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ABSTRACT

This practicum explores potential for a new prison typology for federally sentenced women within Canada. The Koza Centre is an alternative to designs and practices currently in place that have the potential to create barriers to successful rehabilitation and reintegration.

The primary intention of this work is to understand the issues and needs that are shared by many women who have come into conflict with the law and respond with an appropriate design. The methodology for this includes a brief history of women’s imprisonment in Canada and current political contexts, an analytical framework focused on overall well-being, and precedent studies. From this, programming and strategies have been developed that inform an evidence-based design.

The result is a design focused on rehabilitation through the building of healthy relationships, ties to the community, programming that fosters successful reintegration, and supportive interior design that facilitates the well-being of those within the space.
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1.1 INTRODUCTION TO PROJECT + SCOPE

In support of the requirements for a Master of Interior Design qualification at the University of Manitoba, the following practicum presents the design of a new federal prison typology for women, the Koza Centre. The primary intention of this project is to address the challenges women face with incarceration, reintegration, and their strong need for positive relationships—both inside prison, and outside among community and family.

The research and literature presented in the upcoming text supports the position that treatment for incarcerated women is primarily hindered by their removal and isolation from society, as well as numerous spatial attributes common to prisons. Arguably, it is time for a new carceral model that provides opportunity for federally sentenced women (FSW) to live with and care for their children while in a facility integrated into a local community. Run by Correctional Service of Canada (CSC), programs and therapy options are offered to assist FSW with addressing the issues that lead to their conflict with the law, and aid in their personal growth and development. This model focuses on rehabilitation through the building of strong, healthy relationships, ties to the outside community, programming that fosters successful reintegration, and supportive interior design that facilitates the well-being of those within the space.

The Koza Centre is an adaptive reuse of a long-since abandoned factory mill that sits on the edge of a community park in Toronto’s Roncesvalles neighbourhood. The building is 40,000 square feet, spread over three above-ground levels and one lower level. The scope of design work includes new floor plans for all of the levels, with a concentration on the interior design of spaces considered to be most indicative of the project’s intent. Highlights of the facility include individual living units with shared communal activity areas on the third level; spaces for supportive interventions such as programs, therapy, and education on the second level; and offerings to the outside
community on the ground and lower level, including a community kitchen, social spaces, and a dog care and training facility. These areas of the building that are open to the public are done so with the intent to foster communication and support from the outside community, enrich the lives of the women incarcerated through skills and experience, all the while reducing the stigma of offender.

1.2 RATIONALE

The idea for this practicum was borne out of media accounts that painted a dismal picture of the state of care for incarcerated women in Canada. Over recent decades the country’s penal system has been growing at a staggering rate and is currently witnessing its highest levels of incarceration, particularly among the female population (Sapers, 2014, p. 2). Recent changes to justice-related legislation, including the introduction of Bill C-10—more commonly known as the omnibus crime bill—has lead to harsher sentencing, including increased mandatory minimum sentencing and reduced instances of parole. This type of tough-on-crime political posturing is most recently synonymous in Canada with former Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s style of governance. What has resulted from this and many former years of neglect is an ineffectual penal system that is bursting with inmates and lacking in adequate resources.

Canada’s Correctional Investigator, Howard Sapers (2014), in his most recent annual report, criticized CSC and the current state of the judicial system and its federal policies. The section on FSW identifies a number of issues unique to that population. Among these, Sapers notes the 66% increase over the past 10 years of women serving their sentences in penitentiaries rather than in community programs. This is despite the fact that women continually demonstrate “higher levels of motivation and reintegration potential compared to their male counterparts” (p. 46). He notes troubling trends related
to the care of women in prison, such as mental health issues being addressed with psychotropic medications, and a quarter of all self-harm incidents being responded to by “use of force interventions” (p. 46). Overall, the report speaks of an over-crowded system with tensions among prisoners and staff, all compounded by lack of space, outside contact, programs, skilled labour, and education.

Significant contributors to the discourse of criminalized women in Canada, such as authors Gillian Balfour, Elizabeth Comack, and Kelley Hannah-Moffat have helped to substantiate the importance of a female-centered approach to the care and governance of women in prison. Apart from feminist-specific readings, experiences of and perspectives on criminality and imprisonment are historically discussed in male terms. They are often devoid of discussion about how women’s experiences may differ from men’s, which are presented to be the standard (Comack, 2006, p. 22). This is also true of the design of prisons. Since their conception, prisons were built in response to men’s psychological and spatial needs (“Forum on Corrections”, 2012).

This practicum demonstrates the value that design can add to the quality of life for a specific group. Approaching the design and programming of a federal facility in direct response to women’s needs, rather than relying on male-centered data, is imperative. In doing so, it ensures that the physical environment of prison is one that supports a rehabilitative process specifically for women. Because there are a myriad of challenges and circumstances that are unique to women in prison, a single design solution is not adequate.

Demographically, a high percentage of incarcerated women have a history of sexual and physical abuse, often leading to substance abuse and crime as a direct result (Comack, 1996; Balfour & Comack, 2006). Circumstances such as this contribute to the fact that women are twice as likely as men to be diagnosed with mental health conditions upon date of admission (“Corrections and...
A common theme that arises from interviews with women in prison, is that factors such as poor socio-economic standing have prevented them from receiving access to support for struggles in their lives, until they have been locked up (Comack, 1996, p. 140). Overwhelmingly, FSW come from a life of poverty and have low levels of education and skills training (“Forum on Corrections”, 2012). Because women comprise under 5% of Canada’s total prison population (Sapers, 2014, p. 45), federal facilities are often much farther from the offenders’ homes than men’s—further isolating them from community and family support systems (Matthews, 1999). This is despite the fact that two-thirds of them have children and are at high risk of losing custody due to their run-ins with the law (“Forum on Corrections”, 2012).

The visibility of FSW in Canada has increased through media coverage and advocacy efforts, and with this has come support for change. CSC has made efforts to update their policies and practices to more suitably and directly address the needs of FSW. As this and the subsequent chapter will show, however, CSC has not done enough to meet its mandate to provide rehabilitative support for FSW in a safe, secure, and humane manner.

The demand for better care of FSW and more accountability on the part of CSC is not new. Canada has a long and sordid history of ill-treatment of women in custody that began with the very first to be locked up in 1835. Without a prison or area specifically designated for women, they were housed in the hospital at the Kingston Penitentiary for men in Ontario (“ Correctional Service”, 2000). When the basement of the north wing of the penitentiary became the first official prison for women four years later, there were accounts of the abysmal conditions considered to be even worse than the men’s quarters. It was described as “cold, damp and crawling with bugs” (“ Correctional Service”, 2000, p. 7). Punishments within the walls were severe and abusive to both the body and the mind—including being
forced to spend hours cramped in a box that was too short to stand-up in fully. The wing was overcrowded and generally unfit to accommodate the women (“Correctional Service”, 2000).

In 1867, in the annual report by the Inspector, it was recommended that a new building be erected as a proper prison for women (“Correctional Service”, 2000). Almost 150 years after that annual report, and numerous facilities later, recommendations and concerns have continually been voiced about the conditions in women’s prisons. Historically, the time taken to implement recommendations have been egregious, if not completely ignored (Balfour & Comack, 2006).

The Prison for Women (P4W) that operated from 1934 to 2000 in Kingston, Ontario is Canada’s most well known, and infamous, women’s facility. It is also one that precipitated a sea change in how women’s federal corrections would be approached. Until 1995, P4W was Canada’s only federal prison for women, which meant shipping many away from their families and communities across the country to serve their sentences in Kingston. Almost immediately, there were issues. Operational costs were high given the low number of women at the facility. The level of security was excessive for the majority of FSW who were there for relatively minor offences such as prostitution. Programs based on male-centered treatment that could not adequately respond to the needs of FSW made it appear as though they were untreatable. The safety of those at the facility—often threatened by incidents of self-harm used as a coping mechanism for past traumas—was not properly met. Instead of therapy and programs that would help to treat the root of problems, most issues were addressed through control measures such as segregation (Balfour, 2006, p. 157).

Following a prisoner suicide in 1988, an inquest into protocols and operations at P4W lead to the formation of the first Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women (TFFSW) (Balfour, 2006, p. 157). As Balfour notes, “the
Task Force proved to be the most significant study of women’s imprisonment in Canada, and served as a blueprint for unprecedented change in the treatment of criminalized women” (p. 157). The TFFSW was co-chaired by CSC and the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS), the country’s primary non-profit organization advocating for the rights of women within the justice system.

In 1990, one year after their formation, TFFSW published Creating Choices—a document that aims to guide the treatment of women in prison. The document was developed from the stories of FSW, as a qualitative study to understand the issues from first-hand perspectives. It allowed women to speak for themselves, and helped to develop an understanding that much of the conflict women face with the law is rooted in deeper social, political, and economic contexts, including—overwhelmingly—histories of sexual and physical violence. By forcing women’s “corrections” into a model based on men’s criminality, the system was ill-equipped to provide any benefit or support that FSW fundamentally need (Balfour, 2006, p. 158-9).

Developed from Creating Choices, principles of programming in women’s facilities are now structured as women-centered, holistic, supportive environments that recognize the diversity of those incarcerated (“Program Strategy”, 2004). The most significant milestones that have come from the recommendations laid out by the task force are the decommissioning of P4W, and the construction of six new regional facilities across the country between 1995 and 1997. Included in this is the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge for aboriginal women in Saskatchewan (“Program Strategy”, 2004).

Authors such as Gillian Balfour, Elizabeth Comack (2006) and Kelley Hannah-Moffat (2013), however, speak critically of the effectiveness of Creating Choices. They argue that the shift that has occurred is primarily one of language and rhetoric rather than practical change that would show any effect on the experiences of FSW in prison. As Hannah-Moffat (2013) argues:
It is now held by many inside and outside corrections that *Creating Choices* promoted an unachievable ideal. Within CSC, *Creating Choices* is now simply referred to as a philosophy statement. While the benevolent rhetoric of empowerment and healing embodied in *Creating Choices* has permeated correctional discourses, the more sinister and punitive disciplinary reality of ‘corrections’ persists. (p. 177)

Time and again, CSC has received criticisms such as this for its failures to properly implement the recommendations and practices put forth in *Creating Choices*. Despite the apparent forward strides made on paper related to the treatment of FSW, first-hand and documented accounts of the sometimes harsh reality of life on the inside continue to emerge over a decade after the release of *Creating Choices*. Videos of female inmates being strip-searched by male correctional officers in 1994 at P4W (Balfour, 2006, p. 160), as well as the story of Ashley Smith, the nineteen year old who committed suicide in 2007 while guards outside her cell were given orders not to intervene (Doria-Brown, 2013), are two examples of the disparity between reality and the rules of conduct. This suggests that while efforts are being made to address CSC’s shortcomings in properly treating women in their care, current programs and typologies surrounding the carceral system should be further examined and scrutinized for better solutions. And while much of the discussion here is framed around ideas of well-being, empowerment, and rehabilitation—similar to *Creating Choices*—it is my hope that I will have moved beyond mere rhetoric to provide tangible alternatives and approaches to the spatial experience of prison.

### 1.3 DESIGN ETHICS

In recent decades, the question of social and ethical responsibility has emerged as a prominent discussion in design fields. Increasingly, designers and builders are recognizing a professional onus to provide equitable and accessible design solutions to those that would benefit the most from it. As a result, vulnerable populations and disaster-torn areas are receiving help
where high-caliber design was once financially out of reach. Arguably, design is reinventing itself with a social and moral consciousness unlike ever before. This is partly evident by the emergence in the last two and a half decades of organizations such as Architects Sans Frontières International (“Who We Are”, 2015) and Architects Without Borders, who have established chapters throughout the world.

This heightened sense of responsibility of the designer has not only impacted what projects will be picked up, but also provides grounds for what types of designs will be boycotted. The ethical implications of a project become an important consideration because design does not exist within a vacuum—it belongs to context, has specific intent, and responds to the functions and needs of its place and users (Sorkin, 2013). Prisons are prime examples of designs that have the potential to violate basic human rights, and many designers are now refusing to play any role that enables this. The main proponent spearheading this campaign is the American organization Architects/Designers/Planners for Social Responsibility (ADPSR). Originating in the 1980s with attention on nuclear issues of the time, the ADPSR of today is primarily focused on fighting against the design community’s involvement in prisons—specifically spaces for torture and death such as solitary confinement, execution chambers, and “super max” prisons where prisoners spend most of their day in total isolation (“About ADPSR”, n.d.).

There are many, in contrast, who believe that design does not hold the power to effect change in areas where much larger systemic or political issues are at play. There are others, further, who simply believe that ethics are not a part of their job and therefore not their business. Yet, it is important for designers to ask themselves what level of moral and ethical responsibility they have in the creation of space that perpetuates the values and ideas that it is being used for. Rarely is change initiated by the governing body from which the injustice is rooted. The hand is often forced by a shift in popular opinion
as more and more individuals refuse, whether overtly or indirectly, to support certain practices. Incarceration is a social, cultural, and political matter, one that is controlled by government—but designers have the power to consciously choose their level of participation, in turn, asserting their position on the matter.

Power will always exist in a space that controls the freedom and liberties of those within it, so it is important as a society to continually ask how and for what ends that power is being used.

This practicum falls somewhere in the middle of this ethical debate. I recognize the need for incarceration to exist as an option in Canada to maintain public safety and the rule of law. It is, however, many of the judicial system’s responses to criminality—mandatory minimum sentencing, under-use of parole, over-institutionalization, excessive use of force and isolation practices, and a lack of effective programming and resources—that I find to be heavy-handed, counter productive, and damaging to the human rights and well-being of those involved.

Prisons undoubtedly exert power over individuals by means of spatial confinement and the removal of the offender from the outside community. If one of the goals of prison is rehabilitation, as CSC states in their mandate, then beyond the confining nature of the exterior walls, the interior must serve in the interest of rehabilitation, not punishment. Does a space that is designed to alienate, isolate and deprive those within it really provide opportunity for health and wellness to flourish? What impact does this have on the type of individual that will be returned to the community post-release?

Power will always exist in a space that controls the freedom and liberties of those within it, so it is important
as a society to continually ask how and for what ends that power is being used. I argue that it is in the best interest of society to use this power to influence positive change in individuals, to ensure that those coming out of prison are not worse off than when they went in.

As a human geographer, David Harvey studies the impacts of space and place from the perspective of those that inhabit them (Findley, 2005). Harvey believes that the architect—and we can assume by extension, the designer—is highly rooted in action:

Architecture [...] is about solving problems, about making a different spatial reality. It does this in the face of uncertainty, knowing that it will not be perfect. This reminds us that architecture is, in its essence, an optimistic, action-based endeavor. (Findley, 2005, p. 35)

Harvey acknowledges that while designers must work within set parameters and restrictions such as clients, building codes, and budgets, they still operate within a realm of creativity that allows for the incorporation of both beauty and change. He recommends that designers recognize their boundaries for optimal success. That is, design can represent an “idealized future” in a way that so many other fields cannot, but this creative expression should be rooted in human scale, with the context, materials available, and specific function of that place in mind (Findley, 2005, p. 35).

Considering design as an expression of an idealized future, it becomes a medium of progress, at its best. It is, perhaps, the ultimate test of one’s creativity. Rather than withdrawing from participation in projects such as prisons, designers should consider immersing themselves in these projects to inject as much design for good as will possibly allow. It is much easier to support change and create impact from within a system than from outside of it. As a penal institution, spatial containment and security are distinct design parameters of the Koza Centre—imagining the different ways in which this space could express a new approach to incarceration is at the precipice of this project’s creativity.
1.4 INTRODUCTION TO ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Having provided a brief introduction to the project, its rationale, and the ethics of prison design, in the upcoming chapter I move into the analytical framework that has informed the design of the Koza Centre. Concepts of well-being as they relate to the psychological, social, and physical health of FSW will structure the framework. From this, tools and strategies emerge that will help to realize a new prison typology that aims to rehabilitate and encourage successful reentry of FSW into society. It is with empathy and critical thought that I have applied my research to the project’s design, continually asking myself how the physical space can facilitate the project intent. The research presented in Chapter 2 helps frame the Koza Centre as a space for nurture and transformation, through the creation of space that is aimed at facilitating the well-being of its users.
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The map in Table 1 provides a visual aid to guide readers through the structure of the upcoming analytical framework in Chapter 2. In short, it illustrates the paths that lead me to specific design strategies that have been used. I will argue that rehabilitation and reentry into the community is primarily contingent upon personal growth and development while incarcerated. Development of life and vocational skills provide pragmatic solutions to issues commonly faced by FSW. Since the majority of the women are underemployed and under-educated, training and work opportunities will give valuable experiences, putting them in a better position to be self-sufficient. Life skills will teach them everything from writing a resume, to how to prepare a healthy meal, to understanding self-awareness, for example.

