousie University
- **Sneha Mandhan,** University of Toronto
- **Isabel Mink**, University of Toronto
- **Theo Page-Robert**, University of Montreal
- **Talydawn Salyn**, University of Calgary

Centering user experiences

Given the emphasis on redefining quality in the built environment, there needs to be an emphasis on working with industry partners and community members to centre the users of various spaces and map the phenomenological qualities of being in those spaces. By centering the user experience, we can develop a definition of quality that is meaningful to both communities and municipalities, and understand the unanticipated impacts of design decisions. We need to focus on capturing and understanding the real, diverse experiences of communities and the plurality of perspectives on the ground.

Emphasizing listening and creating feedback loops

We need to ensure that the right people are at the table, and that we, as academics, are listening deeply to the perspectives that our industry partners and community groups are sharing with us. We also need to ensure that we constantly loop in community partners from the beginning and throughout the process by setting up coherent feedback loops. We need to create visions for redefining quality in the built environment with the general public, and find ways to maintain equilibrium between the needs of our community partners.

We need to hear from partners at the beginning/very early on in a project and then go back and give it a sober second thought and keep looping in those partners by taking elements back to them for feedback loops regularly, perhaps through design charettes for creative problem solving. Often, we engage the community but ultimately little can be accomplished due to constraints on time, money, and policies, so to ensure that we can meet the needs of our communities, we might need to climb the corporate ladder and begin implementing changes there.

Knowledge translation and mobilization

Often, the measurement of quality of the built environment is a black box; when describing design, architects seem to speak a different language compared to communities and city council members. Given this challenge, it is imperative that the roadmaps we develop focus on translation of understanding of design values into simple language that incorporates user perceptions of design, and on mobilizing knowledge for local communities.

Often, when the public expresses opposition to ideas, the conversation revolves around parking, Floor Area Ratios (FARs), and density – communities are not coming in and talking about design or the experience of design, which are often more subjective issues. Sometimes concerns are framed as neighbourhood character arguments which are often

met which accusations of NIMBYism. This could be associated with a level of fear that raising concerns about design will not be effective, whereas something tangible such as parking will be more likely to be listened to regarding the approval of community projects. In some countries there are modules addressing the built environment in K-12 education which helps formulate ideas about design at an early age. There is a need to educate society to value things differently around ideas related to design, the environment, and behaviour.

It is also important to focus on long-term impacts of this project through two distinct ways:

1. By developing methodologies as part of roadmaps that can be used by community partners beyond this project; and

2. by using these roadmaps and definitions of qualities in design schools so that we are training future designers based on the learnings from this project. The graduate student committee has some annual funding which can go towards some of these efforts.

Emphasis on empirical modes of measuring quality

Traditionally, definitions and measurement of quality in the built environment have relied on empirical methods. There has been a lack of incorporating storytelling, development narratives, and lived experiences into understandings of quality. We need to find ways for people to voice their opinions and experiences of spaces and places without having to count and distill them into empirical units.

Dalhousie University is looking at aspects of belonging, University of Calgary is looking at aspects of health in the environment – we need to start thinking about what anthropologists call thick descriptions where the notion of beingness is at the fore.

Voluntary efforts towards good design versus codes

Often, we rely on designers' voluntary commitments towards good design, without much funding dedicated to it. There are often no project requirements or codes that enforce good quality in design, which limits the ability to make real change in the built environment. Codes primarily focus on increasing safety. For example, there was a lot of reinvention of the wheel and reliance on American standards for accessibility because for a while there were no clear Canadian standards for things such as height of signage above grade, or levels of contrast in materials to make signage accessible to people with visual impairment.

Additionally, there is a fine line between enforcement and guidelining, and we need to move from prescriptive codes to performative codes that emphasize good design, but that also makes people aware of their prejudices. There are really important criteria, platforms and tools that are used for awards which could be good starting points. Calgary's Mayor's Urban Design Awards are a good example where many of the award winners have good projects not because they were forced to have them, but because they were being creative. The Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) Awards are another example of criteria that can be used to define "quality."

There are also other considerations to make when thinking about changing industry practices – increasingly, it is becoming untenable to obtain insurance for projects if green strategies are not incorporated into the design, and there are many built projects where architects and designers are not involved and so builders tend to be motivated primarily by costs and profits. Codes, and their enforcement, levels the playing field in some ways – a small builder can compete with big builders because the requirements per codes are the same for both. Behaviour and society is driven by a multitude of factors and we need to focus on human behaviour and psychology as well when considering the question of codes.

Finally, there is a need to understand how the design per codes impact the use and experience of the spaces designed to code – we need to centre the users and focus on centering their experiences in the design of codes, including accounting and designing for unanticipated impacts.

Transparency in design evaluation

Often, perspectives of design among the general public are very different from those of designers and municipal officials. The City of Calgary is working to develop plain language guides for evaluation of design that reflect City policy and have been vetted by industry professionals. These guides also rely on the findings from a design quality perception survey of over 750 residents from different backgrounds where residents were shown images of buildings at the scale of community, building, and urban design and asked to rate them. A significant difference was noted between what architects and residents thought was good design. Another example of a design and evaluation tool kit that is being developed by a team at Dalhousie University is the Design Resource Manual for Schools. This manual is being treated as a living document so that it gets informed and updated continually.

We need to focus on learning from and expanding such efforts to make the process of design evaluation more transparent and iterative, especially to develop standards around design that community groups could point to as best practices for design.

Formats for quality roadmaps

The roadmaps need to be simple in content and easy to understand and use. They should have clearly defined audiences, be impactful, and ideally be tools that local communities can embrace, adapt and use for their own needs. We need to think through the role of illustration and plain language text in developing these roadmaps. We also need to ensure that we create roadmaps that make a real impact instead of becoming platitudes.

Potential formats for the roadmap include:

- a video that can be shared online (a fun way to share information),
- a digital app with a feedback mechanism,
- a decision-tree or a checklist (to enable community-based design evaluations or project 'quality'),
- a design guidelines document,
- design codes, and
- design scenarios (having a number of visions/strands coming from the community partners that influence how we are going to move forward).

Additionally, given that each of the groups on the project will be creating a roadmap that is specific to its project focus, should there be a bigger roadmap that comes out of the combined project? Are there intersections between this group work and the architecture policy group in Canada.

Roundtable 2a – AthabascaU & UBC & ConcordiaU – Dec 1
Thursday, December 01, 2022, from 14:45 to 16:15

Authors of the summary:
- Morteza Hazbei, Doctoral student (Concordia University)
Date of submission: 2023/01/10

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

Researchers:
- **Josie Auger**, Athabasca University
- **Henty Tsang**, Athabasca University
- **Veronica Madonna**, Athabasca University
- **Trevor Butler**, Athabasca University
- **Vivekanandan S. Kumar**, Athabasca University
- **Gina Martin**, Athabasca University
- **Douglas MacLeod**, Athabasca University
- **Fionn Byrne**, University of British Columbia
- **Sara Jacobs,** University of British Columbia
- **Carmela Cucuzzella,** Concordia University
- **Ursula Eicker,** Concordia University
- **Carly Ziter**, Concordia University

Citizen Groups:
- **Emmanuel Rondia**, Conseil régional de l'environnement de Montréal
- **Eva Doan-Lavoie**, GRAME
- **Victor Bouguin**, Vivre en Ville
- **Sonia Blank**, Architecture Sans Frontières Québec

Cities and procurement:
- **Patrick Marmen**, Ville de Montréal

Award organisations:
- **Sean Ruthen**, Perkins&Will
- **Grant Fahlgren**, Canadian Society of Landscape Architects

Students:
- **Twilla Soosay**, Athabasca University
- **Trishtina Godoy-Contois**, Athabasca University

- **Robert Ferguson**, University of British Columbia
- **Morteza Hazbei,** Concordia University
- **Sara El Khatib**, Concordia University
- **Shantanu Biswas-Linkon**, Université de Montréal

The discussion initiated with some broad and diverse questions of "What is quality?" "How was quality looked at in Roman and Greek times?" and "how is it still carried over to today?" How can building codes and regulations affect quality? We debated looking at issues not from the perspective of profit but in a way that helps the people residing there. It is mentioned that this living experience is intergenerational and needs to be considered through time. Also, we considered quality a multifaceted concept meaning that we should consider quality from diverse opinions. Continuing the multifaceted concept of quality, we briefly discussed EDI; it is good that people were invited to this project, but we should make sure that their voices will be heard and that they can impact the project and make a difference. Furthermore, we discussed what is counterproductive to EDI; for instance, the stigmatization of marginalized groups or women, 2SLGBTQIA, contradicts the social aspect of EDI that we are working on. Patriarchy and white male hegemony-dominated practices in this field and their effects on quality are the other topics we touched upon at the beginning of our discussion.

Is "Quality" a Process or an Outcome?

Is quality a process, an outcome, or both? Is quality learned intergenerationally? we discussed that defining what quality is in built environment is a "process." Because « approach » means a "process," not criteria, therefore, we could start the discussion by thinking about common "processes" instead of "common approach". We asked some questions to understand what we would want to reach at the end of this partnership research. Do we want some solid outcomes or to highlight and emphasize the process of understanding and implementing quality in the built environment? For example, we asked ourselves why this SSHRC project was funded. What is the agenda for this project? Is it because of making a bilingual living Atlas on quality in the built environment? are we just in this process to produce an outcome, or is there a way we can have a category of quality that is also about advocacy?

What Is NOT "Quality"?

The common approach could be an inverse approach meaning that what is not quality? For example, some row houses with not have proper materials and need better framing. These spaces, so-called affordable houses, are meant to be for low incomes people. However, quality is sacrificed in those places in several ways. Another example is, on the Concordia research site, "what is not quality?" was the basis of their methodology. They selected two awarded retirement houses considered very high-quality places for elderly people. Even in these two high-quality centers, when they conducted photo documentation and ethnography, they realized many built environment-related problems. Therefore, we should figure out what is not quality in these seemingly high-quality buildings. The question of what is not quality is very fruitful since it tries to fill the

gap in a comparative way. Moreover, we have an old paradigm defining quality, and we would like to determine quality with a new paradigm so we can truly be more inclusive for all of our citizens. Defining a new paradigm involves ingenuity, innovation, and willingness to new ideas. Many buildings got awarded, but they don't have basic accessibility quality; for example, people with disability cannot enter. The question of "What is not quality?" helps us define our new paradigm and how it may be a venue for innovation.

