

## MINUTES OF MEETING

**Date:** Thursday, 24 November 2005 (4:00 p.m.)

**Present:** Roger Mitchell RAIC Syllabus Local Program Coordinator  
David Edwards Studio Coordinator  
Reid Pattison Student Principal  
Alton Tangedal Thesis Advisor/Mentor  
Kurt Dietrich Syllabus Thesis Candidate

**Purpose of Meeting:** The purpose of this review was to monitor the progress of the Candidate and advise of any relevant issues which may remain to be addressed as the design study continues.

### ITEM / DISCUSSION

#### 1.1 Presentation Review

Kurt led the meeting with a brief presentation of the thesis process to date. The presentation included background materials from the previous stage as well as current development. Comments relative to the presentation drawings are:

- ? The initial presentation assembly seems out of sequence: follow a plan-section-elevation format.
- ? The overall perspective should complete the presentation, not lead it off.
- ? The presentation should demonstrate the logical sequence from research through the design project. Illustrate the process.
- ? Insert people into the images for a sense of scale.
- ? Insert a bar scale into the plan images for a sense of scale.

#### 1.2 Site Planning Resolution

The site plan was discussed at length as this presentation was the first opportunity to review this element. The comments made relative to site planning include:

- ? Bus loop seems excessive – perhaps a straight exit out would be better.
- ? Landscaping does not appear to be well defined. Is it to be axial, looped, circular: how does it tie into the building form?
- ? Forecourt frame-out presents a negative “feng shui” element with a knife edge facing the entrants. Perhaps this form could be more suitably resolved.
- ? Site selection criteria should be clearly explained during the presentation.
- ? Site / building interface should be resolved in a more positive format including solutions at the entrance, rooting the building to the site and development of the rear court area.

**1.3 Presentation Verbal Elements**

Items that are critical to the presentation/explanation process should be explained during the student presentation. These items include:

- ? Explain the background to ensure that there is an understanding how this design solution is based on the curriculum criteria.
- ? Mathematical resolution is explained properly, however don't let the math resolution rule the solution – ensure the aesthetic and artistic elements are explained also.
- ? Illustrate one section of the curriculum summary in detail to show the depth of that research, and how it relates to the final design solution.

**1.4 Published Information**

The scope of drawings that will be printed to support the presentation was discussed. Comments relative to publications include:

- ? The design programme, illustrating individual pages leading up to the solution, should be mounted for reference.
- ? The educator requirements for the individual teaching spaces should be mounted.
- ? The resolution / supplemental information relative to the design areas and programme should be mounted for reference.
- ? Pick fewer illustrations of the interior/exterior renderings and make the few used stronger in their appearance.

**1.5 Future Development**

- ? It was agreed that Kurt has demonstrated a readiness to complete the final presentation.
- ? It was agreed that the educators (Ingrid and Sherman) are crucial to the final presentation.
- ? Kurt will contact Ingrid and Sherman to pick the nearest available date in December that they are available. Roger and David will coordinate jury members for the final presentation.
- ? Note: Sketches in PDF format are contained on the appropriate website page. Please visit the website index for the date of review icon.

**Should there be any errors or omissions in the foregoing Minutes, please advise the candidate immediately, otherwise the Minutes shall be considered correct as written.**