The development branch of this map contributes to the design of the Koza Centre primarily through the programming and types of spaces that are offered. Personal growth, on the other hand, is more intangible than skills and training; it is about one’s well-being. It is a broad term that can be distinguished into three primary aspects: physical, psychological, and social health.

Physical health is not just influenced by an individual’s fitness level but also by the health and quality of the environment they live in. This is particularly relevant in a carceral facility where users are primarily bound indoors. When discussing psychological health from the perspective of interior design, it comes down to understanding the ways in which one’s mental health is affected by their physical surroundings. Just as there are ways that space can be psychologically damaging and oppressive, there are also spaces that help to empower and uplift those within.

The remaining realm of well-being, social health, is addressed through the role of family and community. It is, arguably, the most influential aspect of well-being to the design for its role in driving the success of women’s rehabilitation and reentry through the building of social
capital, identity construction, and one’s sense of belonging and purpose. Demonstrating the importance of family and community to FSW provides justification for integrating the project into a busy neighbourhood and designing within for social health.

The right-hand side of the map shows a branch with design criteria that comes in response to the discussions of well-being. The design criteria for the project includes aspects related to both user health and psychological experiences of space. To address health, building systems and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) strategies have been incorporated. The design also encourages users to be more physically active in their everyday lives. Straddling user health and psychological experience is the integration of biophilic design that attempts to bring people and nature closer together. The remaining strategies related to psychological experience include measures for user control and the development of positive and uplifting spaces.
1.5 QUESTIONS OF INQUIRY

Three questions have been identified that express the primary learning objectives for this practicum.

Firstly, I am investigating the ways in which the design of typical prisons impact FSW—socially, mentally, and physically—and contribute to or hinder their sense of well-being. This question is critical because my design is rooted in the argument, discussed at the onset of Chapter 2, that rehabilitation is only truly possible when one’s well-being and overall health have been adequately met. By identifying how the spatial environment of prison affects women, I can encourage or avoid these aspects using evidence-based design.

The second question that I am asking is whether the redesign of a women’s federal prison could more accurately reflect CSC’s philosophy and mandates, as well as other progressive, emerging opinions of the rights and responsibilities of the carceral system. Interior designers create spaces in support of their clients’ needs. Part of this process involves examining the spaces in which our clients operate and identifying if they successfully express their image and goals or contradict them. In short, is the physical space in which the client operates in harmony with their mission and values.

The third and final question that I am asking is whether interior design can and should be used as a tool for positive social change and, if so, what the limitations surrounding this might be. It is my hope that the work done in this practicum shows the value of responsible design.
1.6 PROJECT UNDERPINNINGS

This practicum has three main project underpinnings. These are interwoven throughout the project and form the foundation upon which all of the work is based. They are as follows:

1. Rehabilitation and successful reintegration is contingent upon well-being as it is defined in this practicum;
2. Women turn to community and family for strength and support; and
3. This work is done from a standpoint of social and ethical responsibility within design.

1.7 LIMITATIONS

The most obvious limitation to this practicum project is that it simply cannot offer a complete solution to the issues faced by FSW in Canada. Complimentary work in fields such as sociology and law could provide insight on the complexities of societal issues and the judicial system that cannot be adequately addressed by an interior design practicum. I do not presume that the alternatives offered here will ameliorate years of problems, entrenched in a system that—while slowly moving in a positive direction—appears inherently broken. It is not just the walls, but the programs, people, and policies that make the experience of federal prisons what they are. While it is beyond the scope of this practicum to propose policy changes and otherwise in response to the issues identified, my focus is set on the spatial realities of incarceration—providing insight and strategies for an interior design that would support prison as a truly rehabilitative environment for women.
1.8 PROJECT GOALS + LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The following list identifies the primary goals and learning objectives of this project:

- Exploration of an alternative prison typology that moves away from a punitive, oppressive institution, and focuses on a healing, uplifting environment.
- Design that responds more appropriately to CSC’s mandate and introduces design strategies from more progressive carceral models.
- Emphasis on design that does not inflict undue psychological stress on its users.
- Promotion of physical health through design for active living.
- Maintaining a connection to the community—rather than isolating incarcerated women—while simultaneously encouraging the community to use and share the space with the women serving time there.
- Maintaining the architectural vernacular of the neighbourhood throughout elements of the building to align with concepts of community (re)integration.
- Structure design by level according to activity type and level of interaction with the outside community.
1.9 KEY TERMS

FSW - federally sentenced women

CSC – Correctional Service of Canada

REHABILITATION - The ideal outcome of rehabilitation is healthy, law-abiding citizens who are productive contributors to society. Within the justice system, this process includes identifying and addressing the issues in an individual’s life that have lead to their criminal behaviour. The primary goal is to then equip these individuals with the skills, coping strategies, strength, and support that will enable them to make choices that will make it much less likely that they will come into further conflict with the law. Rehabilitation is discussed in this practicum as occurring in close tandem with well-being, as defined below.

WELL-BEING - For the purposes of this practicum, well-being is defined as “the state in which the individual is able to develop their potential, work productively and creatively, build strong and positive relationships with others, and contribute to their community” (Beddington, et al., 2008, p. 1057). Well-being is a holistic measure of health that encompasses the social, physical, and psychological realms of oneself.

REENTRY or REINTEGRATION - These terms are used interchangeably and refer to an individual’s return to a community (not necessarily the one they left) upon their release from imprisonment.
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2.1 INTRODUCTION

The following chapter looks at the context of women’s imprisonment from a spatial, programmatic, and overall experiential perspective. The text examines these perspectives through the lens of well-being and its sub-categories. This method of analysis enables the experience of women’s incarceration to be broken down into the areas of well-being that are affected and influenced as a result. Beginning with psychological well-being, the text explores how design can influence one’s thoughts and mental states. Aspects of social well-being are primarily focused on issues of motherhood in prison and concepts of community as defining one’s sense of self and relationships. Lastly, the chapter closes with physical well-being, how other realms of well-being affect the body physically as well as how physical health can be affected by the built environment. This discussion begins with Correctional Service Canada’s (CSC) mandate and mission that establishes the design intent of developing a more suitable interior for women’s rehabilitation.

Within Canada, any offender that has been sentenced to two or more years of imprisonment will serve their time at a federal institution under the care and responsibility of CSC. CSC’s mission states that it “contributes to public safety by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens, while exercising reasonable, safe, secure and humane control” (“About Us”, 2012). The primary piece of legislation that governs how CSC operates and conducts itself, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, also mandates them with the responsibility of providing “programs that assist with rehabilitation and successful reintegration into the community” (“Section 2”, 2010, p. 1).

Assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens, however, is a deceivingly simple statement for a highly convoluted issue. Understanding individual histories and looking at women’s crime through the lens of everyday experience, provides opportunity to see it as a product of the other challenges faced by women in their lives (Comack, 1996; “Program Strategies”, 2004). Although individual circumstances can vary significantly,
incarcerated women in Canada often share similar social contexts. They commonly come from a poor socio-economic background, lacking in proper education and skills which makes finding employment difficult; many are single mothers struggling to make ends meet for themselves and those in their care; the majority of women in prison have been a victim of abuse or trauma and suffer from issues with mental health. Many attribute their incarceration, in large part, to the damaging grip of substance abuse that makes feeding the addiction necessary by any means (Bauman-Grau & Gundy, 2013; Blanchard, 2004; “Forum on Corrections”, 2012; Gilham, 2012; Zheng, n.d.).

Transitioning from prison to the outside world on one’s own, without adequate support or coping skills, is a daunting and often discouraging task. Individuals are faced with a myriad of potential obstacles that may include family and social issues, housing, employment, lack of education or training, stigmatization and temptations from a previously destructive lifestyle (Visher & Travis, 2003, p. 96). It is clear from the research that the goal of rehabilitation is to equip individuals with the skills, coping strategies, and support that will enable them to make choices that will make it less likely that they will come into further conflict with the law. The chance for successful rehabilitation and reintegration into the community is most promising when individual needs have been properly addressed. In essence, rehabilitation is contingent upon health, personal growth, development, and healing—all significant factors that are affected by one’s overall well-being, which will form the design premise of the Koza Centre.

———

WELL-BEING

Health is much more complex than simply physical fitness; it is well-being, a holistic wellness that extends to all aspects of one’s life—the physical, psychological, and social realms. It is a state of mind and body that
enables individuals to face adversity and challenge in life. For the purposes of this practicum, well-being is defined as “the state in which the individual is able to develop their potential, work productively and creatively, build strong and positive relationships with others, and contribute to their community” (Beddington, et al., 2008, p. 1057). ¹ This definition embodies the optimal outcome of rehabilitation.

Not surprisingly, there have been many attempts to categorize and quantify levels of well-being. In the field of clinical psychology, Kinderman et al. (2010) have developed one of the more well-rounded assessment methods, known as the BBC well-being scale, by utilizing three sub-scales that include psychological well-being, physical health and well-being, and relationships. An already challenging concept to quantify, not only does one’s well-being fluctuate in response to life and experience, but even the determination of what well-being looks like is hostage to the attitudes and context of its time, making an already inherently challenging concept harder to quantify (Ryff, Singer, & Love, 2004). Drawing from Kinderman et al.’s BBC well-being scale, the following analytical framework will be organized into the three sub-scales for manageability—psychological, social, and physical health.

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation Development (OECD) measures well-being as part of their Better Life Initiative. The group, who originally used economic status as the primary measure of a country’s well-being, has since shifted their focus to the individual and aspects of life that have the most effect on well-being (OECD, 2013). Within Canada, a specific index has been developed that identifies aspects of well-being as defined within the context of “Canadian values”. This information is important because it provides individuals and policy-makers with an in-depth look at the determinants of a country’s well-being—the strengths and weaknesses that contribute to society’s complex issues (“About the Canadian”, n.d.). The Canadian Index of Well-being (CIW) has been organized into eight primary

¹ Although Beddington et. al are presenting their definition of mental well-being in this quote, I would argue that both social and physical well-being must also be present to achieve this criteria.
categories as laid out in Table 2. This practicum will address a number of these categories including community vitality, education, environment, and healthy populations through various programs and design strategies.

**TABLE 2 - CANADIAN INDEX OF WELL-BEING CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY VITALITY</th>
<th>DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Community Vitality measures the strength, activity and inclusiveness of relationships between residents, private sector, public sector and civil society organizations that fosters individual and collective wellbeing” (“Community Vitality”, n.d.).</td>
<td>“Democratic Engagement measures the participation of citizens in public life and in governance; the functioning of Canadian governments; and the role Canadians and their institutions play as global citizens” (“Democratic Engagement”, n.d.).</td>
<td>“Education measures the literacy and skill levels of the population, including the ability of both children and adults to function in various societal contexts and plan for and adapt to future situations” (“Education”, n.d.).</td>
<td>“Environment measures the state of and the trends in Canada’s environment by looking at the stocks and flows of Canada’s environmental goods and services” (“Environment”, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WELL-BEING IS DEFINED AS “THE STATE IN WHICH THE INDIVIDUAL IS ABLE TO DEVELOP THEIR POTENTIAL, WORK PRODUCTIVELY AND CREATIVELY, BUILD STRONG AND POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHERS, AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR COMMUNITY” (BEDDINGTON, ET AL., 2008, P. 1057).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HEALTHY POPULATIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LEISURE AND CULTURE</strong></th>
<th><strong>LIVING STANDARDS</strong></th>
<th><strong>TIME USE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Healthy Populations measures the physical, mental, and social wellbeing of the population by looking at different aspects of health status and certain determinants of health” (“Healthy Populations”, n.d.).</td>
<td>“Leisure and Culture measures activity in the very broad area of culture, which involves all forms of human expression; the more focused area of the arts; and recreational activities” (“Leisure and Culture”, n.d.).</td>
<td>“Living Standards measures the level and distribution of income and wealth, including trends in poverty; income volatility; and economic security, including the security of jobs, food, housing and the social safety net” (“Living Standards”, n.d.).</td>
<td>“Time use measures the use of time, how people experience time, what controls its use, and how it affects wellbeing” (“Time Use”, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBSTACLES TO WELL-BEING IN TYPICAL PRISON DESIGN

Since it is more likely with the omnibus crime bill that offences in Canada will result in incarceration—due to mandatory minimum sentencing, for example—it is imperative to question the ways in which current prisons, if at all, inhibit the well-being of those confined there. While studies looking directly into this are scant, an area that may provide some insight is research that looks at the effectiveness of prison at rehabilitating offenders. With the understanding that successful rehabilitation and reintegration are, in essence, dependent upon the overall health of an individual, we can reasonably infer whether well-being has been affected by the prison experience. Much like well-being, however, rehabilitation is difficult to quantify and many studies that attempt to measure rates of rehabilitation among offenders have primarily done so by looking solely at rates of re-offence rather than a more complete look at individual contexts (Visher & Travis, 2003). Within Canada, reports on recidivism rates differ significantly according to variables such as what constitutes recidivism, whether it be any return to prison related to the original offence, such as breach of probation, or exclusively new offences. The number of years that data has been collected following an individual’s release from prison also contributes to an inconsistency in numbers (Nouwens, Motiuk, & Boe, 1993; Barrett and Gobeil, 2007). The Canadian Press reported in 2014 that the overall recidivism rate of federally convicted offenders in this country was above 40% (Egan, 2014). An earlier study found that these statistics were only slightly lower for federally sentenced women in Canada; using a sample of all women released from 2003 to 2004, the rate of recidivism was at 38% (Barrett & Gobeil, 2007).²

With numbers this high it is undeniable that federal institutions are not adequately meeting their mandate of rehabilitation and successful reintegration into the community. This is a significant problem, one that

² Any revocation of conditional release or new convictions were included in the count.
Sapers (2014) points to as a large strain on government expenditures at the average expense of $211,618 per annum to keep a female offender in custody. This equates to almost $106.5 million a year for women alone—a group that comprises only 4.9% of the total population of those in federal custody.3

In addition to these high rates of recidivism, often referred to as the revolving door syndrome, is the overwhelming opinion of scholars, professionals, and advocacy groups that prisons breed criminality and that, without proper support and programs focused specifically on individualized treatment, prisons are brutalizing places that often desensitize, de-socialize and create more hardened criminals than those that entered the system. Many of the criticisms of prison are systemic and require substantial shifts in policy and practice to effect change, but there are also those that are a result of the conventional prison structure itself. Imprisonment is, after all, a practice of physical confinement. It is the forced segregation of any individual that threatens the normative functioning or safety of society, to a building designed specifically to contain and control them. Where capital punishment does not exist, justice operates, both physically and psychologically, entirely through spatial containment and the denial of an offender’s free will of place and time (Findley, 2005; Hancock & Jewkes, 2011).

---

**WELL-BEING AS DESIGN STRATEGY**

The design of the Koza Centre will be approached through an identification of spatial strategies that promote a sense of well-being as they relate to the unique needs of incarcerated women. The remainder of this chapter will look at the design challenges of a typical prison and the particular ways in which they negatively affect users of the space. From this, new design strategies for supporting the mental, social and physical well-being of users will be developed with the intention of contributing to CSC’s mandate of successful rehabilitation and reintegration.

---

3 Based on 503, the total number of federally incarcerated women in Canada in 2010 (Women Offender…, n.d.).
Early into this discussion it becomes evident that physical, social, and mental health do not exist separate and distinct from one another. Social situations and physical health affect mental states, just as mood affects interactions with others or even how quickly bodies are able to heal themselves. As a result, the following three sections may jump between different realms of well-being, situating them in the text where they are most relevant to the discussion. This illustrates just how interrelated our minds, bodies and relationships are, and why it is so important to frame health as so much more than a physical state.

2.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

ARCHITECTURE AND POWER

Throughout history, architecture and space have been utilized as a tool to express and exert power. Some of the world’s oldest structures still stand as testament to the power and influence of those in whose honor they were built (Findley, 2005, p.2-4).

Use of material and scale, but also the regulation of space and the bodies within them, are all representational strategies historically used by designers to convey concepts of power (Dovey, 2007, p. 12). Within the history of prison architecture specifically, the Panopticon is a significant example of the ways in which design has gone to extremes to control and manipulate both the bodies and minds of those imprisoned.
It is the French philosopher Michel Foucault that is credited with the Panopticon’s endurance, from his in-depth analysis of Bentham’s philosophies (Brunon-Ernst, 2012). Three centuries after its inception, the Panopticon continues to be a dominant fixture in critical analyses of prison and other surveillance theories. The Panopticon, designed by Jeremy Bentham, introduced a new model of eighteenth century prison, one rooted in progressive penal reform (Simpson, 2014, p. 112). This new approach required less physical restraints on the offender and was intended as a form of rehabilitation that allowed time for reflection and repentance (Brunon-Ernst, 2012, p. 8; Foucault, 1995, p. 202; Simpson, 2014, p. 115).