Role of Architectural Awards in Defining "Quality"

Discussing what is not quality led us to think about architectural awards. We talked about how awarded agencies should wait at least two to three years after building construction before awarding the building to assess the building's lived experience. We also discussed How do buildings get awarded? What are the criteria? What do architects need to submit? Recently, Awards have been used a lot to define quality, and then they reinforce some of our assumptions of what constitutes quality. They incentivize designers to act a certain way and push for a more aesthetic and image-driven version. They also push clients and citizens in a specific direction.Awards, or in a broader meaning competitions, are based on image and text criteria. Their short-term evaluations don't let them consider what will be the buildings' live experience after completion. Also, they don't have qualitative components as part of submissions and reviews to understand how they determine quality.

We discussed the process or outcome in architectural awards. awards would be more engaging if part of the competition criteria was a letter of support from the community group that designers have worked with during the design process. How do we shift back the award process so that people occupying these places have time to experience and see if they are comfortable living in those places? Part of the award application should incorporate inhabitants' voices, not only the designers' voices who put the glossy images as part of their submission package. This way incentivizes clients, designers, and city officials to empower community groups, which makes more accountability for them and eventually might push the market.

RAIC International Prize is an award that used to be called the Moriyama International Prize. One criterion is to investigate what social impact they made in their community. And one of the ways that they judged the projects is that each of the jurors actually had to visit the project and see how the community uses the project and talk to the community. Therefore, it isn't just pictures and images which you can manipulate easily. It is essential to get a truly authentic picture of the built environment rather than what we sometimes manufacture through magazines, imagery, and renderings. Because if you can't afford flashy photographs or renderings, you have a hard time competing at the same time in the review process. It has to be a clear set of objectives and not just to look good, meaning

that setting some really clear objectives based on social and environmental justice can start to put the reviewers' perspectives in mind.

Therefore, we need community, different voices, and different kinds of data that we don't have access to, but we need to know where it is. We need to be able to collect that data, analyze it, and inject it because it normally doesn't get injected into award programs or quantitative research. And the more these award programs keep awarding projects that are not based on community needs, the less the public understands what quality buildings are. So let's ask some questions: what is an award? Why do we need awards in the first place? We need awards because it's a way to mediatize quality in the built environment so that the population understands that this is what is considered quality. But if we keep spewing out stuff that is not good, we're pushing ourselves back.

"Quality" Is a Multidisciplinary Subject

Quality needs to be considered systematically, moving more into cross-collaboration and across disciplines rather than a fragmented approach. There's the separation of architecture from builders, and that has long-reaching effects on quality. Now we're looking at quality from a purely aesthetic approach from one discipline, but in other disciplines, focus on tangible aspects. for example, Aluminum in Canada is considered a material that has great embodied energy because we recycle it, but we don't calculate cradle to the grave since it comes from Brazil.

Today, we have 130 people participating in the conversation, and they come from all different areas, civil society, governments, academia, etc. this is the beauty of this research since we got a good cross-section of individuals involved that can provide their thoughts and their best thinking and their research. However, how do we combine all that into an Atlas that's concrete and constantly evolving? So that we can use it for advocacy to make changes in policy, develop curricula, design awards, building codes, etc.

The common approach to quality has to be locally driven. The gaps also need to be assessed in a way that is more reflective of maybe being able to describe the situation accurately. What is affordability mean? What do we do if we have homeless populations? What kind of housing solutions can we have?

Relation between Communities and "Quality"

We are conducting this research project because, essentially, the way we've determined quality has failed. Many people are underserved by the design profession in a way that is driven to particular interest for a very long time. On the contrary, the relative power that communities and the public has had is somewhat limited by the way that system has been

set up. Those with wealth interest so much more readily can intervene in the system and influence it, implying that it benefits them, and those that don't have that relative power don't gain as many benefits. The opportunities for the communities to intervene are very limited in terms of the approval process. It's only if you can build enough support to say no to the project. It is a very limited way that communities have that side of power. How the works that this project is doing make recommendations about what are the spaces in which communities can have more say in processing and before and after projects are being completed and how they can be systemic. It also changes education since we are adding things to pedagogy for consideration, for example, what are those mechanisms to open up people's engagements in projects and has more leverage of what we are doing. We need to make sure that changes are more resilient and don't fade away again from what we've been doing previously.

It's vitally important to hear from people in the community about what matters to them and that designs incorporate that. Therefore, it is essential to have designers who come to the table with innovative solutions because the general public can describe the built environment problems in multiple ways and what the challenges are. Still, they don't always have the solution, so the general public can bring various perspectives to the table, and designers provide them with innovative solutions and consider the community's needs.

Another important question that discusses was "how do communities participate in the process of developing quality and defining quality? Who defines quality?" It is one of the challenges that we always have. It's a very insular conversation of experts sitting on the panels as juries, and we don't have any community representation on those panels often. And we need input from the community. As professionals working in the built environment, we should serve the community. If we are always talking about changing the definition of quality, it would be really helpful to have communities part of those conversations. And ask questions about whether the building serves the people it was meant to serve. The city of Vancouver has several different digital and in-person platforms for community input, but how does this input get used in the design process? Thinking about reciprocity and what we can as designers deliver is something that isn't just about the design project, but it's something that the community can take and then can help them in organizing other things or future projects.

The Distorted Value System and the Question of Quality

Defining quality in positive ways is that living future institute's concept which not only socially and culturally rich but also ecologically restorative. It also has to be economically rather than just ecologically restorative. The major problem in defining quality and berries to quality is that our value system has become distorted. We're nothing more than

22

decorators for developers. For example, the recent rise of poor doors where their separate entrances for affordable housing versus another what's called a rich door or those who can do the market-based housing is such a repugnant thing even to consider, and yet that's becoming the norm as we've extruded these towers up for residents. Therefore, to adjust to quality, we have to address our value system.

Capitalism and How It Affects the Quality of Built Environment

How does capital drive the definition of quality? Especially when we were talking about awards and how they're biased toward certain groups of people. In a critical appraisal method, we could assess some of these projects and look at how the flow of capital affects quality in their process from start to finish. For example, how financial constraints from designers, clients, or higher levels who receive benefits influence quality. How does capital influence what we think about quality? Not just access to financial resources to build structures but, at the same time, who has the finances to afford to live in those spaces. For example, in aging populations, do they have the financial capacity to access those qualities? Would your capital affect what resources you will have access to? If you didn't have much accumulation of capital in your elderly age, can you go to cap your level of quality? In the case of quality for aging people, the quality that you have access to at some point in your life depends on what you did in your lifetime. Elementary school teachers might not have access to good quality; however, businessmen and real estate developers will have access to better qualities.

The book Iceberg, Zombies, and the Ultra Thin, called architecture and capitalism in the 21st century by Matthew Souls at UBC, talks about how architecture has become an instrument of financial capitalism. For example, one of those skyscrapers that win awards can cost $1,000 a square foot, whereas an elementary school is closer to $150 a square foot, so capital distorts the way with our whole marketplace. Therefore, could we say that quality is fair and balanced? (the balance of power as one outcome) it's just important to understand some of those factors in assessing how we've already defined quality.

Quality, Earth, and Caring

A lot of people live in trailers up north in Alberta. That's not quality because they are not using basic life quality, which is housing. Also, access to resources from the land improves life quality, such as having your own fire. Although this might not be sustainable, having a fire, especially for elderly people, improves quality compared to building heating systems. Wood fireplaces and water are essential things that we need to survive. The oil industry is affecting water resources, so it's about more than just community. It's also about the environment and all beings and sustainability. In the case of elderly people, how do we want our elders to be cared? Quality is about caring. How do we become

23

caring designers, architects, and human beings? In other terms, quality means kindness and honesty, and these values should also be part of the guides. We're dealing with so many crises and conditions today, such as managing the planetary boundaries of the world and needing to think about sustainability goals. We should use this opportunity to encourage architects and designers to take more action in preparing their designs.

Methodology to Capture Quality

In terms of methodology, a reasonable approach would be an iterative approach in which we always go back on what we've learned. Also, when we produce Atlas, we always have to go back since it is changing. For example, what is quality in 5 years will definitely be different from what we have assumed. As mentioned earlier, it is essential to include citizens. But how can we include them from the beginning to the end of the process?

It's very important that we date whatever we do because twenty years ago, quality had a different definition. Even though we have social activists thinking about quality-related questions on a deeper level than just the glossy images, the questions coming out of the time based on ongoing knowledge and different social conditions at the time are very different than today. How we want to improve social, urban, and living conditions are very different from the past. Therefore, a method for documentation should be used to let people in the future compare reports, for example, quality definitions in 2022 and 2025. This is why it can be transformational because, ideally, we create a body of knowledge and pass it along. Then we'll come back in five years when new people come to the table, and we can evolve and develop and add to what we already have.

Qualitative Data and Challenges to Assess Quality

What data sets exist out there? What variables can we use to capture what quality is? And how do we access those variables, and how can we measure those variables? In indigenous people's case, data management within community organizations is one challenge. There are a lot of past plans that have a lot of information embedded. However, they aren't very centralized and finding someone in charge or with information is challenging.

Statistics and quantitative data are easy to get and analyze, but we need more qualitative data to act on them to understand the community's needs better. On the Concordia site, working on elderly people, a lot of qualitative data is missing. For example, where elderly people live, which areas are more concentrated, and what are their needs and issues and problems that they are facing. These qualitative data are more problematic when the case study group is vulnerable, such as elderly people and immigrants, and homeless people, people with disabilities. One way forward could be asking an organization that directly

24

works with these people to come and participate in in this research. An example of a way to collect qualitative data is a website where people can post comments. For example, in Montreal, they have a platform called COM Constitution office of Montreal; whenever a big project is coming, people can discuss this project on this website. So the project gets reviewed before it actually gets built. However, this office doesn't have the power to affect the project and work as advice for designers and city planners.

Collecting qualitative data is one of the reasons why we're working with community groups and citizen groups in this project because the academics certainly need to learn from communities. The only data we're acutely aware of is census data and open data from cities. However, we need access to data about community groups. Also, the type of qualitative data is important; for instance, people talking about lived experiences are temporary data, so to be able to analyze that data, we need to collect this data on yearly basis.

Future Research and Work

Based on the discussion, what tools, systems, and ways could we hand off to community groups and recommendations to awards? We need a broader perspective on what determines the quality. It won't be a fixed word defining quality at the end of this collaborative research. But it is more about how people participate in determining the quality and how it's communicated to people about what makes quality and ensuring that more voices are heard. But what products can we deliver that can make changes? For example, we hand things off to awards organizations with more direct recommendations, or we can hand things to community groups. Some things that make implementing change. It could be good to consider as we look back at the quality and how we determine it and to look at our case studies. Based on our case study results and different group voices results, can we develop tools by our common approach and not only a publication?

Roundtable 2b – AthabascaU & UBC & ConcordiaU – Dec 2
Friday, December 2, 2022, from 12:30 to 14:00.

Authors of the summary:
- Shantanu Biswas Linkon, Doctoral student (Université de Montréal)
Date of submission: 2022 / 01 / 10

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

Researchers:
- **Josie Auger**, Athabasca University
- **Henty Tsang**, Athabasca University
- **Veronica Madonna**, Athabasca University
- **Trevor Butler**, Athabasca University
- **Vivekanandan S. Kumar**, Athabasca University
- **Gina Martin**, Athabasca University
- **Douglas MacLeod**, Athabasca University
- **Fionn Byrne**, University of British Columbia
- **Sara Jacobs,** University of British Columbia
- **Carmela Cucuzzella,** Concordia University
- **Ursula Eicker,** Concordia University
- **Carly Ziter**, Concordia University

Citizen Groups:
- **Emmanuel Rondia**, Conseil régional de l'environnement de Montréal
- **Eva Doan-Lavoie**, GRAME
- **Victor Bouguin**, Vivre en Ville
- **Sonia Blank**, Architecture Sans Frontières Québec

Cities and procurement :
- **Patrick Marmen**, Ville de Montréal

Award organisations :
- **Sean Ruthen**, Perkins&Will
- **Grant Fahlgren**, Canadian Society of Landscape Architects

Students:
- **Twilla Soosay**, Athabasca University
- **Trishtina Godoy-Contois**, Athabasca University

- **Robert Ferguson**, University of British Columbia
- **Morteza Hazbei,** Concordia University
- **Sara El Khatib**, Concordia University
- **Shantanu Biswas-Linkon**, Université de Montréal

The national online convention, the second of the five annual meetings, was held on December 1 and 2, started by seeking the answer of "What is wrong with current definitions of quality?" and what can be the future roadmaps to define, develop, and assess the quality in the built environment". This online convention brought all together more than 120 participants from across Canada from 14 universities. During this online convention, the expectations and obstacles to the quality of the built environment were discussed throughout 2 series of 5 thematic roundtables. Each roundtable consisted of academic researchers and representatives from cities, citizens' groups, and professional organizations. Throughout all the discussions of these roundtables, mostly three points were in focus- prospects for the collaboration; describing explicit obstacles to quality; proposed case studies to analyze these obstacles. The information, conversed and extracted during the thoughts from the roundtables, will be used to develop quality roadmaps. A dedicated summary of those discussions has been outlined in this report which took place during roundtable 02 whose topic was Inclusive Design for Health, Well-being, Aging, and Special Needs. Keeping in mind ensuring comprehensiveness, alongside the researchers and representatives from cities and professional organization, this cluster also ensure the participation of the citizen groups concerned with the inclusive built environment like the Foundation Véro & Louis, the Foundation Québécoise de la maladie d'Alzheimer or the organization Building Equality in Architecture Calgary.

To begin with, in this section, I will briefly recap all the expectations and objectives for the partnership that came out of the discussion; then I will detail them more. Some of the key expectations for the partnership, as expressed by the participants during roundtable two (02) are as follows.:

- Comprehensive view of quality:
- Interactive and easily accessible format:
- Identifying quality from all perspectives and diversity:
- Ensuring contextuality and site specificity
- A truly adaptive and evolving living atlas:
- Quality ensuring cultural values, ethical values, and lived experiences

Comprehensive view of quality

The main expectation, which was discussed numerous times during the roundtables, from the partnership is to ensure a comprehensive view of quality. The quality in the built environment should be connecting people for providing their quality of life. For example, in the roundtable, the negative effects of living in high rises are having on the connection between people and society were discussed. So, there was an emphasis that this quality of life should include and illustrate caring for individuals and our families, guests,

28

neighborhoods, and societies. The roadmap to quality, which will define and comprise the value, will be global in nature. Besides, it will also ensure the ethical part of quality. The participants put a great focus on ensuring the ethical part so that everyone gets counted, involved, and participated in the roadmap to quality. Furthermore, there was an urge to 'Connecting people to places', to make it beneficial for the users rather than making it a mere research action methodology.

Interactive and easily accessible format

After developing some clear and certain opinions on quality, the next point of discourse was how the partnership expect to be the expression, format, or presentation of the roadmap to quality. There is a concern, and it's not deniable, quality in a built environment is a quite complex and complicated process. So, it is a common belief among the members of the roundtable that the format of the roadmap should be an interactive format rather than a complex one. At first, there was a suggestion that maps of different places across Canada might be maps. Even it was discussed that either it can be a library or an archive. Based on this idea, later it was proposed that it might be some interactive YouTube videos, which are small, filled with infographics, and informative contrary to large monotonous videos. Then, another important expectation appears, it should be easily accessible like Wikipedia so that anyone can search for it and update it. Of course, there should be some person or team to validate that information. At, the later stage, an interesting idea came up that it can be like a 'Cookbook' which is small, easily accessible and transferable, very popular, and user-friendly. The reason behind the point is that common people, who are this partnership's main target, may find this roadmap relatable and useful map to quality in their daily lives. Overall, the main expectation of the format was that it should be informative, interactive, easily communicated, accessible, and of course, containing some validated material.

Identifying quality from all perspectives and diversity

Another noteworthy discussion that happened in the roundtable is that quality should be identified from all perspectives and all diversity. As the city is a complex point with multiple groups of participants. And every city, or neighborhood consists of at least three groups, 1. Users, 2, builders, 3. Administrators. So, the question raised is how this would this Atlas look in different Fields and how could everyone relate to it. The importance of identifying quality from different perspectives discoursed. Because this atlas should be something satisfying everyone's interest, especially people's interests. Historically, whenever this type of activity happened it resulted in satisfying or signifying a definite group. This should not be repeated this time. Alongside, exploring quality from diversified fields and communities was another expectation. The built environment consists of diversified users. So, for developing a true meaningful atlas diversified notions are

29

needed to include. Here 'Diversity' refers to diversity in context, diversity in the community, diversity in age and gender, diversity in culture, diversity in ethnicity, and even diversity in usability. Overall, identifying quality from all perspectives and diversity was one of the major anticipations from this partnership among the participants of all groups and organizations. The quality should not be only from the researcher's perspective but also from everyone's perspective, acknowledging and recognizing people existence, for creating belongingness.

Ensuring contextuality and site specificity

One of the first and earliest discussed ideas was the importance of contextuality and site specificity. The principles of the roadmaps should be rooted in the context. There was even a quote like quality and value are deeply connected with context. So, ensuring contextuality was one of the major concerns and expectations. This focus on context paved the way for site-specific principles. The guidelines and principles should be neighborhood specific, even if it is possible, it should be site-specific. The principles for British Columbia may not be appropriate for Montréal. Even those guidelines may differ in a different part of Montréal. So, including the site-specific principles for developing quality, and addressing it is necessary. Finally, there was a suggestion that there can be some Building codes, or an app or website, or even a Chat Bot, to help in the design and in selecting exact materials, techniques, and patterns for ensuring quality in built environments regarding age, gender, and race. All these can help to produce quality by providing lots of site-specific information to the end user.

A truly adaptive and evolving living atlas

In the middle session of the roundtable, the topic of adaptiveness for the living atlas was discussed. There was discussion that as it is a living atlas, and city is also an evolving thing, so roadmap to quality should be something adaptive and ever-changing. Its features of it should not be something that is adaptive in nature. The action for quality also should be adaptable. Besides, it should be kept in mind that information is something that should be transferred from generation to generation. And it should be evolving. So, without having any fixed principles it should be progressing in nature. Yes, there should be some basic baselines that should be mate but also it should be ensured that those baselines are flexible in nature. From the perspective of design, the demand of people is a continuous thing. So, the concern for people and resources for people should be something that is also changing in nature. There was an interesting suggestion that there would be a definite point that ties all the branches of the living atlas like trees. We should not forget that as it is a living atlas so the solution for quality should be also something that is life, changing, and timeless.

Quality ensuring cultural values, ethical values, and lived experiences

At the end of the discussion, it was agreed that quality is something that is closely related to value. And value is one of the most intangible and hard things to capture. For ensuring a comprehensive view of quality, it is expected to focus on cultural and ethical values. Putting importance on lived experiences is a must. Because everyone experiences the built environment in a different way. There was an example of a real-life educational building where An elevator was introduced for a differently abled student. But unfortunately, the fact the elevator was directly opposite side of his/her classroom. So, ultimately, though the intention was good and noble, it resulted in hampering the quality of the built environment. For this, recognizing lived experiences and participation of the focus group for any definitely built environment is really necessary. Regarding ethical values, it was expected that during the selection of participants or community, we should not be biased. We should not systematically or unintentionally overlook any definite group. There was a concern among the participants of the roundtable on the process of selection of the proper group. Occupant focus data identification is really necessary for proper quality in the built environment. The expectation is to reach the furthest possible recipient. Because by saying inclusive, we should be aware, we often ignore the invisible people unintentionally. Inclusiveness should not be discussed not only in theory but also must be materialized in practical life.

Diversity in user and audience is different

The main barrier to quality in the built environment, discussed during the roundtable, is the user and audience is diversified. The target audience for the partnership is vast. So it is a concern that how to come to a common ground and format for quality. According to the discussion of the roundtable maybe we should select and focus on the most distressed group. But then again debate came what is the basis of selecting the target group. Besides, there was concern about what real quality is. And what are the features of the quality? Maybe a solution can be quality should be defined according to time, context, and user.

Lack of interactive data and access to information or documents

Another major concern discussed in the roundtable is the lack of interactive and produced information. Yes, it is true that we have a limitation of data. But are we really being able enough to reach the common people and express ourselves in an interactive way? There still exists the top-down approach in the built environment. We simply should express ourselves to common people in a more simple and attractive way. Alongside this, another major concern is the lack of accessibility to information and documents. Though we are

living in a modern society and the internet is almost accessible to everyone, we have to still face the lengthy process of bureaucracy for having access to documents.