The original Panopticon design was an annular building consisting of an outer ring of individually segregated cells, surrounding a central watchtower where guards would have an unobstructed view into each prisoner’s cell (Figure 1). Observation was the primary function and, to ensure optimal oversight, Bentham included

---

4 Bentham developed at least four versions of the Panopticon, only the first and most rudimentary of which was a penitentiary. As other iterations were developed, it became less about the building itself and more focused on a set of principles for guiding design (Brunon-Ernst, 2012, p. 21, 23).
an exterior window in each cell so that prisoners were backlit, creating a perfect silhouette (Foucault, 1995, p 200). While those in the central tower could see a large number of individuals from one vantage point, the prisoners’ views were fully obstructed by the tower, though unable to see into it—its presence, rather, served as a perpetual reminder of the watchful eyes that may at any time be overhead (Brunon-Ernst, 2012; Foucault, 1995, p. 200).

The Panopticon is recognized as a space whose physical structure itself imposes control and subordination of those captive in it. The power is not reliant upon a central figure but is established through the building’s configuration—its partitioning of space and the resulting psychological effects. Because the possibility of surveillance was constant, subjects understood that self-regulated discipline was necessary (Foucault, 1995, p. 202). The central watchtower stood in as the surrogate gaze of the prison guard.

How design is approached—the ways in which space is used, compartmentalized, and organized—is steeped in the politics and culture of its time. As Lisa Findley (2005), professor and author of *Building Change: Architecture, Politics and Cultural Agency*, notes:

> These [various spaces of power] are not neutral. They were made using strategies to embody particular attitudes, cultural practices and ideologies. They are specifically designed to support and encourage these practices. Rearranging or erasing these spaces to reflect a new set of ideas, constituents and power relations is a long-term endeavor necessary to complete any political, cultural and social transformation. (p. 5)

With this, Findley helps put into perspective just how closely linked the physical is to the ideological. Bentham considered himself a visionary, designing the Panopticon as a more progressive alternative to the harsh punitive practices in place in eighteenth century Europe. Yet, from a twenty-first century perspective, the isolation and psychological manipulation of the Panopticon is cruel and inhumane.
When looking at prisons, we are able to see a great deal about the attitudes of that time toward criminality, the strategies that were used to deal with offenders, and what class of citizen criminal behaviour relegated one to. This practicum will contribute to a new narrative by attempting to show what change might look like spatially in a new prison typology that focuses on rehabilitation and reintegration in the twenty-first century. As attitudes and perceptions about the role of prisons and the appropriate treatment of those incarcerated changes, the older models must be rejected in order to allow the new to flourish. Insisting on a new method of treatment and rehabilitation for those in the care of CSC, while simultaneously refusing to provide the appropriate spaces to accommodate for this, creates barriers to the growth of ideas. Rejecting older models and presenting new alternatives is part of a slow and necessary process of change.

---

**PSYCHOLOGY OF SPACE**

Removing someone from their community and confining them to an institution is an obvious exercise of power, but what about the environment within the prison walls that further denies individual liberties? Environmental Psychology provides a tool to assess the ways in which the physical environment impacts human behaviour and psyche. Richard Wener, professor of Environmental Psychology at Polytechnic Institute of New York University has dedicated over 30 years to studying the effects of prison design on its users. In his book entitled *The Environmental Psychology of Prisons and Jails: Creating Humane Spaces in Secure Settings* (2012), Wener illustrates how a lack of person control over one’s immediate environment precipitates psychological and behavioural issues among those in prison.
Privacy, territoriality, crowding, and isolation are the primary determinants of the type and quality of social interaction that takes place within a prison (Chang & Sullivan, 2011; Wener, 2012). If one is not able to control their level of social interaction because they do not have control of how they move about within a space, it is more likely that social interactions will be negative. This is because physical space affects mental states. Optimal privacy refers to the full range of social needs one experiences at different times—from being completely alone to willingly engaging with others. An individual’s optimal privacy, therefore, requires control and the liberty to move about between spaces in order to find an appropriate setting for their needs (Wener, 2012).

Without access to spaces that one has control or ownership of, there is little chance to attain optimal privacy; and yet, having the ability to remove oneself from certain situations is often necessary for controlling emotional levels. Solitude and intimacy are necessary conditions for working through difficult emotions (Wener, 2012), emotions that would invariably arise during one's imprisonment.

Prisons impose limitations on the degree of privacy that can be accommodated when security and sight lines are
often necessary conditions. Wener (2012) examines how inmates compensate for feelings of lack of control that often result, turning to the tools they do possess such as verbal and nonverbal behaviour, and through “physical arrangements of space” (p. 116). They may retreat within themselves and develop anti-social behaviours or may claim territories for themselves within the public spaces of the institution. This latter tactic is often only successful for the strongest of the group and creates social conflict. Territoriality, as it is known, is similar to personal space but it is a claiming of a specific area as one’s own that is not necessarily theirs to claim. By claiming territory, an individual attempts to assert their dominance over the other users of the space and grants them increased control over interpersonal interactions (Wener, 2012).

A Canadian study of three institutions by Cooley, Jewitt and Oren (1973) found that common areas, neither the territory of staff or inmates, were where the longest and most positive interactions between users took place. In a neutral space, individuals would not perceive the interaction as a territorial threat and feel the need to defend it.

If Cooley et. al suggest that ownership of space in prison has the potential to cause aggression and negative interactions, would the removal of private spaces create a more positive environment? A 1982 study conducted by Zimring, Weitzer, and Knight (as cited in Wener, 2012) have found the opposite to be true. In prisons where individuals’ cells were lockable and private, the added level of control produced happier inmates. Having a place to retreat meant that optimal privacy needs could be met and inmates spent more time in public spaces interacting positively with others as a result. Territoriality within communal spaces also diminished because its function as a coping mechanism was no longer required. Over-crowding and isolation, while very different from one another, are two issues that prisons in Canada and throughout the world face on a daily basis. Mandatory minimum sentencing and reduced instances of parole lead to prisons that are often over-capacitated for the
population they were originally designed for (Sapers, 2014). When individuals feel crowded their interactions and associations with other people become negative. When forced into such situations, people become unpredictable, act out, or exhibit aggressive behaviour (Chang & Sullivan, 2011; Wener, 2012).

Denying individuals basic human contact and social interaction can have just as much of an affect on inmates as over-crowding and is arguably one of the most psychologically damaging practices still prevalent in Canadian prisons. Isolation can take on various forms and includes lack of stimuli or social contact, sensory deprivation, and solitary confinement. When prolonged, isolation can diminish one’s ability to have normal, healthy, social relationships (Wener, 2012). Howard Sapers and others, including the ADPSR (“Human Rights”, n.d.), the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, and Amnesty International (Sperry, 2013) all publicly support the end of long-term solitary confinement, a practice Sapers refers to as a “form of harsh and punitive confinement on the mental health and emotional well-being of these women” (as cited in Botsford Fraser 2010). In the United States, the suicide rate of those in solitary confinement is five times higher than the rest of the prison population (Sorkin, 2013). At the time of Ashley Smith’s suicide, she had spent almost four consecutive years in isolation (Botsford Fraser 2010).

Not having anywhere to go but inside your head is particularly damaging for incarcerated women. Women have been shown to suffer more than men from social isolation because they commonly adjust to prison by forming pseudo family relationships as a coping mechanism. Stress often leads women, far more so than men, to reach out to others for social support (Bordt, 2012; Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013; Wener, 2012). It is commonly accepted that this behavioural response stems from women’s common role as caretakers in society.
Factors affecting psychological health discussed in this section have thus far been related to space as it mediates levels of social interaction among those in prison. Lack of control over other interior environmental factors, such as light, noise, temperature, and access to nature raise frustration levels that often lead to stress in individuals (Chang & Sullivan, 2011). According to Wener (2012), this relationship is inversely proportionate—the less control one has, the greater their stress level. In particular, “unpredictable, intermittent stressors appear to have the most negative and lasting impacts” (Wener, 2012, p. 119). When a sound or any other sensorial stimulus, for example, has a steady and predictable rhythmic pattern, it can easily fade into the background, or even provide a lulling effect. Intermittent stressors, however, engage a fight or flight response when something in the environment startles them (Sternberg, 2010). Prisons are traditionally notorious for their high noise levels due to their lack of soft furnishings to minimize reverberation, use of loud intercoms, and lack of closed, private spaces. Inmates in these settings have been reported to suffer significant hearing loss and sleep deprivation, while prison staff cite high noise in prisons to diminished performance with tasks, leading to an increase in accidents, loss of concentration and overall job stress. While few reports specifically speak to the effects of noise on prisoner behaviour specifically, control over one’s immediate environment including noise, temperature, and light, all lowered stress levels and aided in positive interactions among individuals in the space (Wener, 2012).

Although men and women are affected by numerous stressors that are prominent in prison, it is how individuals respond to them that shows us interesting differences in the ways that men and women typically cope. Men have a tendency to suppress their emotions which then leads to outbursts of anger and violence (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013). Women in prison report, in contrast, to experiencing heightened emotions in
prison. They do not feel that there is the option to openly express themselves for fear of being labeled as irrational, out of control, and difficult to manage. Women show less propensity for violence and follow more rules, but are subjected overall to higher levels of supervision and punishment within prison than their male counterparts. Unable to express their negative emotions, women often turn to diversions such as meditation and humor. When positive coping outlets are not found, “disease, addiction […and] socialization problems” can emerge in response (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013, p. 8).

By understanding the degree to which surroundings affect users psychologically, design strategies can be developed that will help to reduce stress and negative behavioural outcomes, and others that encourage positive mental states. It is clear that designing for a certain level of autonomy in daily life is crucial to individuals in prison. Providing some level of control to an inmate’s surroundings—the ability to dim a light, raise the temperature, or close a door—is easily accomplished. Many women in prison speak of their lives as something that they are not and have not been in control of for some time (Comack, 1996). Restoring that control through skills, education, therapy, and the normalization of daily life all contribute to the process of rehabilitation. Beyond designing for space that minimizes stressors that affect psychological health, are there design strategies that could actively promote mental health? Utilizing design as a tool to help restore the connection between humans and nature might be the answer.

BIOPHILIA

Biophilia is a term that is credited to Edward O. Wilson, an entomologist at Harvard University. Wilson’s biophilia hypothesis states that humans share an inherent affinity for nature that has developed from our close association to it throughout our evolution (Kellert, Heerwagen, & Mador, 2008; Fox & Frumkin, 2011). Humans evolved within nature and have only been living
in a developed, modern world for a small fraction of our history; evidence of human ancestors have been dated as far back as 200,000 years, compared to the earliest developments in modern civilization dating only 5,000 years ago (Kellert et al., 2008, p. 3). Evolutionarily speaking, “most of our emotional, problem-solving, critical-thinking, and construction abilities continue to reflect skills and aptitudes learned in close association with natural systems and processes that remain critical in human health, maturation, and productivity” (Kellert et al., 2008, p. 4). As a result, humans still find themselves drawn to these natural elements that we associate with our development because they aided in our evolution, and are, still today, essential to our well-being.

Considerable research has been conducted to examine how deeply humans are affected by immersion in the natural world. The results have shown significant evidence that contact with nature aids in health, reduces stress, increases productivity, supports better cognitive functioning such as concentration and memory, and contributes to an overall increase in quality of life (Kellert et al., 2008, p. 4; Fox & Frumkin, 2011).

Studies have indicated that hospital patients with window views of nature versus brick walls or parking lots require less pain medication and are released from care with better results earlier than patients without such views (Fox & Frumkin, 2011; Sternberg, 2010). These results, in addition to lowered levels of depression, were also found to be true in hospital rooms that received adequate levels of daylight, particularly morning light from east-facing windows (Wener, 2012).

Within carceral settings, Wener (2012) has found that access to and views of nature positively affect mood and behaviour by reducing boredom and stress. Inmates not only commented on the view but also the pleasure of observing wildlife and other people. A window to somewhere else has also become a tool to increase the perceived size of space, making people feel less
crowded when they are able to see for a distance. This increase in depth of field is also good for the eyes by providing more variety in focal lengths—eye muscles are able to relax thus reducing the amount of strain on them (Wener, 2012).

Kellert, Heerwagen, and Mador (2008), co-authors of Biophilic Design: The Theory, Science, and Practice of Bringing Buildings to Life, stress the importance of integrating elements into buildings that bring us closer to nature, what they call “biophilic design”. They argue that the built environment risks the health of its users by alienating them from nature and that the design of urban environments must undergo a drastic shift in thinking (Kellert et al., 2008). They call for a new approach that lowers its impact on the environment, mitigates the negative effects that do result, and helps to bring humans and nature back together.

Although there is plenty of evidence to support the fact that humans are positively affected by nature, the ways in which this can be accomplished is much less absolute, there is no perfect method. In response, Kellert et al. have identified six essential elements of biophilic design that break down further to 70 potential design strategies, shown in Table 3. They note that this list is fluid and should be built-upon and adjusted as more studies are developed that contribute to the body of the knowledge.

Humans evolved within nature and have only been living in a developed, modern world for a small fraction of our history: evidence of human ancestors have been dated as far back as 200,000 years, compared to the earliest developments in modern civilization dating only 5,000 years ago.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES</th>
<th>NATURAL SHAPES + FORMS</th>
<th>NATURAL PATTERNS + PROCESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>color</td>
<td>botanical motifs</td>
<td>sensory variability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>tree + columnar supports</td>
<td>information richness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air</td>
<td>animal (mainly vertebrate) motifs</td>
<td>age, change + the patina of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunlight</td>
<td>shells &amp; spirals</td>
<td>growth + efflorescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plants</td>
<td>egg, oval, + tubular forms</td>
<td>central focal point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animals</td>
<td>arches, vaults, domes</td>
<td>patterned wholes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural materials</td>
<td>shapes resisting straight lines + right angles</td>
<td>bounded spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>views + vistas</td>
<td>simulation of natural features</td>
<td>linked series + chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>façade greening</td>
<td>biomorphy + biomimicry</td>
<td>integration of parts to wholes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geology + landscape</td>
<td>geomorphology + fractals</td>
<td>complementary contrasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habitats + ecosystems</td>
<td>hierarchically organized ratios + scales</td>
<td>dynamic balance + tension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIGHT + SPACE</th>
<th>PLACE-BASED RELATIONSHIPS</th>
<th>EVOLVED HUMAN-NATURE RELATIONSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>natural light</td>
<td>geographic connection to place</td>
<td>prospect + refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filtered and diffused light</td>
<td>historic connection to place</td>
<td>order + complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light + shadow</td>
<td>ecological connection to place</td>
<td>curiosity + enticement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflected light</td>
<td>cultural connection to place</td>
<td>change + metamorphosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflected light</td>
<td>indigenous materials</td>
<td>security + protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light pools</td>
<td>landscape orientation</td>
<td>mastery + control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm light</td>
<td>landscape features that define building form</td>
<td>affection + attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light as shape and form</td>
<td>landscape ecology</td>
<td>attraction + beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaciousness</td>
<td>integration of culture &amp; ecology</td>
<td>exploration + discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial variability</td>
<td>spirit of place</td>
<td>information + cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space as shape &amp; form</td>
<td>avoiding placelessness</td>
<td>fear + awe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>reverence + spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside-outside space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3 - ELEMENTS + ATTRIBUTES OF BIOPHILIC DESIGN**
2.3 SOCIAL WELL-BEING

Social well-being is a necessity for the health of women in prison. It is not a privilege that should be used for disciplinary measures. Studies have continually shown that rehabilitation and successful reintegration are contingent upon strong support systems and positive relationships both during incarceration and after release (Dietz, n.d.; Squires, 2004; “Program Strategies”, 2004; Visher & Travis, 2003). An analysis of women’s personal accounts from prison found that the common link throughout their writing was the value they placed on relationships, and the vital role it played in their survival and betterment. Included in these relationships are “pseudo-family structures” among female offenders that fulfill day-to-day social needs for support and community (Bordt, 2012, p. 136).

MOTHERS IN PRISON

While relationships on prison grounds help female offenders to cope and find reprieve from the challenges of imprisonment, maintaining connection to family is imperative. If one has had to leave children behind, sustaining that relationship is especially critical for maintaining the well-being of all involved, strengthening the chance of rehabilitation, reunification post-release, and even reducing risk of recidivism (Blanchard, 2004; Gilham, 2012, p. 99). A 2012 report by CSC stated that up to two-thirds of women in Canadian prisons were mothers, the same percentage of which were at high risk of losing custody as a result of their law breaking (“Forum on Corrections”, 2012). Two years later, those numbers increased to three quarters of the female prison population with a child under 18 years of age (Sapers, 2014, p. 46). This means that at least 377 Canadian children have a mother behind bars.
Despite issues that may exist between a mother and her children prior to incarceration, the sense of loss when they have been separated has devastating effects for both parties. Unlike many fathers in prison, two-thirds (Sapers, 2014, p. 46) of incarcerated mothers are single caregivers (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013). In these circumstances, a prison sentence means leaving that child without any parent left to care for them. In a Quebec study of 203 children with incarcerated mothers, two-thirds suffered from extreme stress that developed into a number of emotional, behavioural and social problems (as cited in Blanchard, 2004, p. 45). Such emotional issues may include depression, anxiety, stress, difficulty developing emotional bonds with others, and displays of anti-authoritarian behaviour (Blanchard, 2004; Gilham, 2012, p. 90; Haney, 2010).