Lack of Adaptability

Lack of adaptability to current practice principles and rules is another major barrier to quality. This static and fixed characteristic is creating a lot of obstacles to addressing and developing a roadmap to quality. There was an example in the discussion on SDG. Though SDGs were created with good intentions and one of the updated and modern manuscripts to ensure people's inclusion well being social aspects. But some of its principles, and goals are too static, in other words, are not adaptive enough. This lack of adaptiveness makes it less viable. Other principles and codes like building codes, and green building principles are also more or less the same in character, not adaptive enough in nature.

Need of exact process of data collection

According to the roundtable, the exact process of data collection to understand the exact picture of any neighborhood or society is still not agreed upon and defined. This is causing distributional inequity which is hindering the way and flourishing of quality. Unless a proper methodology or framework is developed for collecting and processing the information till then inequity will exist. And this is creating barriers to quality in the built environment. Besides, How would be best to present information is also a major concern and generates a lot of problems in the path of quality.

Problem of checkbox or prototype

Another problem of current existing principles or prototypes, discussed in the roundtable, is that they are a kind of one size fits all approach. But people, who are the soul of the city and built environment, are diversified. At least they can be divided according to age, race, gender, and ethnicity. So, a solution for one neighborhood working very well can not be directly implemented in other areas. But unfortunately, this practice is happening commonly. And, numerous times it has been mentioned in the discussion that, administration and builders are aligned with these types of solutions as they are easy to build and cost-effective. But it was noted that modular or prototype: modular is not quality for indigenous people. What deficit is created by more projects and how to calculate that deficit is a worry among the presently built environmentalists. This way of perceiving and implementing quality is certainly a major barrier.

Lack of comprehensiveness

It is proven and believed that there are many levels of quality. And was focused on the roundtable to recognize and address all the levels for having a comprehensive view of quality. For example, it was exemplified that If for a project it is necessary to accomplish four stages A, B, C, D at a certain agreed level for creating quality, we simply can not ignore the A, B, C and only focus D. At the end of the day though some quality may create it would not be the exact quality what we are searching and intending for. And simply we can not be happy with that output. The built environment is harmony, and we should treat it as a comprehensive one. This segregated approach to the built environment is making the community, and society more isolated which is a barrier. Alongside, different fields have different specific criteria for the quality regarding their field and profession. Lack of understanding and ignorance of this multiverse feature of quality is a barrier to promoting quality.

Ignorance of lived experiences for quality

Value has many branches and backgrounds. Lack of proper acknowledgment of value paves the way for minimizing the quality. Connection to community and lived experience is something that really is still lacking. The major concern now is the quality being implemented or produced effectively or efficiently. Ensuring this lived experience is very essential which we are still discounting. This is commonly acting as a barrier to the quality. For a roadmap to quality, we have to have a way to accommodate the lived experiences in the policy procurement or formal recognition.

The roundtable did not put too much focus on the case studies rather participants discussed the feature of the roadmap to quality and other methodological features. The roundtable mentions some row housing and urban high-rise buildings without any significant information. The participants put focused on exploring the limitations of building codes and SDG goals. But an interesting case came up, though it is not from the architectural field. There was a mention of a website from Douglas MacLeod. This website is https://calloftheforest.ca/plant-a-tree/. This particular website suggests which tree and good for any specific site or area if we provide the postal code. Maybe we can take reference from this website and make an archive or app which would suggest us some criteria or benchmarks which are needed to create quality in a certain neighborhood or site.

There are some potential questions that emerged for the future through the discussion in the roundtable. These can be useful to define quality in a comprehensive manner

- What happens after five (05) years when the partnership project is over? Regarding this, it would be vital if we treat quality as a process instead of a product. There can be a continuous methodology.

- Whether quality in the built environment a process or product? Or only some principles?
- What are the feature of a roadmap to quality and how can we define different aspects of quality?
- How can we create the roadmap in an accessible way and specifically for the person with a disability or I would say, a differently abled person?
- In real-world and academic studies, the players may change over the course of five years. There may be a scenario after the five-year mark that the context will be significantly different from where it started the journey. Therefore, it is a burning fact that how do we accommodate the socioeconomic and demographic changes that will undoubtedly happen across Canada over the next five years? And how can we balance the project?
- How do we define quality during the design process, and pre-design process not only after construction?
- Living atlas is a sharing of our experiences but the question is how do you operationalize that?

Again, we can ask some basic and fundamental questions:

- what do these roadmaps to quality means and what do they look like?
- how do we reach here? And how do we know what is quality?
- Is it better to understand the multiple voices separately or is it better to look at certain issues comprehensively?

But among all questions, according to the discussion of the roundtable, the most important questions are:

- By saying inclusiveness and comprehensiveness are we creating segregation unintentionally? Because when we put so much focus on a matter it gets, sometimes, unwanted attention.
- What happens when five (05) years are over? Maybe we need to create a methodology evolving like a city, which is a continuous process

Roundtable 3a – UManitoba & UMontréal & TorontoMet – Dec 1
Thursday, December 01, 2022, from 14:45 to 16:15.

Authors of the summary:
- Victorian T-Malo, Design Master student (Université de Montréal)
Date of submission: 2023 / 01 / 10

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

Researchers:
- **Virginie Lasalle**, Université de Montréal
- **Jean-Pierre Chupin,** Université de Montréal
- **Bechara Helal,** Université de Montréal
- **Samantha Biglieri,** Toronto Metropolitan University
- **Anne Cormier,** Université de Montréal
- **Izabel Amaral,** Université de Montréal
- **Mercedes Garcia-Holguera**, University of Manitoba

Citizen groups:
- **Sarah Huxley**, Fondation Véro et Louis
- **Katty Taillon**, Fondation Véro et Louis
- **Jillian Mills**, IUSMM

Cities and procurement:
- **Jeanne Leblanc-Trudeau,** Ville de Montréal
- **Kristina Reinders**, City of Toronto

Award organizations:
- **Jonathan Bisson,** RAIC

Students:
- **Nicole Li,** Toronto Metropolitan University
- **Catherine Meunier,** Université de Montréal
- **Victorian T-Malo**, Université de Montréal
- **Panos Polyzois,** University of Manitoba

The discussion that took place on December 1, 2022, between representatives (researchers and students) from the University of Manitoba, the Université de Montréal and the Toronto Metropolitan University, and different groups of experts, including city representatives, citizen groups and award organizations, mainly focused on the definition of quality and the barriers to achieving quality in the built environment. The question of the responsibility of quality in the built environment and concrete suggestions for case studies were also approached, to produce the first draft of a roadmap for the partnership.

Elitism and the overall architectural culture as a barrier to quality

A first example of a barrier to quality is elitism and the overall architectural culture. The use of a language that only architecture experts understand creates a barrier between the users and the designers. As a matter of fact, the citizen groups do not feel comfortable enough to speak with architecture experts about architecture; they do not feel comfortable enough to participate in the technical conversations, they feel intrusive in the professionals' world. This concern was raised by citizen groups during the discussion. In a way, the architectural culture itself seems to limit the participation of outsiders, delegating to the architects and designers the responsibility to represent a group of users they are not a part of, to understand a reality they do not live daily. At some point in history, architecture stop being a public matter. To bring it back, the presence of an intermediary person appears to be essential to decode and understand a reality that designers are not a part of, to create a built environment adapted to the needs of the person who's inhabiting it.

Projects that win awards have often not been inhabited

Second, a "good" project is often described by its granted awards. However, projects that win awards have often not been inhabited. Pictures are retouched and reality, anecdotes and truths are removed. The importance of direct experience was raised during the discussion by Virginie Lasalle (Researcher) and Sarah Huxley (Fondation Véro et Louis) regarding ongoing research: getting out of universities, being in the space and seeing the people using the architecture is a way to determine what is working and what is not. But sometimes, designers and architects need the help of intermediaries to understand certain behaviors. For example, in the research mentioned above, that takes place in specialized habitations for individuals on the autistic spectrum, some behaviors need to be interpreted by specialized workers who are then indispensable in the development of a definition for quality in the built environment.

Third, similar to the first barrier, a clear limit to this roundtable was the language barrier French vs. English but it can also be a barrier during dialogue between architectural

professionals and citizen groups. It was also brought up that it would be great if indigenous people could communicate their needs in their language.

An initial set of concrete solutions to overcome barriers to quality

A set of concrete solutions have been proposed to overcome each barrier highlighted during the discussion in the previous point.

In line with the first barrier identified, the use of the method called *photovoice* could help overcome the language barrier (Barrier #3), and the barrier between architectural experts and architectural users (Barrier #1), who each are, in fact, experts of their own reality.

Another suggestion is to conduct observation of the real usage of architectural spaces. As it was mentioned in the second barrier identified in the previous point (Barrier #2), researchers, like professionals, need to get out of universities and watch people interact with the architectural projects they created, like what might be called a post-occupational evaluation. Giving a voice and including people with limitations in the design process could also make them feel like experts of their reality, making them more inclined to collaborate.

It seems fair to say that the discussion revolved around the notion of language. In this order of ideas, some problems have been put forward in the roundtable: the term "*aménagement*" is often generalized with "architecture", but there is much more to it than just architecture: there is urban planning, interior design, industrial design, etc. Is it possible to find a better umbrella term? During the discussion, no one had the exact same definition of design. Is there no "good" definition of design? Could there be a "good" definition of quality? Is quality a parcel of the answer to the definition of design?

A research project idea launched in the conversation is the mapping of all the actors of quality in architecture and design. With this suggestion, some questions emerge: Who are the actors of quality in architecture? Are construction professionals quality actors? And janitors? Where does quality begin and where does it end?

To conclude this report, it is essential to highlight the expectation the participants have for the partnership. There is definitely a desire to include the users, directly or indirectly, to challenge the closed bubbles of expertise and create a safe space where everyone can exchange and enrich the design process. There is also a need to specify and clarify some terminology to ensure the accessibility of the architectural culture.

Roundtable 3b – UManitoba & UMontréal & TorontoMet – Dec 2
Friday, December 02, 2022 from 12:30 to 14:00.