Pre-school aged children appear particularly vulnerable to the effects of an incarcerated mother (Blanchard, 2004; Gilham, 2012, p. 90; Haney, 2010). If the child is less than five years old, they often begin to view their primary caregiver—whether it be a relative or foster-parent—as their mother, creating potential issues for the reunification process down the road (Gilham, 2012, p. 90). At such a young age, this disruption also creates potential for obstacles to healthy development. Brain development occurs consistently at specific stages in childhood and into early adulthood; if certain needs during this time are not met, healthy development is interrupted and may lead to future issues. The prominent psychologist John Bowlby argues that the parent-child attachment is imperative to emotional development, as it is a child’s first exposure to socialization and intimate relationships (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013, p. 83-6).

For mothers, forced separation from their child has profound effects, as evidenced by feelings of worry, helplessness, and guilt over the situation (Blanchard, 2004; Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013; Gilham, 2012, p. 93-4; Haney, 2010, p. 76). This impact is so consuming that incarcerated mothers have identified this loss as
the most significant problem they faced while in prison (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013, p. 84). For some, the idle time spent thinking about the separation can act as a driving force for self-improvement; for others, it can push them away from their parental duties—a result of not being able to face the reality of the situation or from fear of causing further pain to the child (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013, p. 84-5; Blanchard, 2004).

With a land mass just shy of 10 million km², Canada has six federal correctional institutions available for women. When prisons are far from an offender’s home, the removal isolates her from any existing community and family support systems (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013; Fettig, 2009; Gilham, 2012; Matthews, 1999, p. 195; Purdy, 2002). Distance, in addition to other obstacles such as resistance from current caregivers (Gilham, 2012, p. 91), or feelings of shame, are why only 50% of incarcerated mothers receive visitations from their children.

The benefits to both of maintaining the mother-child bond during incarceration, many argue, outweigh trepidations about exposing a child to this environment. Children have a strong ability to provide their mother with a sense of hope for the future; numerous reports suggest that regular contact between the two—including having the child live in residence with the mother (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013)—reduces recidivism and increases the likelihood of the offender’s successful reintegration upon release (Bruns, 2006; Gilham, 2012, p. 99; Sapers, 2014, p. 46).
The United Nations (U.N.) acknowledges that women in prison have distinctive needs separate from men requiring special attention. At the U.N. General Assembly of 2010, they developed “Rules For the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (the Bangkok Rules)”. Issues such as gender-specific healthcare, motherhood, and caretaking are prominent, including the “[promotion of] good practices in relation to the needs and physical, emotional, social and psychological development of babies and children affected by parental detention and imprisonment” (United Nations, 2010, p. 2). Among the 70 rules laid out in the resolution, the following list highlight those most notable to mothers in prison:

RULE 4 - Women prisoners shall be allocated, to the extent possible, to prisons close to their home or place of social rehabilitation, taking account of their caretaking responsibilities, as well as the individual woman’s preference and the availability of appropriate programs and services.

RULE 23 - Disciplinary sanctions for women prisoners shall not include a prohibition of family contact, especially with children.

RULE 26 - Women prisoners’ contact with their families, including their children, and their children's guardians and legal representatives shall be encouraged and facilitated by all reasonable means. Where possible, measures shall be taken to counterbalance disadvantages faced by women detained in institutions located far from their homes.

RULE 28 - Visits involving children shall take place in an environment that is conducive to a positive visiting experience, including with regard to staff attitudes, and shall allow open contact between mother and child. Visits involving extended contact with children should be encouraged, where possible.

RULE 45 - Prison authorities shall utilize options such as home leave, open prisons, halfway houses and community-based programs and services to the maximum possible extent for women prisoners, to ease their transition from prison to liberty, to reduce stigma and to re-establish their contact with their families at the earliest possible stage.

RULE 49 - Decisions to allow children to stay with their mothers in prison shall be based on the best interests of the children. Children in prison with their mothers shall never be treated as prisoners.

RULE 51.2 - The environment provided for such children's upbringing shall be as close as possible to that of a child outside prison.

(United Nations, 2010, p. 8-17)
The United Nations in their capacity as global peacekeepers and advocates for human rights represent with the Bangkok Rules a global shift in thought about the rights of incarcerated mothers. The rules listed here show a distinct emphasis on maintaining bonds between mother and child in an environment that fosters these relationships, where access to her child is never used as a method for discipline.

Within Canada, a mother-child program currently exists where children may live on prison grounds with their mother on a full or part-time basis. Mothers, step-mothers, legal guardians, and adoptive mothers are all eligible to apply to the program. Once an application is approved, the individual agrees to participate with certain responsibilities and behaviour expected of them. Children can then live either in the cell or apartment with their mother, or in an adjacent, connected room. Acceptance to the program is always based on the best interests of the child over anything else (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013).

The potential benefits of the mother-child program extend not only to its participants but the inmates close to them, as well. The mere presence of children has an effect on the overall atmosphere of the prison. Much like the pseudo-family structures previously mentioned in women’s prisons, children tend to bring out warmth, mutual caring, and concern among everyone for the health and welfare of the child, as others help with caretaking responsibilities (McKinley, 2007; Stone, 2011). The acting Warden at the Nova Institution for Women, Laurie Bernard, noted the difference children and dogs made to the attitudes of the women there. News of the arrival would spread across the facility creating a general air of excitement. When arguments would break out or people were making too much noise, she continually observed other women intervening to remind them of the child’s presence (personal communication, August 17, 2015).

Despite its availability, Canada’s mother-child program does not appear to be in active operation as it has been

---

5 In 2008 the criteria for the program changed the age of children eligible for part-time residency from age 12, down to just 6 years of age. Full-time residency is only considered for mothers that give birth in prison, allowing their children to stay with them for the first four years (Stone, 2014).
riddled with intermittent public, political, and institutional resistance from those viewing it as a security issue (Leclerc, 2008) or an undeserved privilege (Stone, 2014). Although the majority of female offenders in Canada are mothers, there were no full-time participants and only two part-time in 2014. The year prior, there was only one child in the program across the whole country (Stone, 2014). Some of the obstacles facing the success of the program include strict eligibility rules that exclude a high percentage of the population (Leclerc, 2008), and overcrowding that draws from the spaces that would have been used to accommodate the children on site (Stone, 2014).

Regardless of the reason for low participation rates in the mother-child program, prison is undoubtedly a challenging environment to strengthen personal relationships. The nature of the secure facility puts many limitations on the duration, type, and setting for children’s visits. Professionals continually reiterate the need for correctional institutions to adequately respond to the varied needs of incarcerated mothers by providing appropriate spaces for visits, and programming that helps with parenting skills and development of these essential bonds (Blanchard, 2004; Gilham, 2012). Included among these spatial requirements are:

- a designated family room;
- privacy for the mother and child;
- non-intimidating, child-friendly atmosphere; and
- comfortable areas for play, including adequate floor space (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013; Gilham, 2012, p. 100).

During my visit to the Nova Institution for women in Nova Scotia, I saw no clear evidence of a suitable environment for parents to develop relationships with their children. The indoor visiting area had a handful of children’s toys tucked away on a shelf with nothing else to indicate that children might occupy the space. This particular facility was not faced with over-crowding in their newly opened minimum security building—adjacent children’s
rooms were available—but no one was participating in the program. The bare walls and lack of stimuli would not be a comfortable environment if no additional effects were brought in to accommodate them. There were no nurseries or playrooms dedicated to children that I was made aware of.

Due to the overwhelming evidence illustrating the damage that removing young children from their mothers can have on both parties, the Koza Centre will allow children to live at the facility with their mother. The design will focus on spaces that nurture relationships, while helping to restore a level of normalcy to the child’s upbringing by having them attend kindergarten or schooling outside of the facility.

COMMUNITY

An emphasis on concepts of community in the design of the Koza Centre straddle the psychological and social realms of well-being. The development of a community-based model is aimed at reducing the stigma surrounding incarceration, particularly of women offenders, as well as supporting rehabilitation by generating social capital, maintaining and strengthening healthy ties to family and friends, and positively contributing to self-identity. Community involvement frames the way others see you, you see yourself, and the types of relationships you maintain.

Ordinary & moralized concepts of community
The first question that must be asked is, what is community? It is a term so embedded in the everyday lexicon and appears in so many iterations that it resists one true and clear definition (Mason, 2000). This fluidity of meaning suggests that its value lies not within the parameters of language but in its importance to the

---

6 From infancy to 12 years of age.
human condition—it does not necessarily matter what you consider community to be, but that you identify as a member of one or many.

In the book entitled *Community, Solidarity and Belonging: Levels of Community and their Normative Significance*, political theorist Andrew Mason (2000) presents the idea of community as being fluid and dynamic. He provides two distinct concepts—the ordinary and the moralized community. The one most are familiar with, community in the ordinary sense of the word, has four components that must be present to be considered a true community: shared values, participation in a shared way of life, identification with the group, and mutual recognition among members (p. 20).

While a community is always a group, a group will not necessarily be a community if any defining elements are absent. Participation in a shared way of life is arguably the essence of community, with practices that are often carried out cooperatively and collectively. Whether a community is social, political, or even professional in nature, its practices are believed by its members to be inherently valuable to their way of life (Mason, 2000, p. 21-2).

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMUNITY-BASED MODEL IS AIMED AT REDUCING THE STIGMA SURROUNDING INCARCERATION, PARTICULARLY OF WOMEN OFFENDERS, AS WELL AS SUPPORTING REHABILITATION BY GENERATING SOCIAL CAPITAL, MAINTAINING AND STRENGTHENING HEALTHY TIES TO FAMILY AND FRIENDS, AND POSITIVELY CONTRIBUTING TO SELF-IDENTITY.
The moralized concept of community contains all of the characteristics of community in the ordinary sense, but requires two additional elements: solidarity amongst members and the absence of any “systematic exploitation” or “systematic injustice” (Mason, 2000, p. 27). This latter condition can be understood more simply as equality amongst members of the community. While structure among members is often necessary to the success of a community, power that denies equality among the group must not exist. The other additional element, solidarity, is an expression of “mutual concern”; concern of what exactly varies according to the particular community and that which connects its members. This solidarity arises when members are able to see themselves within the other members and identify in that manner, based on shared values and way of life. Since this results from conditions present in the ordinary concept of community, it is possible for solidarity to exist at the same time that inequality or exploitation is also present (Mason, 2000, p. 28-32).

To further distinguish between ordinary and moralized concepts of community, Mason positions the two as existing for different purposes within a society. In the ordinary sense, community is used as a tool for classification, identification and positioning within society. This is important as the complexities of our social realms are managed by classifications and codifications that help individuals identify their place in relation to others and the world. To a much different end, moralized communities exist as forms of commentary, statements against or celebrations of “social and political arrangements” (Mason, 2000, p. 34). In both of these instances however, community acts a tool that allows for the individual to be recognized and heard through the strength of membership—voices are made louder and ways of life are given greater legitimacy.

To recognize the value of community to the Koza Centre, it is important to identify which of the two concepts is most salient. Much like the variability of the word community, the concept expressed in this design is
dependent upon the scale at which it is being viewed. The very presence of the facility at an institutional level embodies a moralized community. The call for a redesign that questions and reconsiders the current housing methods of those incarcerated is, indeed, a social and political endeavor. It exists within an ongoing dialogue of reformists that attempt to bring to light the hazards of the types of prisons we are accustomed to.

On a different level, one that is scaled down from the institutional to the individual, we see representation of community in the ordinary sense. Offenders living at the centre will have applied to serve their sentence there. While solidarity amongst members may not necessarily be present, shared values are expressed through individuals’ commitments to bettering their lives. Offenders participate in a shared way of life and recognize the other women and even staff as members of this community working towards that common goal.

**BASIC NEEDS AND WELL-BEING**

While it cannot be assumed that a moralized community with solidarity amongst members and an absence of any injustice or exploitation will necessarily exist at the Koza Centre, the development of mutual concern would carry significant value for individuals at the centre. A.H. Maslow (1943) famously developed a hierarchy of needs pyramid that identifies three major drivers of human motivation: basic, psychological, and self-fulfillment needs. These categories are further broken down into five tiers, with physiological needs at the base of the pyramid all the way to self-actualization at the peak. Maslow argued that the fulfillment of a more basic category of need was an essential condition of realizing each category above it. That is, before the need for love and belonging can be addressed, safety and physiological needs must first be satisfied.
Research shows that criminal behaviour carried out by women are often related to issues of poverty and the provision of basic needs such as food, shelter, or safety (Pollack, 2008, p. 6; Gilfus, 2006). For example, when one is not able to feed herself or those they take care of, have nowhere to turn to flee an abusive situation, or are consumed by addiction, motivation is associated with meeting needs at the base of the hierarchy and, arguably, no higher levels of need can be addressed. If prison’s physical and programmatic structure, however, can fulfill basic needs, incarceration could move toward fulfilling higher level needs. Community, mutual concern, healthy relationships, and the (re)development of self-identity and personal potential all come back as positive contributing factors to well-being and rehabilitation.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AS SELF-IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION

Women traditionally use community involvement to shape and assert their personal identities. In her article “Negotiating Power, Identity, Family, and Community: Women’s Community Participation,” Abrahams (1996) examines the importance of women’s involvement in community. Women are able to identify and address unmet community needs at a local level. The work is traditionally done with little visibility or publicity, and emphasizes values such as “connectedness, collectivity,…and consciousness” (p. 769).

Abrahams conducted interviews with 50 women of mixed race, age, class, and education, most of whom were married with children. The study showed a strong correlation to community and one’s personal and collective identity. Involvement related to race or cultural services helped women develop pride and deeper understanding of racial identity, particularly so when that
culture was one that had been marginalized. Involvement was also identified as a means of self-therapy. By helping others in situations of crisis that the individual had also faced, it became a way to give the support that they once needed and, in a sense, help themselves at the same time. Many of the mothers in the study said that their community involvement began when they had their children, as “a way to embrace an identity as a good mother”, leading by example (Abrahams, 1996, p. 776-9).

The women in Abrahams’ study (1996), as well as others (Galambos & Hughes, 2001), speak of community work as empowerment—a means for developing confidence and self-worth, skills, knowledge, social networks, and support. Researchers looking specifically at those transitioning from prison to the community, list volunteering and local neighbourhood involvement as important elements of creating a new identity that fosters successful reintegration by allowing (ex)-offenders to perceive themselves in a different role in the community than before (Visher & Travis, 2003, p. 97).

HEGEL - SELF-WORTH BY RECOGNITION

How someone sees themself is critical to shaping how they participate and act within the world. It comes down to perception of oneself and recognition from others. If I perceive that I have little value, I will not offer myself to others in valuable ways—especially if that perception is, in part, a reflection of how I have been recognized by external sources. The late eighteenth, early nineteenth century philosopher G.W.F. Hegel was among the first to look at the formation of self-consciousness, an understanding of one’s own existence in and among the world, as a product of recognition from another; “self-consciousness has before it another self-consciousness; it has come outside itself” (Hegel & Baillie, 1949, p. 229).

Hegel argues that in every interaction there exists some form of power relation, however overt or subtle. He uses the metaphor of a lord and a bondsman to express this hierarchical social relation. Undoubtedly, the lord is the independent being that holds the power, while the
bondsman exists in relation to the lord as dependent and subordinate to the former (Hegel & Baillie, 1949, p. 234). Through their relationship, the lord receives recognition from the bondsman by exerting his power over him, an inferior subject. The bondsman, on the other hand, not only receives recognition from someone whom he identifies as superior to him, but also through his labour—he sees his work and recognizes that he is able to exert control onto the world. He does not simply exist within it, he becomes a tool through which to manipulate it. “Thus precisely in labour where there seemed to be merely some outsider’s mind and ideas involved, the bondsman becomes aware, through this re-discovery of himself by himself, of having and being a ‘mind of his own’” (Hegel & Baillie, 1949, p. 239).