Authors of the summary:
- Kristen D'Penna, March student (Toronto Metropolitan University)
Date of submission: 2023 / 01 / 09

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

*Researchers***:**
- **Jean-Pierre Chupin**, Université de Montréal
- **Virginie LaSalle**, Université de Montréal
- **Anne Cormier**, Université de Montréal
- **Bechara Helal**, Université de Montréal
- **Marco Polo**, Toronto Metropolitan University
- **Samantha Biglieri**, Toronto Metropolitan University
- **Leila Farah**, Toronto Metropolitan University
- **Fatih Sekercioglu**, Toronto Metropolitan University
- **Mercedes Garcia**, University of Manitoba

Citizen groups:
- **Doramy Ehling,** Rick Hansen Foundation
- **Laura McBride**, Rick Hansen Foundation
- **Jillian Mills**, CIUSSS de l'Est-de-l'Île-de-Montréal
- **Sarah Huxley**, Fondation Véro & Louis

Cities and procurement:
- **Jeanne Leblanc-Trudeau**, Ville de Montreal
- **Kristina Reinders,** City of Toronto, City Planning, Urban Design

Students:
- **Nicole Li,** Toronto Metropolitan University
- **Catherine Meunier,** Université de Montréal
- **Victorian T-Malo**, Université de Montréal
- **Panos Polyzois,** University of Manitoba
- **Kristen D'Penna**, Toronto Metropolitan University
- **Jessica Gu**, Toronto Metropolitan University

Expectations for the Partnership

The partnership provides an opportunity for the roadmap document to derive solutions from information contrary to regular practices. Architects commonly deal with regulatory documents such as codes, guidelines, by-laws, and official plans. Formats for documents that can be used by and are also accessible to those beyond architects are an expected goal of the partnership.

Expectations and Functions of the Roadmap

During the roundtable, the participants discussed the parameters and function of the roadmap for all parties. The partnership is expected to develop a roadmap to equity, social value, and sustainability in the built environment through the examination of case studies that exemplify quality. There is also an expectation that the roadmap will have longevity in order to reduce the need for rewriting after a period of time. The roadmap must be a 'living' document that can be built improved and learned with over time. It has the opportunity to function like an organism or network that grows and evolves if there is room for improvement provided. The substance of the roadmap can be presented as a narrative instead of policies. A narrative has the potential to be continued and renewed while policies may deter improvement without starting from scratch.

Expectations for Results of the Roadmap

The roadmap will be a tool to initiate and improve the approach to quality in the built environment and the resulting built work must be recognized. Stimulation of recognition through the roadmap may require regulations that define those which achieve quality. It may also be important to recognize or reward all projects that achieve quality rather that a single project as many awards do. This recognition may improve incentive.

Accessibility of Language

The roundtable group discussed how the format of the roadmap should not be overly written as it will be required to be translated and should still be as effective. The written language with which the roadmap is created should not have an effect on its content. In addition, language in terms of terminology, can be exclusionary and not as productive towards building quality from information gathered through public engagement. The variety of actors involved in consultation range in profession and contribution, and hence terminological language. When people voice their opinions and concerns, the different in language can leave room for interpretation of needs. The resulting issue is the potential for inaccurate solutions. In consultation with the public or with different citizen groups, the question of quality will be expressed and must be accurately addressed. A proposed

solution seeks to educate and share terminology in order to improve engagement with the necessary terms. The task would require learning methods of communication in order to share professional knowledge with others as well as being able to learn from others effectively.

Accessibility of Presentation/Representation

The group acknowledged exclusionary aspects of representation and communication within architectural research and proposed a perspective that could improve the research. The interdisciplinary partnerships involved in the project can provide insight into alternate methods of communication that are not necessarily prescriptive or common in architecture. Some other issues identified in architectural representation deals with the idea that it has become ocular centric. The resulting concern is that an entirely visual representation reduces the multi-sensory experience of the built environment. The group discusses how awards are often given to projects entirely based on photographs and drawings. A participant mentions the Governor Generals Award and how in its early days, it sent its jury to the project to evaluate in person which recognizes the reduction occurring in purely ocular representations. In addition, the visually stimulating representations are often highly edited. In this way, the architect may be making a portion of the information inaccessible to others. The conclusion of these thoughts was indicative of a shift from the inclusion of just one sense to many others in order to make the project accessible to all. This conversation led to the examination of aesthetics of communication and the graphic predisposition of architects. If any visual representations are to be created, they must not be biased towards the architect's aesthetic choices as they may not resonate or be easily understood by everyone. The importance and relevance of the display of information became an important topic to explore in the creation of the roadmap. One participant mentioned the study of fonts and colour that convey the right message and are also more accessible to read. Methods of visual communication can also be varied beyond architectural drawings or photographs and potentially expand into comics or other established visual mediums. An important aspect of this idea is that the medium should reflect the user or consumer of the roadmap as well.

The accessibility of the roadmap itself was also discussed as the format must reflect the methods by which people will interact with it. This would mean that it is consumable on a variety of devices and potentially is accessible in different formats.

Accessibility in Participation

The participatory nature of the project seeks the consultation of many parties including the community, the city, and various organizations. A participant describes how awards organizations try to engage the public but have found that these interactions are often

with the same people. There is a goal of incorporating a wider range of voices and perspectives that may be uncommon for them. The roundtable group notes that the examination and inclusion of *who* is involved is very important but also *when* they intervene can be critical. There can sometimes be a situation where a project propels itself forward to quickly without all the right people beforehand thereby resulting in backtracking. These projects attempt to streamline processes but are then slowed down significantly later on because of neglected information in the initial speed of the project. A participant described how consultants will sometimes have something to say about things that were previously decided upon. It is proposed that a roadmap of participation is created strategically in order to reduce overlooked concerns and prevent delays in a project.

Types of Case Studies

The examination of case studies will involve a variety of criteria however, it was proposed that the case studies may not need to be studied in isolation. One participant suggested that the case studies may include some that could be considered bad examples in order to better understand what is not a successful approach to quality as well as potentially measuring the good against the bad. Looking as multiple sides of quality may improve clarity and stimulate reflection on the conditions of the built environment.

The Nature of Awards

The topic of awards was discussed by the group as that which selects case studies to consider. The criteria by which awards designate was then examined and two particular conclusions emerged. The conclusions define the parameters for potential case studies. As awards are commonly evaluated based on performance, the first conclusion began with a question of what performance entails. The group dictated a difference between performance perspectives and performance measures as they are qualitative and quantitative respectively. It was concluded that more of the performance perspectives need to be evaluated in awards. A participant suggested a form of a public life study that would record how people are actually using public space through observation and interaction through interviews. The application of the discussion to case studies may be in the criteria involved in choosing a case study. Projects that have documentation of performance in a qualitative way may be worth studying. One participant suggested that the Toronto Urban Design Awards be considered a case study i…This potential case study can study quality as well as the reward of quality. The award industry plays a part in influencing architects' perspectives of quality and successful design based on their own criteria and past winners. The case study of an award may provide some clarity on the application of quality in the built environment.

The second conclusion was the goal of re-evaluating projects that win awards or reward projects some time after they have been built. Awards programs often will award a brand-new project just after it is built which does not provide much time for evaluation of any lived experience of quality. It was suggested that older projects be rewarded for quality as well. The difference between this suggestion and the current method is the evaluation of experience as a criterion for awarding. Such as task requires more clarity as to how successful experience of a place should be evaluated.

A Multisensory Roadmap

A large portion of the group's conversation revolved around accessibility of the information produced in the project. In order to not only be understood but also to appeal to a large variety of people, it was suggested that the roadmap become multisensory. In this way, sensory deficits or different ways of learning can be accommodated and encouraged in the project. The group discussed the relevance of this notion but the application of the idea with require further research and consultation. A participant mentioned the concept of virtual or augmented realities as a method however it is said that a 2D simulation and a virtual simulation are both still simulations and that there may be an issue with that. Another participant suggests various sensory specific narration such as recordings of people as they walk through a space. The roadmap can consist of a variety of mediums and methods that express quality. In the same way, it was suggested that these ideas of presentation of the roadmap may serve as guidelines for design as well. The innovative methods of multisensory display that result from further brainstorming may become important integrative techniques for multisensory designing as well.

Narrowing the Scope

The group discussed how there are many topics that the roadmap can address and that it must be developed so that it is not too open ended. In order for the roadmap to gain traction, it must have a strong expression. Divergently, the format and content of the roadmap might also be more effective if it is light-handed. A participant described how the history of architecture did not always include drawing and in its early stages consisted entirely of instructions. The participant suggested that the roadmap could be a set of instructions in order to stray away from over-prescribing which might be a result of visual methods like drawing. Another overly prescribed document begins to resemble and simply reinvent the existing forms of guidelines that are not as effective. The concluding goal becomes a challenge of how to be as light as possible without being vague.

In addition, the allocation of roadmaps is explored as the defining forces began to be identified in the discussion. The group notes that there would need to be multiple roadmaps not only for each site in the project, but also for each issue or audience or

concern in each site. The level of complexity emerging suggests that the roadmaps might function in a kind of network of roadmaps.

Roundtable 4a – LaurentianU & ULaval – Dec 1
Thursday, December 01, 2022, from 14:45 to 16:15.

Authors of the summary:
- Dener François, Doctoral student (Université Laval)
-Alex Langevin (Université Laval)
Date of submission: 2023/ 01/ 10

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

*Researchers***:**
- **Jacques White**, Université Laval
- **Pedro Garcia**, Université Laval
- **Michel de Blois**, Université Laval
- **Thomas Strickland**, Laurentian University
- **Terrance Galvin**, Laurentian University
- **Shannon Bassett**, Laurentian University

Citizen groups:
- **Francis Pronovost**, Écobâtiment
- **Naomi Grant**, Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury
- **William Morin,** Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury
- **Cortney St-Jean**, UpTown Sudbury
- **Martial Van Neste**, Conseil de quartier Maizerets

 Cities and procurement:
-**Stephen Monet**, City of Greater Sudbury

Award organisations:
- **Lyne Parent**, AAPPQ

Students:
- **Joëlle Tétreault**, Université de Montréal
- **Charles Cauchon**, Université de Montréal
- **Alex Langevin**, Université Laval
- **Achraf Alaoui Mdaghri,** Université de Montréal
- **Dener François**, Université Laval

What can be done to have a common definition of the concept of quality, values and criteria of quality from the perspective of citizen groups? This is the question with which this roundtable session began. Seen from this angle, this process implies the consideration of various perspectives in terms of approaches, including questions related to the following themes: On the way to a common definition of Quality through the citizen's perspective.