Through Hegel’s analogy of the lord and bondsman we can see recognition from others as instrumental to the development of self-worth. As if holding up a mirror, individuals are able to see themselves through the eyes of others looking at them. By applying this analogy to the integration of community to the design of the Koza Centre, much like Abraham’s study, therein lies the potential for personal growth and development through community involvement. The stigma of incarceration immediately creates a power relation, a socially constructed dichotomy between those that are law-abiding citizens and those that offend. It is not through isolation or alienation of an offender from society, but instead by placing them in the heart of a community and in service to it that we see the “bondsman” gain self-consciousness, or worth, through recognition. It is through this service that the offender gains acknowledgement from the community at large (I am here, I exist) at the same time that they are recognizing the power from within through community involvement (I have value and control). This newfound self-consciousness not only works toward the development of self-worth, but the dichotomy of offender as Other begins to dissolve when the structure it is based upon no longer holds true (criminals hold no value to society and only work to unravel its structure).
CALIFORNIA PRISON FIRE CAMPS

While labour has long been an element of prison life, often with associations of exploitation, abysmal work conditions and assembly-line type work, some recent prison models are putting inmates to work in direct benefit to the community. The Conservation Camp Program, more commonly known as California’s prison fire camps, provide a direct example of the concepts discussed in this section applied in a carceral setting. The camps, averaging about 100 inmates, three facilities of which are all-female, do no resemble traditional prisons. Instead, they are located in rural-type settings with well-kept grounds with no sign of looming barbed wire walls or any other perimeter security. Inmates are provided with healthy meals and, granted no rules are broken, are free to move about the camp (Goodman, 2012). Prisoners that have been approved for the program have the coveted, albeit dangerous, position of fighting wildfires. California Corrections cite the main goal of the program as rehabilitation through “self-transformation” (Goodman, 2012, p. 444). Many of the guards and inmates alike link the program’s rehabilitative qualities to the connection it provides between inmates and the outside community. One female inmate spoke to the question of how fire camps help to rehabilitate:

Mentally, [the inmates] feel that they’re still wanted. That what they’re doing in fire camp is on behalf of the community. We’re helping the community in a way because we’re fighting these fires. In return, you have people waving at you [while working] on a fire…and it made us feel good knowing that you know what? Hey, even though I’m incarcerated, I am doing something good. Not only for myself, that makes me feel good, but I’m helping the community at the same time…It’s like okay, well, I’m a criminal. They’re going to treat me like a criminal for the rest of my life so why would I care? But here in camp it’s a little bit different because you get acknowledged. You get acknowledged for every little good thing that you do…It makes you feel, hey, you did something wrong, you move on, things will be okay. (Betsy as cited in Goodman, 2012, p. 446)

Reflected in this excerpt we see Hegel’s theory of recognition by others leading to elevated self-worth and Abraham’s identity (re)formation through community participation. Betsy’s use of language indicates that her
community involvement is directly contributing to a new sense of self-identity. Whereas “criminal” is the initial identity she refers to, she ends by acknowledging that image as having changed by moving on from it through her work. This sense of self appears to come not only from her personal sense of accomplishment, but also from positive recognition from the local community.

**SOCIAL CAPITAL**

Social ties, community participation, and the formation of identity and self-worth through involvement all fall within the realm of social capital. It is a significant factor in the development of the Koza Centre, and argued by many scholars as instrumental to an offender’s successful reintegration upon release (Benson, Alarid, Burton & Cullen, 2011, p. 387; Brown & Ross, 2010; Kosto, 1992; Visher & Travis, 2003, p. 95). The term social capital refers to “network-based resources” that are available to an individual (Eicher & Kawachi, 2011, p. 117). These resources develop from the social arenas of one’s life, determined by the extent of their “social connectedness and social ties, their embeddedness in a set of relations of trust, [and] their participation in civil society […]” (Brown & Ross, 2010, p. 38). Brown and Ross (2010) point to family and work life as the principal sites of social capital—the two realms where the majority of one’s time is spent, and often where primary support systems exist.

The connections developed through social capital establish a foundation for emotional support, healthy relationships, and networks for finding and keeping employment. It provides a sounding board for learning and sharing ideas, a sense of trust and safety within a group, and support when working together for a common goal. As a result, social capital provides benefit to the individual through the development of social support systems, as well as to the collective, by the public good that it fosters (Eicher & Kawachi, 2011).

Lack of social capital is a common issue among female offenders. By its very nature, prison is an isolating place
that inevitably depletes one’s social capital—a result of stigmatization from the general population, and the physical distance that displaces women from their family and friends. For some, healthy and productive relationships may have been in deficit long before their imprisonment. For many individuals that have been incarcerated, it is imperative upon release that they avoid the situations and relationships that originally lead to their criminal behaviour (Brown & Ross, 2010). Whatever the individual story, helping offenders to reunite with positive influences in their life, while establishing new forms of social capital, is imperative to arming them with the tools and support for the difficult transition from prison to community.

Social capital is distinguished into two primary types, bonding and bridging. Bonding social capital exists between individuals in a group of a similar demographic, such as race, social class, or religion. Bridging social capital, alternatively, occurs in a more heterogeneous grouping, allowing individuals to mix, gain exposure and expand their perspectives. This often provides one of the demographics in the mix with increased access to resources that might not otherwise be available (Eicher & Kawachi, 2011).

The design of the Koza Centre primarily relates to bridging social capital. The stigmatization that female offenders experience is one that creates potentially lifelong hurdles, limiting the types of chances that they are given, and the respect that they receive. The main level of the facility will attempt to create settings conducive to bridging social capital. The resources available to the surrounding neighbourhood, provided by the women in the program will call into question the perceived value of offenders to society. As this bridging occurs, the potential exists for the offenders to increase their social capital through networking, community involvement, and bonding that a walled prison in a remote location could ever hope to offer.

Design plays an imperative role in the formation of social capital by providing opportunities for relationships to develop and bridging to occur. This may be achieved
through the development of typically social areas such as cafés, event spaces, and designated meeting rooms, but also through spaces that provide opportunity for unplanned, impromptu interactions that are much more informal (Eicher & Kawachi, 2011).

According to Eicher and Kawachi (2011), studies support the argument that mixed land use actually raises the social capital of a neighbourhood. When amenities are within walking distance, individuals spend more social time within their neighbourhoods, outside of their residence. If the Koza Centre is able to provide the surrounding community with amenities and an enjoyable place to spend social time, positive associations will be attributed to the facility and raise the potential for it to be less about the ‘inmates’ and more about the experiences had there. The intent is to evoke a neutralizing effect as the community adapts to this new typology.

The Netherlands, prominent leaders in progressive penal reform, recognize the value of social capital to the health of their justice system. In 1992 they hosted a conference that highlighted alternative approaches to crime and imprisonment across the globe, put
on by the organization Penal Reform International. Netherland’s then-State Secretary for Justice, Aad Kosto (1992), referred to their country’s approach as “social renewal” (p. 11). Social renewal comes from an acknowledgement that it is everyone’s responsibility to ensure that offenders are welcomed back into the community. Kosto argued that prisons should shift focus from “imprisonment as deprivation of liberty [to] restrictions on liberty […] carried out in the community, not in isolation from it” (p. 10). This is reflected in the Netherland’s shift from “closed” to “open” prisons where, through various stages in the program, offenders are afforded increasing amounts of freedom. This allows individuals the opportunity to develop and maintain social capital by sustaining their inclusion in a semblance of daily life while assigning them specific obligations and programs (Kosto, 1992). By rejecting imprisonment as a form of punishment and alienation from society, the Netherlands is choosing to use their justice system as a way to reach and effect change in these individuals that will eventually be released.

2.4 PHYSICAL WELL-BEING

Psychological stress & physical health
Earlier in this chapter, examples of psychological stress affecting physical health were discussed. Environmental stressors that negatively affect mental wellness can, in turn, trigger physical side effects such as loss of sleep and illness. The connection is so significant that researchers from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Princeton have developed a hypothesis that well-being actually enables the body’s biological processes to function properly and prevent, ward-off, and recover from disease and illness with greater success (Love et al., 2004). When an individual is affected by external stress, the brain signals a release of hormones that activate the immune system, inhibiting physical healing throughout the body.

However, just as physical surroundings can impede healing, so too can they trigger positive responses in the immune system that increase its effectiveness (Sternberg,
One example of this is the effects of biophilic design on hospital patients, as discussed in the section on psychological well-being.

Overall well-being includes the incorporation of physical activity into daily life. The healthier one is, the higher their perceived quality of life will be. Physical fitness contributes to this by reducing the risk of physical disability, illness, and some disease, lowering the risk and severity of mental illness such as depression, and improving sleep quality (Carlson, Millstein, & Sallis, 2011).

Physical health is particularly important for incarcerated women as another tool for managing and mediating mental health. It is clear that prison environments present a number of challenges to one’s mental fitness. Women are twice as likely as men to be diagnosed with mental health conditions at admission, long before the stress of prison has been added (“Corrections & Conditional”, 2008). Howard Sapers, reiterates the challenge that prison environments create for vulnerable populations:

> Prison is the bluntest of our criminal justice instruments. A federal penitentiary does not easily bend to meet the needs of mood, behaviour or disability in managing the increasingly high numbers of concurrently mentally ill and addicted persons behind bars. (Sapers, 2014, p. 3)

Female offenders are often survivors of mental, physical, sexual abuse, or other forms of trauma (Blanchard, 2004, p. 45; Gilham, 2012, p. 90; Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013, p. 7). Of course, physical activity cannot cure mental health issues, but it becomes another tool that strengthens one’s abilities to work through them. Adding 30 minutes of walking a day improves mood and reduces the chance of depression. At the neurological level, physical activity strengthens the connections between nerve cells that produce serotonin, a mood regulator. Not only elevating mood, exercise also works to “decrease connections that enhance the stress response”, meaning that when stress does occur, one is better equipped to manage it (Sternberg, 2010).
TYPES OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Physical activity is organized into two primary types, utilitarian and recreational. Utilitarian activity is the physical effort or activity often required as a by-product of doing something else; walking to the grocery store, for example—where the intent is not exercise but getting from point A to B—is utilitarian activity. Whereas recreational physical activity is what might typically come to mind when thinking about fitness: sports and exercise for the sake of exercise. (Carlson et al., 2011).

Integrating design strategies that encourage physical health is particularly important in the design of a prison. While the women at the Koza Centre will be granted restricted access to individualized programs off-site, their range is limited primarily to within the confines of the building’s structure. While providing amenities for group and individual fitness is an important aspect, the layout and design of the prison should be so that utilitarian physical activity is highly encouraged—both in options available for getting from point A to point B, but also by spacing amenities throughout the building.

HEALTHY BUILDING SYSTEMS

Physical health is much more than ensuring individuals receive the proper amount and intensity of physical activity in a week. From the perspective of interior design, the building systems, products and furnishings within must not contribute to a space that makes its users sick. Because the women, children and employees of the facility will be spending such a significant amount of time indoors, it is imperative to ensure that the building materials, how it runs, and what has been introduced to the interior is not threatening the health of the users. As a strategy to address this, the design of the Koza Centre will consider Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) guidelines to promote sustainable, healthy design.
2.5 CONCLUSION

With all of the research that has been gathered over recent decades, there is overwhelming evidence to support the position that physical environments can, in fact, elicit psychological and physiological responses in users of that space. Design, truly effective design is, at its core, responsive—responsive to its users, function, setting, and context. Therefore, when study after study emerged illustrating the measurable effects of space on the human condition, designers responded with a new set of parameters that sought to “promote wellness by creating physical surroundings that are ‘psychologically supportive’” (Ruga, as cited in Ulrich, 1991, p. 97). Not surprisingly, it has been termed “supportive design”. Unfortunately, this approach appears as a niche market, delegated primarily to healthcare facilities rather than a base model for all designed environments.

No study is required to substantiate the reality that individuals carry immeasurable amounts of stress and psychological strain on a daily basis. At the same time, North Americans are spending more time indoors than ever before. This practicum examines how supportive design might benefit a specific demographic, one that is particularly vulnerable to the effects of interior space imposed upon them. This does not mean, however, that the lessons learned in this chapter cannot or should not be applied to any type of space or population within it. The design criteria established here would provide benefit to any user and could be approached as base criteria for promoting wellness.

If the final goal of incarceration is rehabilitation, then women in prison deserve a chance to work toward this in an environment that does not all but completely contradict what is being asked of them. If traditional and even current prison structures inhibit the foundations necessary for rehabilitation then, as designers, we must respond.
By breaking well-being, crucial to the rehabilitation process, down into its sub-categories and examining them through the lens of physical space, we gain an understanding of what design criteria demand revision. Designing for control of one’s immediate surroundings is particularly important for the psychological well-being of women in prison. This control extends to environmental factors such as light and temperature, and also to control of social interaction by accommodating for variability in privacy levels. While these factors can avoid precipitating environmental stress, the integration of biophilic design strategies can actually work to promote positive psychological and physiological responses.

The exploration of concepts of community and social well-being provide a solid foundation in support of relocating prison. Rather than alienating women offenders from society and perpetuating the myth of the criminal Other, rehabilitation should take place in tandem with the community, much like Norway’s concept of social restoration. By integrating prison into the community, relationships can develop, stigmas are challenged, and a semblance of normalcy can exist so that when time has been served, that transition out of the system is much smoother. In order to facilitate social health, design that encourages and fosters bonds between all users of the facility has been utilized.

And lastly, with the sheer amount of time that offenders spend indoors, it is the ethical and professional duty of both CSC and designers to ensure that the building itself does not cause physical illness to those within it. To account for physical well-being, strategies include compliance with numerous LEED guidelines as well as design that promotes active living.
Overall well-being includes the promotion of physical health. The healthier one is, the higher their perceived quality of life will be.

**Rehabilitation and successful reintegration are contingent upon strong support systems and positive relationships during incarceration and after release.**

**By understanding the degree to which surroundings affect users psychologically, design strategies can be developed that will help to reduce stress and negative behavioural outcomes, and others that encourage positive mental states.**
SUMMARY OF DESIGN STRATEGIES

• ensure optimal privacy in offender living quarters can be met while still maintaining safety and security—variation of space should range from fully communal to private ownership
• provide control over immediate environment such as light, temperature, noise, and access to views through user control systems
• create positive distractions through stimulating surroundings (though not over-stimulating) by use of light, color, variation, depth
• utilize elements and attributes of biophilic design
• areas the promote play and nurturing of relationships between mothers, children, and their families

• development of formal and informal social spaces that allow for planned and impromptu interactions
• design for physical activity—promoting utilitarian activity through spatial planning that requires traveling throughout the building and designing various ways to get there, and promoting recreational activity by providing space for fitness and sport
• implementation of LEED design strategies that promote healthy building systems, user wellness, and resource sustainability
CHAPTER THREE: PRECEDENT STUDIES

3.1 Halden Prison Norway
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3.3 West Vancouver Community Centre
3.1 HALDEN PRISON

TYPE / Corrections
DESIGN TEAM / Erik Møller Arkitekter + HLM arkitektur
CLIENT / Norway Department of Justice
LOCATION / Østfold, Norway
COMPLETION / 2010
SCALE / 296,000 sq. ft., multiple buildings

Shortly after the tragedy, media across the world erupted as rumors spread that Anders Behring Breivik—responsible for killing 77 people in Oslo, Norway on July 22, 2011—would likely be sentenced to time at Halden Prison in Østfold, Norway. Touted as “the world’s most humane prison” (Benko, 2015; Vinnitskaya, 2011), the news spread outrage that someone so reviled would be sentenced to what were reported as luxurious living accommodations.

I was fascinated by the controversy that this stirred, revealing many people’s reluctance to invest in the well-being and rehabilitation of those in prison, rather
than a punitive model that strips prison down to most basic living needs. This is not, however, the path that Norway has chosen for its judicial system. The country does not subscribe to capital punishment and the longest sentence is 21 years (Benko, 2015). Beginning in 1998 with the decision to focus on rehabilitative programs, and a more defined commitment in 2007 to ensure that offenders are given the best chance for successful reentry upon release, the Norwegian Correctional Service believes that their countrypeople are “better out than in” (Benko, 2015).

Halden Prison was the first to be constructed after 2007’s realignment and a new design that reflected the country’s commitments was imperative. For the first time, interior designers, not just architects, were hired for the job (Hancock & Jewkes, 2011). The result is a prison built to a human scale with multiple, smaller buildings, never more than 2 storeys high (Benko, 2015) (Figure 2). According to Benko (2015), “every aspect of the facility was designed to ease psychological pressures, mitigate conflict and minimize interpersonal friction”. The large compound that houses 251 high-security male inmates is meant to mimic everyday life as much as possible and ease the transition upon release (Adams, 2010; Benko, 2015; Vinnitskaya, 2011). Buildings separate the facilities according to functions related to

---

7 After the 21 years, sentences can be extended by five year increments in the interest of public safety.
home, work, and recreational life. This strategy also helps to break the monotony of prison, integrate more physical activity into daily life, and gets inmates outdoors into nature and the fresh air (Adams, 2010; Benko, 2015).

Designers paid close attention to creating a connection between the residents and nature. They kept a large number of the site’s trees to maintain the surrounding’s natural forest setting and hide the large concrete wall that surround the site, one of the few reminders of the facility’s high-security rating (Figures 2-3). Otherwise, there is no razor wire, electrical fences, guard towers, or bars on the windows. Large windows let in daylight and provide natural views that change with the seasons (Adams, 2010; Benko, 2015; Hancock & Jewkes, 2011).