Efforts towards a common definition of quality itself, its values and criteria from a citizen perspective: Approach and methodologies

Participants felt that it is essential to seek to engage the various community groups and citizens in their environments, prioritizing various channels. They explained that one cannot rely solely on a survey to capture the citizen's ideal. It is important to consider different ways of doing this, not just a survey.

For some, we must first be close to the people, be more and more attentive to them by using different mediums or channels of communication. Then, we need to adjust and take care of the language used during the exchanges with the citizens and members of the community. Considering that each community of citizens lives its own reality, without an adapted language, it is difficult to establish a constructive discussion between citizens, specialists or professionals of quality, allowing to collect feedbacks and/or implication of the population on/in the process of definition of quality in built environment, values and criteria of quality.

The findings show that there are many elements to look for and that it will be necessary to weigh them for a better integration of the citizen's vision of quality itself for the built environment. Indeed, there is not only a citizen but also organizations within which they are distributed. Also, it is necessary to constantly take into account these two (2) dimensions in order to avoid prioritizing one of them at the expense of the other. This is perhaps an important limitation of survey tools in the process of defining the quality of the built environment according to the participants. These two dimensions, with their different histories and visions, make it necessary to consider several channels of communication in order not to overlook anything. It is therefore necessary to thoroughly understand these modes and/or forms of organization, their composition, their structure, their functioning, their priorities, their preferred channels of communication, their experiences, their real needs and real apprehensions regarding the concept of quality. We must expect a diversity of forms in the citizen commitment to transformative actions in their environment. Ultimately, by working in practice and with them, we must find the appropriate channel to optimize the impact of the discussions, since there is no single approach to reach and integrate citizens. This is one of the real challenges of this partnership project.

Situate and value the voice of citizen groups in the design process

How do the voices of citizen groups find their place in the process of design, of improving the built environment of design? It is interesting to see the dynamics of the interactions between the actors we are constituting in this project during the implementation of the quality process. This question will be discussed in the following sections.

Identify the models, approaches and techniques used over time to better approach the concept of quality

Award committees are usually composed of different profiles. How can we describe the dynamics of integration between members to better integrate the vision and concerns of communities? Examples of the application of successful models, especially in the case of demolition in St. Roch, were discussed. The discussion concluded that there are successful models oriented towards a "community-based approach" that could contribute to strengthening the results of the SSHRC Partnership project (see case examples below).

Understand each generation's perception of their own generation's best practices

Participants said they really liked Mr. Chopin's questions at the beginning. Indeed, we need to work on having a good understanding of each generation on the best practices of their own generation. And how much distance between generations do we have? or how much distance are we missing? Having taken part in many juries in Quebec City and elsewhere in architecture, urban planning or urban design, one of the participants asks a lot of questions about the posture of a person who works in a jury in charge of awarding excellence in quality. He believes he acted according to what he knew, what our (his) generation understands.

How do these generations see reality? What do we have? What are we missing? These questions often lead to a serious questioning of one's own values. The example of the case of a building from the 50's that received awards for quality and excellence, which the population would agree to pay for 30 years later, was presented during this round table session. So it took 30 years to revisit those own values, those own criteria of quality in that context. This sometimes results in a kind of conflict of values, of achievements with regard to design choices or choices concerning the built environment, including the demolition of old buildings. It is possible that this is due to the fact that the quality criteria of the time did not take into account certain elements, such as durability (quality of materials or others), for example, so that the building of the time won awards, but several of the criteria were not taken into account. Participants were therefore interested in

learning more about the different perspectives. It should be recognized that there are many ways to do this, many ways to formulate and try not to be wrong.

-Addressing the issue of appropriate language in exchanges involving citizens

-Adopt an improved project data collection strategy to address the lack of knowledge, documentation, and learning about the entire quality management process for the built environment:

Some case studies

-Lyne Parent: Before being at the association of the architects in private public practices of Quebec, I was at the association of the groups of technical resources of Quebec, so the GRT. We were accompanying cooperatives, non-profit organizations to draft social and affordable housing projects. In fact, it is a model that was born more than 45 years ago in Quebec precisely because groups of citizens were opposed to the demolition of neighborhoods by developers in Montreal and Quebec City, notably in St Roch. It is still an interesting model that exists and that contains good elements of orientation that architects interested in popular architecture have particularly appropriated. At the GRT, public policies have been developed and project management methodologies have been adapted and integrated, while building up a great deal of expertise over time, which we put at the service of the population and citizen organizations. This is how we have managed to contribute to the construction of more than 60,000 social housing units in 45 years. This is the portrait of a successful model, along with others that have been tested, practiced and appropriated in and with the community. It is worth mentioning the form of collaboration proposed by this model between citizens and specialists in the process of architectural transformation of the environment or of the community itself.

In summary, as Martial said, there are various approaches to integrating citizens into the process. There are certainly successful models that have been tried over time that need to be documented, analyzed, understood and integrated into our process.

Morin: Assist people to better impact their quality of life. Consider all actors equally important to maintain coherence and balance in the process

-Naomi: One way to improve the success rate of our actions is to take a collaborative, participatory, inclusive and integrated approach. Usually we have a checklist for collecting information in the process that includes people from the beginning to the end. Therefore, various challenges are to be expected.

Naomi Grant believes that the checklist method can be used, but that it must be accompanied by other methods that actively include citizens.

49

-Martial: I followed an organization of Maizerets Neighborhood Competition which was a real experience integrating two (2) faculties that put aside committee money for a grant. A competition was organized around a jury composed of researchers, a student association of ULaval where "grants" or subsidies are given to the best project for the realization of Charettes. The students gathered to work in small groups and then came together for a big restitution where they shared their respective reflections on the transformation of the district. Workshops were held with citizens in preparation for the realization of Charrettes. This approach had considerable impacts on the environment and the communities. The student projects were graded for quality and served as guidance to the city and insight to the citizens. Just to say that there is always the possibility of using the "competition" approach to address these types of issues that touch the sphere of the quality of the built environment. Done on a small scale, but it was a good example of successful collaboration between students, the University and the citizen communities.

How can we develop a common design approach?

-Establish an atmosphere of co-creation and co-learning that is inclusive, nurturing, and rewarding and that integrates the needs and concerns of citizens around the concept of quality. It is essential to consult citizens when introducing a project in the community.

-Take into account the diversity of profiles (citizens and citizens' organizations), forms of commitment and adherence to quality initiatives. Experience has shown us that the predisposition of people in a community differs depending on whether they are affluent citizens with a low level of knowledge or more or less affluent citizens living in a certain comfort level to whom a previously adopted vision of doing things may give rise to fear of change. Real challenges emerge and notably: how to educate/educate these people? Indeed, people with more comfortable conditions often show resistance. The big challenge is to get everyone on board, to get everyone talking and to talk to everyone. Also, conducting good quality inclusive processes remains a real challenge to integrate the different perspectives and fair processes can help to find a common definition

-To better identify, characterize and document the challenges related to quality processes in order to make them more equitable and to promote the common definition of the concept of quality

-To manage to properly include everyone's inputs in order to achieve a co-creation of quality in a co-learning environment. The definition of the concept of quality must be clarified for everyone's understanding. If we want to have an appropriate definition of quality, we must include people in the process of constructing this definition. Then, how to evaluate it? It is necessary to have the conception of the people who live in the

community on the question. Furthermore, a real challenge is to understand the relationships between the people participating in an organization or a citizen group with their own history and their specific socio-professional way of doing things. Also, the key is to listen to the people in the community in order to build a viable and conclusive trust relationship that will attract them, keep them truly involved and involved in the whole process. Of course, this is a process that usually requires time and investment of resources.

-Working towards a common language to better attract, involve, engage and retain citizens throughout the process and consider the quality aspect in the quality process: At our last internal roundtable at the Laval University site," explains Miche de Blois, "we discovered a group of partners who are very committed, very motivated and increasingly available to engage in discussions/interactions. I am pleased that we have a common understanding of how to approach the issue of defining quality. We need to understand the involvement of each actor in the different phases of the project, the processes they share and the nature of their contribution. Often there is a challenge of language, of communication between actors leading to a problem of shared understanding. Also, how to reach all these actors in order to collect their respective apprehensions? Indeed, it is necessary to understand each other. But there is no price in architecture for the quality of the process. How do you know if everything has gone as planned? You can mobilize people until one day they realize in a meeting that they are talking to make themselves heard, but nobody pays attention. Often people don't come back. But the moment they realize that their voice does not count they will be much harder to reach with new ideas, new projects or new actions of urban transformation affecting the built environment. It is important to seek feedback from citizens on our planning, actions or execution in order to anticipate better impacts of the latter. There is, in the end, a conflict of acceptance between the expertise of the citizen and that of the specialist within the actors. The process must therefore allow for a good integration of citizens. We must work towards common vocabularies. Each group has a language, unique processes that must be identified, documented, understood, analyzed and modeled. This is the work we have committed to and will continue to strengthen at our Laval University site in conjunction with our partners.

-Involve municipalities more in the process of transforming the built environment through our projects and actions: there are cities whose municipalities do not control the architectural process because they are not always involved, said one participant. So we should see how to involve them more in this partnership. There is no guarantee of quality in the built environment, but we need to work to foster it. How do we engage stakeholders in the processes?

-The roundtables will be of great help in achieving the goal of a common definition and understanding of the concept of quality

Roundtable 4b – LaurentianU & ULaval – Dec 2
Friday, December 02, 2022, from 12:30 to 14:00

Author of the summary:
- Sydney Sheppard, M.Arch student (Laurentian University)
Date of submission: 2023 / 01 / 10

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

*Researchers***:**
- **Jacques White**, Université Laval
- **Pedro Garcia**, Université Laval
- **Michel de Blois**, Université Laval
- **Thomas Strickland**, Laurentian University
- **Terrance Galvin**, Laurentian University
- **Shannon Bassett**, Laurentian University

Citizen groups:
- **Francis Pronovost**, Écobâtiment
- **Naomi Grant**, Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury
- **William Morin,** Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury
- **Cortney St-Jean**, UpTown Sudbury
- **Martial Van Neste**, Conseil de quartier Maizerets

 Cities and procurement:
-**Stephen Monet**, City of Greater Sudbury

Award organisations:
- **Lyne Parent**, AAPPQ

Students:
- **Joëlle Tétreault**, Université de Montréal
- **Charles Cauchon**, Université de Montréal
- **Alex Langevin**, Université Laval
- **Achraf Alaoui Mdaghri,** Université de Montréal
- **Dener François**, Université Laval

This discussion outlined a common objective towards defining a roadmap to quality, that would essentially align with a collective vision. Expanding on a previous discussion, process participation was analyzed in the consideration of what it might look like between citizen groups and designers. A roadmap becomes a method for mapping policies and principles over a timeline through a collaboration between multiple actors. This process should map the different perspectives and inputs from the clusters, involving as many actors as possible (becoming multiorganizational).

There are different forms the roadmaps could take, including a document or a toolbox that would incorporate different ideas, views, and personal experiences. It would answer the question, *what kind of roadmap to quality would you need from your vantage point?* Focusing on the process, the creation of a roadmap helps to integrate common objectives while documenting different perspectives and information between multiple actors.

Recognizing that the issues being addressed are also complex, another objective would be to address clear values throughout the process. This could result in developing lists of qualities we're looking for, pulling from detailed examples or precedents. Establishing common goals and objectives between a variety of users can be difficult to define, but is critical in terms of defining a roadmap to quality.

Throughout the partnership, the final result must go beyond producing a guidebook and have an openness to change, learn, and do things. We can re-evaluate and reflect on the criteria and core values at each stage, which is developed simultaneously with multiple actors. Once a roadmap is developed within the grant, how does it function outside of the grant? We must consider how this roadmap functions differently as we move to the next stage.

Visualizing the Process

One example of a barrier toward achieving quality in the built environment involves visualizing the process. Recognizing that there's not a one-size-fits-all solution, the integration of graphics and common visualization creates accessibility for understanding a collective vision. This goes in hand with another challenge that involves addressing a clear set of values that are consistent across different complexities and recognizing that issues themselves are also complex. Graphics are critical, as a simple way to communicate information effectively. Developing a simple, comprehensive graphic language increases accessibility to different users, and opens the opportunity for mapping input from as many actors as possible, over a timeline.

Taking inspiration from John Ziesel's presentation, it is crucial to develop a visual image to work towards at every stage of the process, in order to maintain consistency toward a

collective objective. Visualizations can take the form of infographics, icons, symbols, data collection, etc. This could also involve mapping the user's journey and experience through a space, where every actor in the process has a different journey map. Therefore, this roundtable discussion emphasized the importance of the plurality of roadmaps; it's not a roadmap, it's *roadmaps*. The social values create embeddedness in the pluralization of roadmaps.

Addressing Interest in Participation

Through this discussion, it was addressed that one of the biggest barriers is catching the interest of people for participation. Through the participation process, a common issue recognized is that participants don't feel they are being listened to. At the scale of citizen groups, there's a desire to see a change of process at the institutional level, where a sense of responsibility can be felt by the community. An emphasis would be placed on those who have been excluded from these processes and who choose to communicate should be compensated. There are practices for hearing from more people on a project, which involves going to places where the users are, rather than expecting them to come to meetings. As another strategy, a list of resources could be provided that answers questions such as, *"who do you need to talk to?" what are the relationships you need to foster?"* treating this as its own map for users accessing the common 'roadmap.' The responsible engagement process is like an umbrella, that encompasses many values to work toward action.

Process Quality

Thinking about how users appropriate projects is not analyzed enough. Through this discussion, three categories of quality were defined; the object itself, the process, and appropriation. Complementary to the final 'object,' the process should be included as conditions for the evaluation of different projects. We should ensure that the users can appropriate themselves in the project. In systems design, the model created is not the reality, but is a tool used to reflect on reality; a similar approach should be used for the process, using a model or an image to create the vision. Being able to visualize the process ensures effective communication and a common understanding of how it will work. User experiences and journeys can be mapped, as every actor in the process would realistically have a different journey map. By mapping the process, talking with regulators in the procurement process creates this element of process quality.

Although the discussion of the roundtable placed greater emphasis on establishing a roadmap rather than examples of case studies, several strategies/examples to the approach of a 'map' were suggested.

The Downtown Sudbury Masterplan - City of Greater Sudbury

A document produced by the City of Sudbury that provides an accumulation of changes and goals to positively impact the downtown area. It includes maps, photographs, drawings, and graphics that communicate a set of goals/objectives. How can an example like this be made more accessible to citizens? Is increased accessibility possible, by further developing a graphic language or by producing a citizen app? This could involve changes in policy, the RFP process, and allow citizens to become more involved in this process.

Laval's Graphic Design Program

The Graphic Design Communication School in Laval was mentioned, which incorporates a body of knowledge to bring visualization to the vision. This might include animation, graphic development, etc, but ultimately information architecture and data visualization are forefronts of the school. Visualization helps to make it more accessible, organize new ideas, and bring new questions (this should be complementary work).

Post occupancy evaluation - Manitoba

We recognize when a building is brand new, but we do not always recognize how it performs after the fact. POE can be examined more closely, integrated within Indigenous expertise.

Bauhaus Awards

Case studies can be further examined that have received Bauhaus awards.

Supporting an Iterative Process

When defining a roadmap to quality, there are many inputs to the process, so it must be viewed as iterative. Many factors are considered, such as redefining values, new awards/certifications, or the exponential growth of climate factors. As issues themselves are complex, we must allow for the creative growth of new parameters.

What does it mean to have a flexible process?

What does the roadmap look like beyond the grant?

We must recognize that the roadmap to quality is not repetitive, and not the same method used in every context; if we do things the same way we'll only reach the same result. The complexity of the process should not be reduced, but rather should be expressed throughout the process in a way people 'outside the frame' can understand. This process

must therefore be flexible, and creative. To make this process visible, it should be a growing model, where this process could involve creating a cumulative graphic to represent the iterative process.

Roundtable 5a – McGillU & CarletonU & UWaterloo – Dec 1
Thursday, December 01, 2022, from 14:45 to 16:15.

Authors of the summary:
- Zineb Hameda Benchekroun, March student (McGill University)
Date of submission: 2023 / 01 / 09

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

Researchers:
- **Ipek Tureli,** McGill Univeristy
- **Mariana Esponda,** Carleton University
- **Federica Goffi,** Carleton University
- **Arfa Aijazi,** University of Waterloo
- **Andrea Atkins,** University of Waterloo

Citizen groups:
- **Carolyn Quinn,** Heritage Ottawa

Cities and procurement:
- **Lesly Collins,** City of Ottawa
- **Martin Contal,** PSPC

Award organisations:
- **Chris Uchiyama,** Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals CAHP | ACECP

Students:
- **Zineb Hameda Benchekroun**, McGill University
- **Lucas Ouellet**, Université de Montréal
- **Melissa Lengies,** Carleton University
- **Dana Mastrangelo**, Carleton University
- **Hannah Philips,** Carleton University
- **Taylor Quibell,** Carleton University

As the roundtable brought together partners from different perspectives and subjects (nighttime design, sustainability and adaptive reuse, social and heritage perspectives), the main connection established was the opportunity of adaptive reuse to benefit marginalized communities through nighttime design and considering an intersectional approach when defining quality in the built environment.

The roundtable was first introduced with questions along the line of: While in Canada, the desire is to reduce the environmental impacts and improve the quality in the built environment, how is it that very few programs to incentivize building conversions and discourage demolition/ new construction exist? This led to the primary point discussed during the roundtable between all partners being the question of how to incentivize quality. As a result, the discussion opened to many suggestions and concerns raised by all partners, and they included the following:

- Many of the existing public buildings are used for a limited amount of time during the day and they are underused during the night. These buildings could be temporally reused benefiting marginalized communities in the 24-hour cycle. For instance, people experiencing homelessness could use heated vestibules or air-conditioned spaces as cooling or warming centers. In addition, residential buildings, industrial warehouses are converted for example for multiple typologies like healthcare and housing programs benefiting marginalized communities (*The Working Center* in the city of Kitchener).

- Public and government buildings that are considered for adaptive reuse are often time office buildings. Due to their lease with landlords, there are a few limitations in terms of what can be done. Concerns about the heritage conservation of the built environment can be challenging. In addition, the tensions perceived between the government portfolio and the private sectors proposals should be considered when dealing with the repurposing of public buildings. The followings are a few suggestions of incentives for adaptive reuse to consider:

  o Promoting adaptive reuse as a sustainable option and/or as a social option. This would require an intersectional approach.
  o Financial incentives: these could include building incentives into the zoning by-laws, allowing for tax incentives (examples in the province of Ontario of tax incentives in the long term can be found), waivers of fees (application fees), etc.
  o Besides financial incentives, projects could focus as well on reward systems like LEED and how to develop space qualities like lighting (Turan, et al., 2020).

- As there are different layers of stakeholders and owners to these development projects, how can find a balance between the long-range incentives and the short-term incentives?

- It is also equally important to care about improving the spaces, their long-term accessibility, and affordability and not just developing adequate incentives. Therefore, projects addressing marginalized communities need more attention and engagement. While there is a lack of post-occupancy evaluation in most of these analyses, this requires further development. How is evaluation approached? What happens to buildings after a few years and more? Such questions stress the importance of looking forward and not just examining historic precedents.

- Building quality affects living quality and the users' well-being. Considering this partnership, quality is an important factor to consider. The question then is how to incentivize quality. How is rapid construction, and adaptive reuse for example affecting quality in the built environment?

Barriers

- Lack of post-occupancy evaluations, the hurdles of engaging with different communities, and lack of integration of lived experience in the partnership:

  - Do these projects have a positive social impact? There should be more consideration given to how these case studies/ projects are affecting the people engaged in the research.
  - To undertake this, the first suggested step is looking at the performance of buildings and getting different data by examining previous maintenance requests (pests controls, leaks, etc.) or filed complaints for example. In addition, the study could analyze surveys, questionnaires, and assessments of users available for each case study. This would help when engaging with different communities by tracing a path of what people have experienced beforehand.

- Barriers and challenges when examining case studies:

  - There is a lack of information and available documents when researching case studies that did not receive grants or rewards compared with awarded projects.
  - Various urban settings and environments are underrepresented in case studies. For instance, due to the lack of vacant office buildings in many

cities, studies and analyses for adaptive reuse are localized in a few cities and result in a lack of diversity of cases.

- o The social component which is essential to a better understanding of quality in the built environment, is under examined in a few case studies.

- How quality should be redefined: there is a tension between what is commonly advertised as quality in the built environment and what people really need and want.