Overall, the design is described as “modern [and] cheerful” (Benko, 2015, n.p.). Each building has a distinct look with facades that reference their natural surroundings through the use of wood, brick, concrete, stone, and steel (Vinnitskaya, 2011) (Figure 4). The interiors are minimalistic, functional, and simple—a signature of Scandinavian design. Open plan spaces have been integrated, with communal areas that encourage interaction and domestic living such as kitchen hubs connected to lounges where inmates cook.
and eat together (Figure 6). Color is used to brighten the spaces, utilizing warm and cool hues according to function, and also as a wayfinding device throughout (Hancock & Jewkes, 2011). Hard materials have been balanced by soft furnishings, referencing Halden’s punishment and rehabilitation aspects. In fact, unlike most other carceral facilities, Halden’s design emphasizes normalcy of daily life and utilizes regular, everyday furniture instead of the typically hard, tamper-proof furnishings bolted down for security (Benko, 2015) (Figure 7). As a condition of all publicly-funded buildings in Norway, local art has been integrated throughout. Large graphic components from graffiti-artist Dolk bring humor and lightheartedness to the design (Benko, 2015) (Figure 5).

Instead of having the design dictated by security and risk assessment, Norway’s approach is that of “‘dynamic security’, a philosophy that sees interpersonal relationships between the staff and the inmates as the primary factor in maintaining safety within the prison” (Benko, 2015, n.p.). In order to facilitate these relationships, staff eat their meals and partake in recreation activities with the inmates. Small work spaces encourage staff to move out to the common areas, while the security pods situated between living quarters provide clear sightlines to the spaces when guards
want to give the inmates some space (Benko, 2015, Hancock & Jewkes, 2011). The psychological impact of constant surveillance is minimized by limiting the use of closed circuit televisions (CCTV) to the prison grounds. This strategy is also employed at the minimum security zone at Manitoba’s Stony Mountain penitentiary. Guards there also contributed their success with minimal surveillance to the high rapport and trust developed between staff and inmates (D. Conley, personal communication, June 15, 2015).

Halden Prison is an invaluable look at just how different the design of a correctional facility can be when the intent shifts to managing the well-being of the users, minimizing psychological strain and interpersonal conflict, and promoting strong relationships between staff and offender. Normalization of everyday life within the compound is one that comes across in the literature as key to Norway’s approach to mitigating the transition from prison to the community. Drawing from this, the Koza Centre will look at the whole building as a self-contained neighbourhood. While the facility does not have the advantage of multiple buildings to define activity types, zoning between levels will be crucial.

---

8 The minimum security zone, unlike the medium and high security areas at the facility, are situated just outside of the bounds of the prison’s high-walled fence and razor wire. Prisoners with a minimum security rating share cottage-like apartments with six to eight other “roommates”.

---
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to separating the various spheres of everyday life. This will also mean integrating utilitarian physical activity into the design that mimics Halden’s strategy of locating activities a reasonable distance from one another.

The Koza Centre will draw inspiration from Halden’s approach to creating social environments that encourage interactions and relationship building. Communal spaces will be provided for each living cluster where the women will cook, clean, and spend down time with one another. This means not only developing relationships but learning how to manage conflict and address issues in a constructive manner. Staff will be encouraged to develop trusting relationships with the women by spending time in communal areas and participating in activities. While they will have designated staff areas for work, they will be minimal in size to reduce the amount of time spent there segregated from the offenders. Clear sight lines from these areas will allow staff to give the women and their children some space when needed, while still being able to maintain visibility for security and availability, similar to Halden’s approach.

Halden’s modest, simple design is effective and aesthetically pleasing without unwarranted extravagance. Simple strategies like windows that provide views of the surrounding area to allow inmates to see the changing of seasons, or the use of non-institutional furnishings provide necessities for the facility in a way that considers how to minimize psychological stress on those in prison.

A common argument heard when discussing progressive approaches to incarceration, like those at Halden Prison, is that the design does nothing to make an offender want to leave and return to the outside community. Although I do not agree with this—I argue that this is where the Koza Centre provides a strong alternative. Because a portion of the facility is open and in service to the community, women that have been released still have the option to return to the building as a member of the public. By bridging prison and community, it becomes a safe haven for those needing some familiarity at moments when the transition is difficult.
FIGURE 11 - MAGGIE’S WEST LONDON EXTERIOR
3.2 MAGGIE’S CENTRE WEST LONDON

TYPE / Healthcare  
DESIGN TEAM / Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners  
CLIENT / Maggie’s Centres  
LOCATION / London, UK  
COMPLETION / 2008  
SCALE / 3,980 sq. ft., 2 storey

When Maggie Jencks was undergoing cancer treatment in 1994, she found the cold, institutional spaces to be unbearable. At such a monumental time in a patient’s life, so much of it gets spent in hospital treatment spaces. She and her husband, architect Charles Jencks, developed the idea of a drop-in centre where cancer patients and their families could go for support in a space designed to inspire and nurture. With the first centre opened in Edinburgh in 1996, there are now 20 Maggie’s Centres throughout the United Kingdom and into Asia (Jenks & Heathcote, 2015).

Each building is different from the next as it responds to its specific location and context, but all are designed with the well-being of the users in mind—finding a way to respect the internal struggles patients have from “accepting death to fighting for life” (Jencks & Heathcote, p. 25). The design community has been in strong support of the projects and many high-profile architects have contributed, including Rem Koolhaus, Frank Gehry, Zaha Hadid, and Thomas Heatherwick (Jenks & Heathcote, 2015). The sheer variation between each building—all of which have been warmly received by their users—shows us that designing for wellness can take on many iterations.

Maggie’s Centres are always located adjacent to large hospitals where patients receive treatment. They offer programmatic activities and resources that focus on the “social realities of cancer”, aspects of illness that are often overlooked by large facilities juggling many demands. Jenks (2015) refers to the centres as a “hybrid architecture” that straddle somewhere between a house,
a hospital, a spiritual space, and an art gallery. The inclusion of all of these aspects are to enrich the experience for the users and reflect a more holistic process. Gardens and interior connections to nature are integrated, while spaces for personal reflection and others for communal support are balanced (Jencks and Heathcote, 2015). For Jenks (2015), it is about conveying the spirit of struggle and hope.

Maggie’s West London at Charing Cross Hospital was designed by the architectural firm Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners. The designers responded to the dense urban site by introducing the concept of a nautilus shell’s spiral with a protective outer layer leading to safety and home at the centermost point. A large vibrant orange wall wraps around the building and leads users from the street seamlessly into the centre. The gesture of the wall and the building’s large overhung roof direct focus towards the interior and block out the surroundings as much as possible (Figures 11-12). The structure’s openings frame views of gardens and courtyards instead of large buildings and busy streets (RSHP & Taylor, 2012).
The kitchen was brought to the core, the heart of the building where a large communal table brings patients, families, and friends together (Figure 13). The room is double volume, flooded with natural light from floor to ceiling glazing and clerestory windows (Figure 14). The openness creates a seamless connection to all areas, both inside and out, as if they were all tethered to that central point. Different levels
of privacy are incorporated in the surrounding smaller spaces for meeting and sitting, while sliding doors accommodate for flexible programming ("Projects", n.d.). The Centre Head of Maggie’s West London, Bernie Byrne, points out the strength of this design strategy:

One of the things that I really like about this particular centre is the fluidity and how that affects the dynamics of the centre, because people can find their own space. I think there are lots of lovely spaces where people are contained in their own space, and in a way their own world, but actually they are part of the whole. (Byrne as cited in RSHP & Taylor, 2012, 6:35)

The architectural language of the centre is highly geometric with strong horizontal and vertical elements dominating the spaces. As a result, each view appears within a large circuitry of framing devices. Walls that frame rooms that frame windows that frame courtyards and beyond (Figure 15). The visual information is dense but is carefully balanced by its simplicity otherwise. Like an abstract Mondrian painting, it is as if all superfluous elements have been stripped down to their essential form. A neutral palette created by the primary materials—wood panels and warmly toned concrete—are punctuated throughout by black steel and pops of color from the greenery, protective wall, and soft furnishings.

What truly brings the building to life is the contrast of elements. The designers created variety and dynamism by integrating spaces that are both transparent and
opaque, noisy and quiet, light and dark (“Projects”, n.d.). Biophilic design was clearly a central theme, but organic forms—the spiral-like circulation and the integration of courtyards and gardens—are off-set by the geometry of the forms. Instead of competing with one another for attention, they each provide a complimentary backdrop for the other. For me, this comes back to Jenks’s wish that each centre would, in its own way, represent that balance between struggle and hope. The rationality of the clean, simple structure in tandem with the wildness and unpredictability of nature places users at the center of two worlds.

This is an inspiring precedent for its ability to translate such heavy topics as life and death, struggle and hope, into a clear physical expression of space. In much the same way that Maggie’s Centres focus on the “social realities of cancer” (Jenks, 2015), I have put concerted effort into understanding and addressing what can be considered the social realities of incarceration for FSW. Because of this, many of the design approaches of Maggie’s West London lend themselves to an adapted application in the Koza Centre. Providing a variety of spaces and opportunities for the women to be social or spend quiet time in personal reflection encourages them to self-regulate and, in turn, be more connected to their emotions and needs. This gives dignity to users of the space through control and provides opportunity to practice self-awareness.

Another significant strategy of Maggie’s West London compatible to this project is the integration of biophilic design as an enriching and calming experience for the users. Creating a sense of seamlessness in areas between the interior and exterior is particularly useful for a project that deals with confinement. Since FSW’s access to outside is limited and highly controlled, utilizing as many methods as possible to create a connection to the outdoors and nature is important to minimize the psychological strain of these limiting parameters. This can be expressed through unobstructed views of nature outside but also by bringing natural elements indoors in overt and more subtle ways such as abstracted form.
3.3 WEST VANCOUVER COMMUNITY CENTRE

TYPE / Civic
DESIGN TEAM / HCMA Architecture + Design
CLIENT / District of West Vancouver
LOCATION / Vancouver, BC
COMPLETION / 2009
SCALE / 86,100 sq. ft. facility, 3 storey

The West Vancouver Community Centre (WVCC) was commissioned as a project that would bridge already existing facilities on the site, such as an ice rink, seniors’ activity centre, and aquatic centre (“Building Case”, 2010). The three-storey facility has garnered strong support from the local community who were included in the planning phase, providing insight about what type of centre they envisioned (“Facility”, 2010). The resulting design and programme that developed has created “a recreational, social and cultural community hub” that accommodates local neighbourhood demographics. The building boasts a rich variety of offerings, such as a music hall, art studio, youth lounge, dance and fitness studio, meeting spaces, gym facilities, and childcare (“West Vancouver”, n.d.). Many of the spaces are designed to accommodate current needs but with a level of flexibility that allows for future adaption (“Facility”, 2010).

The large atrium acts as the hub of the facility and is the first point of contact for visitors of WVCC. The transition to the inside is seamless, mitigated by a deep wood-lined overhang at the entrance, with large doors on tracks that, in agreeable weather, can be slid open to eliminate them all together. The large interior volume, streaming with light from both sides of the shallow building is grand in statement at the same time that seating and a long, low slung reception desk brings it back to a more intimate human scale. The large staircase at the edge of the atrium acts as a “spine” to the building, connecting the levels and various activities (“Building Case”, 2010). An emphasis on community connectivity is reiterated by the large windows into the
activity spaces, easily viewable from circulation zones at any level. Natural light and materiality, transparency, and “colorful bridges” (HCMA, 2011) that cross over the main corridor at the upper levels all contribute to a dynamic, playful, yet sophisticated social space for everyone to enjoy.

True to the city’s reputation as a nature lover’s paradise, WVCC was designed with low environmental impact and efficiency in mind. The building meets the standards for LEED gold certification and utilizes a number of sustainable design practices. Included among these are passive solar heating and daylighting attainable through the building’s strong east/west orientation, while natural ventilation from the long skylights also keep the air circulating (“Building Case”, 2010). Geothermal heating supplied by a ground source heat recovery system has been so effective it is able to provide 40% of the entire facility’s energy requirements (“Facility”, 2010). Builders were able to salvage 89% of the outdated centre’s materials to be used in the new facility. These, in addition to water conservation strategies and energy-efficient lighting systems have created a facility that not only responds to its users needs but also their values and ideals.

This precedent will primarily help to provide direction for the Koza Centre on programming and activity selection for areas open to the community for use. With the proposal of a correctional facility in a central Toronto neighbourhood, NIMBYism will inevitably be the knee-jerk reaction from some locals. Strategies to gain support for the facility early on will be imperative to its success. Much like WVCC’s approach, consulting the community on what they hope to gain from the building will help to shift the mentality that this is less something that is being imposed upon and more something valuable that is being offered to them. Although this project is theoretical, I have the benefit of seeing what services locals have actually requested, since the building being used for this practicum is currently in the process of being converted to a community centre.

---

9 NIMBYism - acronym for “not in my back yard”, referring to those that oppose certain types of developments in their neighbourhood.
Some of the amenities that have been requested are a community kitchen, multipurpose rooms, a fitness centre and gymnasium, pool, and daycare centre (Caton, 2015). While not every request can be granted, meeting some of these requests helps to establish a positive relationship with the community and ensures contextual relevance.

WVCC paid close attention to creating a well-rounded programme that offers a mix of recreational, social, and cultural spaces. Rather than focusing on one type of community centre, WVCC’s variety encourages individuals of all ages and interests to participate. This approach is relevant for the Koza Centre, not only because of the demographics of the surrounding neighbourhoods, but because the women staying at the facility will have different backgrounds, skills, and interests. The centre will focus on recreational and social facilities but will also provide resources related to justice services in honor of the project’s commitment to improving experiences and support for those in the judicial system.

The WVCC’s approach to expressing community connection through transparency and visibility is an interesting strategy that the Koza Centre has drawn inspiration from. Socializing and bridging through community involvement lends itself to this design strategy. What will be important is to limit this transparency to the community engagement areas. Sensitivity to the treatment and counseling services, as well as the domestic living areas is important to maintaining a supportive environment for those at the centre as they grow and develop. The distinction must be made that the women staying at the facility and their lives are not on display for public consumption; balance between public and private is imperative for dignity and respect.

FOR IMAGES OF THE WEST VANCOUVER COMMUNITY CENTRE, VISIT :

<https://westvancouver.ca/parks-recreation/community-centres/west-vancouver-community-centre>
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4.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

/ TYPE
• Institutional
• Adaptive reuse

/ USERS
• Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) employees;
• Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS) members;
• Federally sentenced women (FSW);
• Children of FSW;
• Members of the local community

/ SITE

LOCATION:
• SE corner of Sorauren Park
• 40 Wabash Avenue
  Toronto, ON M6R 1N2

SQUARE FOOTAGE:
• 40,000 sq. ft., 4 levels (3 above ground)

ARCHITECTS:
• Charles Edward Langley (1870-1951) &
• William Ford Howland (1874-1948) (Hill, 2009)

HISTORY:
• Formerly Canada Linseed Oil Mill (1910-1969)
• Vacant since 1970
• Acquired by the City of Toronto in 2000
• Site has since been treated for soil contamination, and asbestos in building has been removed (Wencer, 2010)
4.2 SITE ANALYSIS

/ SURROUNDINGS

ADJACENCIES:
• Sorauren Park:
  Wabash town square
  Wabash fieldhouse
  Sorauren dog park
  Baseball diamond
  Tennis courts
  Sports field
• Railway tracks with active service
• Residential housing

ZONING:
• Toronto Ward 14: Parkdale – High Park
• Former General Zoning By-law 438-86
  (“Zoning Bylaw”, n.d.)
• Brownfield site

WIND PATTERNS:
• Prevailing winds from the S and SW
  (“Toronto Climate”, 2015)

FIGURE 17 - WIND PATTERNS PREDOMINANTLY FROM THE SOUTH AND SOUTHWEST
VIEWS:

- NORTH AND WEST VIEWS – Sorauren Park, condos converted from industrial buildings of the same era, greenery
- EAST VIEW – Railway tracks, grocery store, and skyline view of downtown Toronto with CN Tower
- SOUTH VIEW – residential buildings, greenery
PEDESTRIAN & VEHICULAR ACCESS:

- Easily accessible
- High-walkability neighbourhood (Walkscore: 91/100) ("Wellbeing Toronto", 2010)
- Located just off of Dundas Street W., a main arterial street
- Five minute walking distance from Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) streetcar routes 306, 505 and 506
- 20 minute walking distance from TTC Dundas West subway station
- Adjacent to numerous bike-friendly streets from all four directions, including those with dedicated bike lanes
- Street parking available

/ NEIGHBOURHOOD DEMOGRAPHIC

Toronto has been selected as the location for the facility based on its reputation as a tolerant city–celebrated for its vast multiculturalism, gay pride, resource abundance, and variety of communities. While Montreal is generally considered more ideologically liberal than Toronto, the predominantly French-speaking locale would hinder reintegration success for a large number of offenders. It was important that the surrounding neighbourhood not be a struggling, low-income, or troubled area that may bring with it barriers to the future success of those attending the facility. A modest middle class or working class community with a high level of diversity, background, age, and income level is ideal.

The site is located in Toronto Ward 14: Parkdale - High Park, where it straddles the neighbourhood border between Roncesvalles and Little Portugal.

FIGURE 24 - TORONTO NEIGHBOURHOOD MAP WITH RONCESVALLES AND LITTLE PORTUGAL HIGHLIGHTED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5 - NEIGHBOURHOOD DEMOGRAPHICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RONCESVALLES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND AREA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE GROUPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Roncesvalles 1&quot;, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOTHER TONGUE (TOP 5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English - 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish - 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian - 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese - 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan languages - 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Roncesvalles 2&quot;, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARITAL STATUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(after tax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in low income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Little Portugal 4&quot;, 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
/ SITE OPPORTUNITIES & CONSTRAINTS

OPPORTUNITIES:
• Low density of immediate surroundings creates few obstacles to light and views from the interior
• Building situated on a site that has a variety of distinct views that will help optimize privacy levels associated with interior programming: park and green space, residential, skyline
• Young deciduous trees planted around town square on west side will create greater privacy for upper floors as they grow
• Upper floors provide views with great depth—distinct foreground, mid and background views
• Situation of building optimal, with front facing town square and park; and back with large loading docks and area for vehicular access facing railway lines
• Developing on brownfield site extra points toward LEED certification

CONSTRAINTS:
• Proximity to active railway tracks creates potential security risk if offender attempts an escape
• Question of outdoor access for offenders impeding on public park space
• Noise from active rail line and park activities potentially disruptive
• Adjacent park built on top of old TTC streetcar yard making construction for geothermal system a challenge
FIGURE 25 - 40 WABASH AVE WEST FACADE
4.3 BUILDING ANALYSIS

/ FEATURES

STRUCTURAL:
- Masonry
- Concrete columns

BUILDING ENVELOPE:
- Loading zone at east side optimal for delivery and prisoner transport
- Large and frequent window openings provide abundant daylight
- Multiple points of egress currently on every side
- Three large-scale double doors on north side—presumably for transport loading

NON-STRUCTURAL:
- Interior compartmentalized into large zones that coincide with the five primary sections of the building
- Only major interior partitions (masonry) remaining with integrated columns

CIRCULATION:
- Stairwell at south exterior wall from basement to third floor, the only one that travels to all floors
- Elevator and adjacent stairwell at west exterior wall from basement to second floor (west portion of building only two storeys)
- Elevator at east exterior wall coincides with exterior double doors on upper floors and loading door at ground level—related to linseed or heavy equipment transport?
- Small narrow staircases and elevators require replacement and probable relocations
- Different areas of the building extend to different levels

MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL/PLUMBING:
- Original systems no longer existent
/ BUILDING OPPORTUNITIES & CONSTRAINTS

OPPORTUNITIES:

- Frequency and generous sizes of window openings allow daylight to flood interior spaces
- Masonry construction rarely done with newly erected buildings
- Building façade visually cohesive with surrounding neighbourhood, particularly numerous condos on the north edge of the park that have been converted from industrial buildings of the same era
- Flat roof presents design opportunity for elevated outdoor green space and courtyards that won’t impede onto public park
- Three floors coincide with the need for facility’s three distinct security levels
- Large basement provides ample space for mechanical and electrical systems and various types of storage without cutting into programmatic space

FIGURE 26 - EXTERIOR ELEVATION WEST - 40 WABASH AVE

FIGURE 27 - EXTERIOR ELEVATION SOUTH - 40 WABASH AVE
CONTRAINTS:

- Depth of building on first and second floors makes passive ventilation challenging
- Smaller footprint of third floor may not provide enough space for living zone
- Structural grid punctuated by large concrete columns situated frequently throughout the space creates numerous design challenges
- Industrial history and aesthetic of original building could give an institutional feel if not treated carefully
- Original linseed mill appears more like multiple buildings butted together, which segments the interior creating either design constraints or natural opportunities for distinct zones within each floor
FIGURE 30 - EXISTING FLOOR PLAN - LOWER LEVEL

FIGURE 31 - EXISTING FLOOR PLAN - GROUND LEVEL

FIGURE 32 - EXISTING FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 2

FIGURE 33 - EXISTING FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 3
4.4 USERS

/ CLIENTS

• The intended clients include Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) in partnership with the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS).

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA (CSC)

Mission Statement/Values:
• As a federal government agency, CSC manages and oversees offenders that have been sentenced to terms of two or more years, as well as all related facilities and programs. CSC’s mission states that it “contributes to public safety by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens, while exercising reasonable, safe, secure and humane control” (About Us, 2012). The agency’s top priorities include:

SAFETY - Safety related to CSC’s staff and those within its care.
INDIVIDUALIZED NEEDS - Addressing the individual needs of offenders, including considerations of gender, religious and cultural backgrounds, and mental health needs.
PARTNERSHIP - Fostering “productive relationships with increasingly diverse partners, stakeholders, and others involved in public safety” (Our Priorities, 2012).
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF ELIZABETH FRY SOCIETIES (CAEFS)

Mission Statement/Values:
Since the first national establishment in 1939, the Elizabeth Fry Society has been Canada’s primary community-based, non-profit organization advocating for the rights of women within the justice system. The organization itself is comprised of local Elizabeth Fry Societies that are self-governed but operate with a common mission and values, notably, “to ensure substantive equality in the delivery and development of services and programs through public education, research, legislative and administrative reform, regionally, nationally and internationally” (About Us, n.d.). Their shared mandate includes:

HUMAN RIGHTS – These address not only basic human rights but also women’s rights and equality in access to justice “without fear of prejudice or discrimination on the basis of such factors as sex, race, disability, sexual orientation, age, religion and freedom of conscience, social or economic condition” (About Us, n.d.).
COMMUNITY INTEGRATION – To reduce the number of women incarcerated in Canada by advocating for and “[facilitating] the earliest community integration of those who are sentenced to a term of imprisonment” (About Us, n.d.).
ACCESS TO SUPPORT RESOURCES – “To increase the availability of community-based, publicly funded, social service, health and educational resources available for marginalized, victimized, criminalized, and imprisoned women” (About Us, n.d.).
/ PRIMARY USERS

TABLE 6 - PRIMARY USER / FACILITY STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The facility will be staffed on a 24 hour basis by individuals with a</td>
<td>balanced background in corrections and mental health or community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background in corrections and mental health or community integration</td>
<td>(Structured Living Environment... 2013). The work is intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Structured Living Environment... 2013). The work is intensive and</td>
<td>and requires a high level of personal commitment on the part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requires a high level of personal commitment on the part of the staff.</td>
<td>of the staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Values</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Shared values or characteristics of the staff may include a high</td>
<td>capacity for empathy and compassion, as well as an understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity for empathy and compassion, as well as an understanding of</td>
<td>of the value of respect to offenders while still maintaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the value of respect to offenders while still maintaining authority.</td>
<td>authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All genders, age 20-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Requirements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Position Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Workers 10; Correctional Program Officers 4; Counsellors 2;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Liaison Officers 1;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent 1; Instructors 2; Administrative Assistants 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Position Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Officers variable; Social Program Officers 2; Spiritual Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1; Aboriginal Community Development Officers 1; Nurses 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The needs of the staff directly relate to the success and continuity of</td>
<td>operations at the facility and include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintaining the security of the building and all those within it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making themselves available at all times to offenders in order to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage positive relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintaining order among individuals at the facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong visibility of the spaces and adequate surveillance for areas of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decreased visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secure area for sensitive administrative functions, such as storage of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offenders’ files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leading individual and group therapy sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitating offender-community integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching classes/skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7 - FRONT LINE STAFF - POSITION DUTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL-TIME</th>
<th>PART-TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITION TITLE</td>
<td>FUNCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Workers</td>
<td>• responsible for institutional security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• offender escort when off-site work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with other institutional staff to assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offender progress and provide recommendations for parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Program Officers</td>
<td>• develop and provide correctional programs to offenders based on individual need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellors</td>
<td>• mental health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• assist with correctional plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provide therapy programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Liaison Officers</td>
<td>• provide leadership, teaching, counseling and general services to Aboriginal offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• active members of the Aboriginal communityprovide input on case management teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>• provide educational services to offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>• general health support for offenders and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• administering medications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 8 - PRIMARY USER / FEDERALLY SENTENCED WOMEN**

| Description | • FSW attending the facility have specifically applied to the program as an alternative to the current regional facilities. Due to the limited number of spaces at the Koza Centre, offenders that have been selected for the program have demonstrated a high desire and potential for transformation, rehabilitation, and reintegration into society while, at the same time, acknowledging help needed to successfully reach these goals. |
| Shared Values | • Values that these women share may include those of personal development and well-being, responsibility for one’s actions in life, family and positive relationships, and contributing as a positive member of society. While some of these may not be strong among offenders upon their admission to the facility, the focus of the program is, in part, to help develop such values. |
| Demographic | • Women – 18+ yrs  
• in the care of CSC |
| Occupancy Requirements | • capacity for a minimum of 21 women  
• 2 distinct housing clusters with mother/child accommodations in one |
| Needs | • The needs of the offenders directly relate to encouraging success in personal growth, development, and rehabilitation and include:  
• A safe environment where they feel secure and respected  
• A level of autonomy that allows for personal decision-making  
• Highly structured programming that include daily responsibilities  
• Environments that facilitate physical, mental, and social health |
| Activities | • cooking, cleaning, and daily chores  
• therapy sessions  
• knowledge and skills-based classes  
• religious or spiritual ceremony  
• family and social engagement  
• work  
• physical activity |
### TABLE 9 - PRIMARY USER / OFFENDERS' CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In instances where it has been deemed to be in the best interest of all those involved, children of FSW will be allowed to live with, or regularly visit their mother at the Koza Centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The values of these children may vary significantly. However, by their inclusion in the program alone, they value their familial ties with their mother, and have a desire to see her succeed in the program, and the potential for a brighter future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all genders - infant to 12 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>occupancy connected to mother's housing unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexibility of living unit to accommodate up to two siblings, without wasting space if the second bed isn’t in use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The needs of the children directly relate to the desire for normalcy as well as strengthening and maintaining mother-child relationships and include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe and comfortable space to share with parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal, private area of one’s own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fun and play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure and authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>socializing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest and quiet time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 10 - PRIMARY USER / COMMUNITY MEMBERS

| Description | • Those from the community that visit the facility will do so on their own volition and will have highly varied backgrounds, experiences and values.  
• Their participation in the facility may be for services offered by the programming, or may just be in general support of the facility and the women involved. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Values</td>
<td>• Potentially, early visitors share such values as community support, respect for change, and tolerance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Demographic | • all genders, all ages  
• See Section 2.2 |
| Occupancy Requirements | • variable, see section 4.8 for occupancy loads by space  
• ground and lower levels partially available to the community  
• access to facilities on second floor limited to official visitation with FSW |
| Needs | • The needs of the community may be more abstract than those of the other users due to the variety of visitors to the Koza Centre, but may include:  
• Trust in the effectiveness of the facility, its programs and members  
• Sense of safety and security while on the premise  
• Affirmation that the community is not endangered by the presence of the facility  
• The provision of valuable services by the facility to the community |
| Activities | • Knowledge-based resources (justice services)  
• Use of café and social areas  
• Rental of community kitchen  
• Rental of space for outside meetings  
• Dog care and training services |
/ SECONDARY USERS

**TABLE 11 - SECONDARY USER / CUSTODIAL STAFF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>• all genders, 18-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Requirements</td>
<td>• 2 custodial staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the remainder of the duties will be shared by the women at the facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>• storage for custodial supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>• cleaning and maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 12 - SECONDARY USER / FAMILY & FRIENDS VISITING FSW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>• all genders, all ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Requirements</td>
<td>• highly variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• visitation times limited to specific hours based on programming schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>• safe and private space to spend time with family member/friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• space that supports relationships and accommodates children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>• talking and strolling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• playing with children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13 - SECONDARY USER / CASUAL INSTRUCTORS & VOLUNTEERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>• all genders, 18+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Requirements</td>
<td>• variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>• appropriate space to teach, provide workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Activities | • various activities could include:  
• workshops and lessons  
• fitness classes  
• certification training |

/ TERTIARY USERS

TABLE 14 - TERTIARY USERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary User / Staff transporting offenders to/from facility</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>• vehicular access close to building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tertiary User / Collections (inorganic & organic waste)     | Needs | • unobstructed access to receptacles  
• efficient system for facility to organize and appropriately dispose of waste |
| Tertiary User / Maintenance Workers                         | Needs | • clear wayfinding to reach appropriate staff upon arrival  
• easy and safe access to mechanical/electrical spaces |
| Tertiary User / Goods Delivery People                       | Needs | • clear wayfinding to reach appropriate staff upon arrival  
• unobstructed access to loading bay |
### 4.5 FUNCTIONAL + AESTHETIC REQUIREMENTS