- Certain programs or awards criteria and guidelines are of concern when analyzing case studies:

  - o There is limited access to knowledge and expertise. For instance: for the Collections Assessment for Preservation (CAP) Program, or the National Trust Fund, criteria are unavailable for consultation.
  - o In heritage conservation, sustainability or social value is not considered as criteria. Some of the criteria used to define these awards need to change to enlarge the guidelines. This calls for a need of an intersectional approach in the awards programs' assessment structure.

Suggestions for Case Studies

- Repurposing buildings for healthcare usage: buildings that have been converted into medical centers and housing projects in Kitchener:

  - o The Working Center feeding underhoused individuals, with tent cities setting around them.

- How underused public buildings can be used for people experiencing homelessness during the night?

  - o A great reference book about the rebuilding of social infrastructure is *Palaces for the People* by Eric Klingenberg.
  - o Examining Montreal homeless community around Cabot Square, the Atwater metro station, and how nearby public buildings are being used to benefit this community.

- Development projects and a balanced approach around adaptive reuse (education, incentives, sustainability, etc.):

  - o the City of London will be interesting to follow in this regard (Hahn, 2022).

- Analyzing case studies where there is a difference in "quality" within the same site:

    o Affordable housing and community development in Coxwell Toronto (*Queen Coxwell Revitalization*, 2019)

- Post-occupancy evaluation and how it is affecting building quality:

    o Town renewal and revitalization in Hamilton.

Questions and concerns raised by participants that could be further explored moving forward include the following:

- In terms of common approaches, what delivery model of the citizen groups and organizations' work would work best for students?

- In projects that are addressing marginalized communities, there is a lack of post-occupancy evaluation. This is particularly important to look at when talking about "quality" in selected case studies:

    o How can this evaluation be approached in the research?
    o What resources are available and can be used to facilitate this study?
    o CIS seminars can be a way to introduce the post-occupancy evaluation to the research and start raising questions on quality and use for students working on these case studies.

- Looking at formal federal buildings that are being repurposed for different development projects:

    o How do they evolve into communities?
    o What is a successful community? What are its main needs? How do is the quality of use evaluated?

- When defining quality, the definitions are often static. The issue of starchitecture and architecture of awards also arises.

    o Is this partnership looking for definitions, or ways to foster quality? Is it related to awards?
    o What makes a case study "successful"? How to define this by looking at different policies?

References

Hahn, J. (2022, April 21). *Retention of existing buildings must be "the starting point" for Major London Developments*. Dezeen. Retrieved January 3, 2023, from https://www.dezeen.com/2022/04/21/london-plan-guidance-retention-sadiq-khan/

Klinenberg, E. (2019). *Palaces for the people: How social infrastructure can help fight inequality, polarization, and the decline of civic life*. Broadway Books.

Queen Coxwell Revitalization – Coming Soon! Context. (2019, November 6). Retrieved January 3, 2023, from https://www.context.ca/blog/2019/11/06/queen-coxwell-revitalization-coming-soon/

Turan, I., Chegut, A., Fink, D., & Reinhart, C. (2020). The value of daylight in office spaces. *Building and Environment*, *168*, 106503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106503

The Working Centre. (n.d.). Retrieved January 3, 2023, from https://www.theworkingcentre.org/

Roundtable 5b – McGillU & CarletonU & UWaterloo – Dec 2
Friday, December 2nd, 2022 from 12:30 to 14:00.

Authors of the summary:
- Taylor Quibell, MA Sc. Student (Carleton University)
Date of submission: 2023/01/08

Names of participants by type of stakeholders:

Researchers:
- **Ipek Tureli,** McGill Univeristy
- **Mariana Esponda,** Carleton University
- **Federica Goffi,** Carleton University
- **Arfa Aijazi,** University of Waterloo
- **Andrea Atkins,** University of Waterloo
- **William Straw**, McGill University
- **Adrian Blackwell**, University of Waterloo

Citizen groups:
- **Carolyn Quinn,** Heritage Ottawa

Cities and procurement:
- **Lesly Collins,** City of Ottawa
- **Martin Contal,** PSPC
- **Thierry Montpetit**, PSPC

Award organisations:
- **Chris Uchiyama,** Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals CAHP | ACECP

Students:
- **Zineb Hameda Benchekroun**, McGill University
- **Lucas Ouellet**, Université de Montréal
- **Melissa Lengies,** Carleton University
- **Dana Mastrangelo**, Carleton University
- **Hannah Philips,** Carleton University
- **Taylor Quibell,** Carleton University

Quality Roadmaps

The discussion began by looking at content and formats for quality roadmaps. Professor Federica Goffi at Carleton University started the conversation by asking, "Roadmaps for who?" which led to great discussions about how we want to communicate to different audiences. The multidisciplinary nature of this research poses challenges when determining the best communication method. It was determined that roadmaps might take various forms depending on what groups are being spoken to. How we communicate to citizen groups, the public, professionals, scholars, and policymakers may vary, so we need to tailor the message to the audience. Therefore, being mindful of how to communicate with different groups is essential for the accessibility of information and for conveying our ideas. Due to the range of audiences we plan to target, there may be multiple roadmaps, such as policy recommendations, publications, handbooks, and/or formal reports. These roadmaps might also take different forms, such as written, drawn, or statistical representations of information. Federica then raised two important questions: what output will have the most impact, and how will we bring our findings back to citizen groups?

Thierry Montpetit, Senior Project Director at PWGSC, responded to Federica's initial remarks by talking about simple language and that all roadmaps should be understandable. He also expressed that this research needs more exposure and opinion and to leave academic circles. He proposed that our outputs should be simple and resonate with people who are not policy experts or technically inclined. He said that advocating for quality can quickly go over people's heads, so we need clear communication that is convincing and simple to sell. Lesley Collins from the City of Ottawa piggybacked on Thierry's comments by suggesting that we use clear language communication and simple concrete tools that can be used outside of academia. She expressed a need for specific facts to share with clients about what a more quality building looks like.

Continuing the idea of clear communication, Martin Contal from Public Services and Procurement Canada and Adrian Blackwell, Associate Professor at the University of Waterloo, spoke about measurable and understandable statistics. A suggested tool for displaying information is measurements and statistics. Statistics are an excellent way to translate information for the public and politicians, but we need to decide what quantitative measures are convincing. Martin brought up the example of adaptive reuse - If we want to advocate for adaptive reuse, what are the advantages, and how do we measure them?

At the end of the discussion, Martin circled back to how we communicate with different audiences. Beyond different audiences and means of communication, the definition of quality vastly changes depending on the stakeholder. There is not one description of

66

quality, so do we have to consolidate the definition of "quality," or what definition(s) will we prioritize?

Communication Tools & Methods

As mentioned above by the participants, communication barriers affect quality in the built environment. Due to the range of actors in the built environment, the varying levels of understanding, and the different means of communication, it takes work to advocate quality to stakeholders. Because of this, the group has agreed that our research needs to be easily communicated and understood. If this occurs, we will have a better chance of resonating with our target audiences, ultimately leading to quality in the built environment. In addition, a consensus was made that we might need to produce multiple roadmaps to communicate more effectively.

Award Criteria

In the discussion, we spoke about awards and how they affect quality in the built environment. Although award committees are expanding and becoming more inclusive, award definitions can sometimes be self-serving and externalize what quality is. Thierry suggests that every project should have a double duty; if it does not, it is wasteful. Therefore, a building should do more than what it was designed to do, and awards should recognize if it can do more than intended. Martin adds to this by arguing that we need to build in adaptability so buildings can continuously adapt and change uses.

When discussing awards, Chris Uchiyama from the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and Lesley Collins talked about their organizations' awards. They spoke about how their awards are about celebration instead of quality and how they are self-nominated, which means people submit their own projects. If they do not, they are not awarded. Taylor Quibell, a student researcher from Carleton University then expressed her difficulties researching awards. Limited access to evaluation criteria has made it difficult to understand what awards are rewarded for.

Long-term Case Study Analysis

Adrian Blackwell mentioned that the University of Waterloo is looking at long-term case study analysis. Over the course of this research, they plan to look at various case studies from different periods and then delve into the social and environmental aspects of each. They plan to study social and environmental factors over time to understand the future of contemporary buildings. To do this, they are referencing the *Parkdale Neighbourhood Land Trust's* work and methodology. This work looks at affordability, adequacy, and suitability criteria. In the Parkdale example, citizens were hired to conduct a door-to-door

survey. The University of Waterloo group understands that some issues they have identified are future problems, so they are working backwards when looking at their case studies. Adrian suggested we reduce the number of case studies we evaluate to get a more in-depth analysis. For example, if the focus is on community attitudes, we must narrow our scope as this will be time extensive. By limiting case studies, we will have the opportunity to go deeper. Federica, Taylor Quibell and Lesley Collins then suggested that we revisit our case studies in the later years of the research to explore the test of time and evaluate different factors.

Communication with citizen groups

A common thread in our conversation was that the user/occupant should help define quality. Ipek Tureli, an Associate Professor from McGill University and her group are actively listening and understanding quality through the user. However, a common challenge was how to communicate effectively with different stakeholders. Communicating and engaging with citizen groups is timely and extensive and must be done ethically. An issue being faced currently by their group is limited resources and inadequate in-house experience with interviewing. Zineb Hameda Benchekroun from McGill University then spoke about the methodology that they are using. When working with marginalized communities, they are using an intersectional approach, which is when you find additional information from other marginalized communities that may have similar experiences.

To end the conversation, Melissa Lengies, a Carleton student researcher, posed two important questions, "whom should we be targeting with our research in terms of how we frame it and the type of information we document?" and "what would the main output be, a handbook for the public, a formal report for the government, etc.?" This is something the group is planning to look at moving forward.

Below is a list of questions that have been paraphrased from the roundtable that could be considered for future research:

1. How do we visually interpret information and make it more accessible and understandable to the broader public or the government?
2. Should roadmaps take multiple forms to target different audiences?
3. What final output will have the most impact, and how will we bring our findings back to citizen groups?
4. Since the definition of quality vastly changes depending on the stakeholder, how/will we consolidate the definition of quality?
5. In particular cases, should we narrow our scope to execute a more thorough, in-depth case study analysis?

6. Is it worth revisiting case studies in future years to evaluate different factors?
7. What quantitative measures of quality can be used to produce a convincing output?
8. How do we display and consolidate our findings, so they resonate with people who are not policy experts or technically inclined?
9. How do we gain feedback on the social outcomes of case studies? How do we listen to these voices?