#### TABLE 15 - SPATIAL REQUIREMENTS BY USER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USERS</th>
<th>SPATIAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>LOCATION CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY USERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>• shared open plan office</td>
<td>• not so central as to make a prominent area off-limits to offenders and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• secure file storage area</td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>• private office area for small meetings</td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Workers</td>
<td>• security stations areas where discrete discussions with offenders and children can take place *</td>
<td>• stations situated at vertical access and other key points to ensure no unauthorized access (loading zone, stairs/elevators) primary workers not tethered to specific space—encouraged to spend as much time in communal spaces with inmates, developing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• stations situated at vertical access and other key points to ensure no unauthorized access (loading zone, stairs/elevators) primary workers not tethered to specific space—encouraged to spend as much time in communal spaces with inmates, developing relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Program Officers Social Program Officer</td>
<td>• shared office areas for therapy/counseling *areas for education/training *areas for cultural, artistic, recreation activities *</td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Officers</td>
<td>• meeting area *</td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellors</td>
<td>• private office areas for private and group therapy/counseling *</td>
<td>• quieter, more discreet area of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Counsellor</td>
<td>• space for spiritual practice and counselling*</td>
<td>• quiet area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Liaison Officer</td>
<td>• shared office areas for aboriginal teaching and counseling *</td>
<td>• adjacency: office close to ceremonial space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Community Development Officer</td>
<td>• shared office areas for aboriginal teaching and counseling *</td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• space for spiritual practice *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>• areas for education/training</td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USERS</td>
<td>SPATIAL REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>LOCATION CONSIDERATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>• healthcare area including: medication distribution examination room</td>
<td>• level: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• records storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders</td>
<td>• 2 housing wings with:</td>
<td>• level: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• private rooms adjacent children's room</td>
<td>• (private and communal living)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• communal areas for cooking and socializing</td>
<td>• all (physical activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• areas for personal time and reflection *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• areas for physical activity/recreation *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• outdoor space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• washrooms/showers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders' Children</td>
<td>• private rooms with direct access to mother's private room</td>
<td>• level: 3 (living)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• areas for play and socializing area for childcare</td>
<td>• all (play/social)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 (childcare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td>• justice/community services</td>
<td>• play area that appeals to all ages to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• café</td>
<td>encourage engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• areas for lounging/socializing</td>
<td>• ample types of seating and arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• meeting room for rental</td>
<td>• level: lower and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• area for children and adults to play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• area for special arts/culture events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dog care and training area with easy drop off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY USERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Staff</td>
<td>• storage for cleaning supplies</td>
<td>• level: all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Friends &amp; Family</td>
<td>• comfortable private area for spending visit</td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• area for children to play and engage with parents *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USERS</td>
<td>SPATIAL REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>LOCATION CONSIDERATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Instructors/ Volunteers</td>
<td>• areas for education/training</td>
<td>• level: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• specialized training rooms according to activity *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERTIARY USERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff transporting offenders to/from facility</td>
<td>• admittance area must be connected to vehicular access point</td>
<td>• level: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• east side of building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Collection Workers</td>
<td>• area for efficient and clearly marked waste collection (organic, inorganic, recycling)</td>
<td>• elevator required to be close to loading zone and vehicular access point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• east side of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• level: 1 (city collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Workers</td>
<td>• electrical room</td>
<td>• level: basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• mechanical room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods Delivery People</td>
<td>• loading dock</td>
<td>• east side of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• elevator required to be close to loading zone and vehicular access point</td>
<td>• level: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ownership of particular space not required, and can be used for various programmatic activities.
## Table 16 - Spatial Requirements by Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>FF&amp;E</th>
<th>SIZE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL / BASEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog care &amp; training</td>
<td>• dog grooming station</td>
<td>2430 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• crating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• obstacle equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness equipment room</td>
<td>• weight/exercise machines</td>
<td>530 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness studio</td>
<td>• storage for exercise mats and equipment</td>
<td>700 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockers</td>
<td>• lockers</td>
<td>465 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• benches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• showers with accessible stall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>remaining space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>480 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1290 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial closet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total square footage requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>5950 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+15% circulation (890 sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6840 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual square footage of level</td>
<td></td>
<td>9850 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL / GROUND (1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Entrance/Admittance to upper and lower floors</td>
<td>• desks and counter</td>
<td>590 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• identification scanner and camera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• computers, video monitors, telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• metal detector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE</td>
<td>FF&amp;E</td>
<td>SIZE REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing</td>
<td>• waste collection</td>
<td>1920 sq. ft. (social)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• tables and seating</td>
<td>1585 sq. ft. (play)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• play areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café (seating in socializing space)</td>
<td>• beverage station</td>
<td>220 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• cash counter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Teaching Kitchen</td>
<td>• cold storage</td>
<td>1750 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dry storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• cooking area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• prep area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• cleaning area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• small appliances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Fry justice services</td>
<td>• resource library</td>
<td>535 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• desks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• meeting area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating for reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>• desk</td>
<td>220 sq. ft. (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td>100 sq. ft. (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• teleconferencing equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program admittance</td>
<td>• waiting area with seating</td>
<td>1460 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• desk and seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• computers/telecommunication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• holding room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• baggage scanner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• metal detector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading dock</td>
<td>• storage closets</td>
<td>995 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• overhead loading doors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central waste collection</td>
<td>• central bins for collection by city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE</td>
<td>FF&amp;E</td>
<td>SIZE REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td>• toilet stalls</td>
<td>120 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sinks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• soap receptacles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• paper towel receptacles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• hand dryers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s:</td>
<td>• urinals</td>
<td>155 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s:</td>
<td>• waste receptacles in stalls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal:</td>
<td>• grab rails</td>
<td>85 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial closet</td>
<td>• ventilation</td>
<td>55 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• shelves and pegs for hanging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• service sink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• floor drain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• floor space for large machinery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• space for trash cart (40” h x 26” w)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>• storage for all services on level</td>
<td>remaining space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9790 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 20% circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1960 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total square footage requirement</strong> 11750 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actual square footage of level</strong> 13300 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL / 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security hub and admittance from lower level</td>
<td>• desk and counter</td>
<td>230 sq. ft. (security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td>260 sq. ft. (waiting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• computers, video monitors, telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• vertical lockers - full, half, and quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General assembly space</td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td>1575 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• kitchenette with fridge + storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE</td>
<td>FF&amp;E</td>
<td>SIZE REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms (X2)</td>
<td>• desks</td>
<td>550 sq. ft. (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• chairs</td>
<td>395 sq. ft. (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• presentation boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• projector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• instructor desk and chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group therapy &amp; aboriginal ceremony</td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td>1000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• counter space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal connections office (for 2)</td>
<td>• desks</td>
<td>350 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• secure file storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling rooms (x3)</td>
<td>• desks</td>
<td>210 sq. ft. (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td>100 sq. ft. (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• secure file storage (in one)</td>
<td>100 sq. ft. (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art therapy</td>
<td>• tables</td>
<td>310 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• display areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual space</td>
<td>• moveable seating/benching</td>
<td>640 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• audio equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• platform/raised area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>• variety of seating options</td>
<td>300 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family room</td>
<td>• play area with toy</td>
<td>540 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sleeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• mats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• bookshelf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• craft table with storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE</td>
<td>FF&amp;E</td>
<td>SIZE REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| General meeting room                | • table  
• seating  
• a/v equipment                                                        | 190 sq. ft.       |
| Admin hub: Administrative support Program officers Sharable workstations | • work stations  
• seating  
• secure file storage                                                    | 1130 sq. ft.      |
| Copy room                           | • copy and fax machines  
• paper and office supply storage  
• shredding and recycling                                                  | 230 sq. ft.       |
| Manager’s office                    | • computer desk  
• secure file storage  
• seating for meetings                                                      | 210 sq. ft.       |
| Washrooms                           | All:  
• toilet stalls (incl. accessible stall)  
• sinks  
• soap receptacles  
• paper towel receptacles  
• hand dryers  
Women’s:  
• sanitary receptacles in stalls  
• baby changing station  
Universal (gender neutral):  
• baby changing station                                                        | 130 sq. ft.       |
| Custodial closet                    | • ventilation  
• shelves and pegs for hanging  
• service sink  
• floor drain  
• floor space for large machinery  
• space for trash cart (40” h x 26” w)                                       | 55 sq. ft.        |
<p>|                                    | Total square footage requirement                                      | 8605 sq. ft.      |
|                                    | Actual square footage of level                                        | 9465 sq. ft.      |
|                                    | 10200 sq. ft.                                                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>FF&amp;E</th>
<th>SIZE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL / 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living clusters</td>
<td>• 19 adult’s rooms</td>
<td>70 sq. ft. ea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 children’s rooms (accommodates 2)</td>
<td>(1820 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 nurseries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal living amenities</td>
<td>• 7 washrooms with showers</td>
<td>510 sq. ft. total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (incl. accessible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 cooking</td>
<td>640 sq. ft. total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 dining/lounging</td>
<td>1200 sq. ft. total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 lounging (shared by both wings)</td>
<td>735 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security station</td>
<td>• desk and counter</td>
<td>210 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• computers, video monitors, telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>• consultation room</td>
<td>135 sq. ft. (exam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medication distribution:</td>
<td>135 sq. ft. (meds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• storage (climate controlled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• mini storage fridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• door with counter for distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• patient record storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• waste collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Room (x2)</td>
<td>• washers/dryers</td>
<td>160 sq. ft. total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sorting/folding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyards/Rooftop gardens</td>
<td>• above ground garden beds</td>
<td>2265 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• shade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• labyrinth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• play equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custodial closet</th>
<th>FF&amp;E</th>
<th>SIZE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                  | • ventilation  
                  • shelves and pegs for hanging  
                  • service sink  
                  • floor drain  
                  • floor space for large machinery  
                  • space for trash cart (40” h x 26” w) | 55 sq. ft. |

**Total square footage requirement**

7865 sq. ft.  
+ 20% circulation  
(1570 sq. ft.)  
9435 sq. ft.  

**Actual square footage of level**

5120 sq. ft.  
(requires additional wings)

## TABLE 17 - AESTHETIC + MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>CONCEPT &amp; ATMOSPHERE</th>
<th>LIGHT &amp; COLOR</th>
<th>MATERIALS, APPLICATION, &amp; MAINTENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LOWER LEVEL / fitness amenities, dog care | • welcoming atmosphere clear visibility into dog care area and partial visibility into fitness areas to show off the dynamic energy of the spaces  
• large corridors and clear wayfinding to avoid environmental stress  
• keep anatomy of dogs in mind by providing large, wide, and low steps from ground to lower level | • light, reflective colors and applications to help brighten spaces given limited daylight penetration  
• addition of playful colors for fun and engagement  
• open ceiling plate as much as possible to allow daylight to penetrate level | • resilient & shock absorbing flooring in areas for fitness and playing dogs  
• highly durable materials that can handle heavy use/impact  
• sound absorption and ventilation extremely important to maintain this particular level’s indoor environmental quality (IEQ) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>CONCEPT &amp; ATMOSPHERE</th>
<th>LIGHT &amp; COLOR</th>
<th>MATERIALS, APPLICATIONS, &amp; MAINTENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GROUND LEVEL / community integration & resources, offender admittance | • security measures to ensure FSW feel safe about the public entering, while the public feel safe about having this typology in the community  
• requires a fine balance of visible security measures without so much that it implies danger or feels too institutionalized  
• welcoming atmosphere  
• social areas that facilitate interaction and are inclusive of all ages (ex. play areas not just for children) | • light-bathed space throughout level with window expanses that create visual connection to the vibrancy of the surrounding park  
ALL LEVELS:  
• color application to be used as a communicative device to indicate the energy level of the space to its users  
• earthy and neutral tones mixed with brighter colors in appropriate areas | • sound absorption important in double-volume space to avoid disrupting second floor and rest of ground floor |
| SECOND LEVEL / therapy & programs, education, spiritual practice, family visitation | • incorporate design element that visually connects second level to the lower level community areas that speaks to the project as a sort of connective tissue between FSW and the community  
• important balance between more open and public areas where individuals are being social and gathering for programs and learning and the other areas of the floor where more privacy and discretion is appropriate (therapy, spiritual practice) | balance between areas of light and dark:  
• lighter in the large open areas, and  
• darker in the areas where therapy and spiritual practice occur, where FSW might need to feel that added protective layer for comfort (dark to create protection and comfort, not to create danger or uneasiness  
ALL LEVELS:  
• low-emitting, low VOC material selections  
• durable and easy to clean/maintain  
• as much natural material selection as possible while still meeting above criteria  
• as locally sourced as possible |
### 4.6 INDOOR SYSTEMS REQUIREMENTS

#### / MECHANICAL
- sprinklers
- HVAC
- elevators
- individual system controls

#### / ELECTRICAL
- lighting
- safety detectors
- receptacles
- telephone jacks
- computer & internet connections (limited)
- individual system controls

#### / PLUMBING
- bathroom with shower
- kitchen
- laundry
- janitorial
- change room facilities for gymnasium
- special activity spaces that require wet sinks (e.g. arts/crafts room)

#### / SECURITY
- CCTV on first and second level
- emergency call buttons
- security clearance points for upper floors
4.7 SPATIAL ANALYSIS

/ ADJACENCY MATRICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dog care</th>
<th>equipment room</th>
<th>fitness studio</th>
<th>change rooms</th>
<th>storage</th>
<th>custodial closet</th>
<th>electrical room</th>
<th>mechanical room</th>
<th>vertical access pt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dog care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fitness studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>custodial closet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electrical room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanical room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertical access pt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrices / Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrices</th>
<th>Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Adjacency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Adjacency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 - Adjacency Matrix - Lower Level
### Table 19 - Adjacency Matrix - Ground Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vertical access pt.</th>
<th>Security entrance</th>
<th>Socialize/ Play</th>
<th>Cafe</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Justice Services</th>
<th>Meeting Room</th>
<th>Washrooms</th>
<th>Custodial Closet</th>
<th>Offender Admission</th>
<th>Loading Dock</th>
<th>Central Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>custodial closet</td>
<td>admin hub</td>
<td>manager's office</td>
<td>counselors' offices</td>
<td>aboriginal connection</td>
<td>spiritual space</td>
<td>teaching spaces</td>
<td>group therapy</td>
<td>daycare</td>
<td>visitation</td>
<td>lockers</td>
<td>art therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>custodial closet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manager's office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counselors' offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aboriginal connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lockers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertical access pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copy room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>living clusters</td>
<td>communal</td>
<td>contemplation</td>
<td>showers</td>
<td>washrooms</td>
<td>laundry</td>
<td>custodial closet</td>
<td>staff/security hub</td>
<td>healthcare</td>
<td>vertical access pt.</td>
<td>outdoor space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contemplation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>showers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laundry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>custodial closet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff/security hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healthcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertical access pt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outdoor space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
/ ZONING DIAGRAMS

FIGURE 34 - ZONING DIAGRAM - LOWER LEVEL
FIGURE 35 - ZONING DIGRAM - GROUND LEVEL
FIGURE 37 - ZONING DIGARAM - LEVEL 3
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5.1 INTRODUCTION TO DESIGN SOLUTION

The design presented in this upcoming chapter is a culmination of my research on the Canadian carceral system as it relates specifically to women that have been federally sentenced. Current issues and historical perspectives, studies and literature from experts in both design and justice-related fields, site visits to correctional facilities, and a variety of progressive precedent studies have all contributed to an informed and enriched evidence-based design. This study has provided me with a meaningful understanding of the relevant issues and their situation within much broader contexts and, with that, an acknowledgement of the need for designers to question and explore this sensitive typology further. The programming presented in Chapter 4 has been developed from this research while tailoring the project to its specific site, building, and user needs.

This project is a reimagining of what a carceral facility could look like when rehabilitation, not retribution, is the primary intention; when an emphasis on connecting women to their communities and families is valued over their removal and isolation from these important support systems; and, when their well-being has not been unnecessarily sacrificed in the name of safety and security. In order to do this, I have made a concerted effort to deinstitutionalize the design of prison. As a result, it has taken on a hybrid typology—both offender treatment facility and community centre.

Located in a multi-cultural, mixed-use neighbourhood in Toronto’s west end, the Koza Centre is situated on the edge of a popular park and opens itself up for partial use by the surrounding community, with the women living there working and providing services in these public areas. Some of these offerings include a care and training centre for dogs, a community kitchen, and a café. In tandem, those FSW attending the program are provided with a safe and supportive space where they can carry out the duration of their sentence with their young children. Here, they are provided with choice and
access to a variety of treatments, programs, and services that will help to facilitate rehabilitation.

It has been my goal to create the opportunity for a symbiotic relationship to occur between the centre and surrounding community: while the latter gains amenities and revival of a piece of the neighbourhood’s unique history, FSW benefit from community integration with the establishment of healthy support systems, increased self-esteem, and the development of employable skills. Furthermore, a positive relationship such as this creates potential to reduce the stigma of women who have been incarcerated.

The following chapter outlines my proposed design solution through explanation of the design language, spatial organization, programs, and key design features throughout. Annotated floor plans with design strategies developed from the analytical framework, map how various aspects of well-being have specifically been applied throughout the facility (Figures 47, 52, 54, 61).

5.2 CONCEPTUAL EXPLORATION

Conceptual exploration for this project has been used to connect the project’s design language and naming to the underlying concepts from Chapter 2. In other words, it was a means to discover how the design intent might be expressed physically through the poetics of the space.

The name of the facility, the Koza Centre, becomes the first point of reference to help establish the identity of the facility and its mission. Referring to the Turkish word for cocoon or chrysalis, koza is the process through which a caterpillar sheds its skin to reveal the final stage of development in its transformation to becoming a butterfly. In this state of chrysalis, the insect’s skin becomes a protective layer for it as it goes through a concentrated state of growth and change within.
KOZA (TURKISH) - CHRYSALIS/COCOON

- A PREPARATORY OR TRANSITIONAL STATE
- A PROTECTIVE COVERING: A SHELTERED STATE OR STAGE OF BEING OR GROWTH

STUDYING THE PROCESS OF CHRYSALIS AND COCOONING INSECTS, PREDOMINANT GESTURES OF LAYERING AND WRAPPING PRESENTED A STRONG VISUAL LANGUAGE THROUGH WHICH TO EXPRESS CONCEPTS OF SAFETY, WELL-BEING, AND COMFORT—ALL PIVOTAL ASPECTS OF A SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT.
This conceptual exploration must not be misconstrued as an attempt to link rehabilitation, particularly women’s, to an inherent natural, biological process. The connection, rather, is to the building itself posing as a protective layer for those within. Rather than having the primary concern of the design of a prison to be to contain, segregate, and control bodies within space, this approach shifts the intention of the design to a supportive, protective, and nurturing design. The title and subtle design language developed from the conceptual exploration help to continuously link viewers back to this project’s commitment to individual well-being and supportive environments. Studying the process of chrysalis and cocooning insects through research, videos, and sketches (Figure 39), predominant gestures of layering and wrapping presented a strong visual language through which to express concepts of safety, well-being, and comfort—all pivotal aspects of a supportive environment (Figure 40).
5.3 SPATIAL ORGANIZATION

The spatial organization of the building has been zoned primarily according to programmatic needs as well as the public’s degree of access to space, which becomes greatly reduced the further one is from street level. The lower floors are where community engagement occurs, while the second floor provides programs for FSW and their children, with public access limited to friends and family visitations only. The third and uppermost floor, restricted to those living or working at the facility, houses the domestic quarters (Figure 41).

Following the vertical zoning of the facility, each floor was then further organized according to access restrictions and activity type as illustrated in Figure 53. Within each of the levels, the spatial organization has been approached according to areas of high visibility and transparency, to areas requiring higher privacy control and less visibility. Because of the high variation in programming from one level to the next, this strategy has been used for different means. On the lower levels, transparency is greatest in those areas accessible to the public; on the second level, the general assembly and teaching spaces have the highest visibility, while more sensitive spaces such as those for therapy and spiritual practice are treated with reduced transparency; on the upper floor, this method addresses individuals’ needs for varying levels of privacy and personal space.

The building, designed for and solely used during its operational history as a linseed oil mill, has been almost fully gutted over the past forty-five years. All that remain are the major structural partitions that organize the interior into six large zones on the main level. This number fluctuates on the other levels due to varying heights and depths within the building. It appears that these partitions are the result of numerous additions to the building, though no research was found to confirm this. Rather than creating a design challenge, these large brick partitions provided a natural guide for organizing zones within each level.
LEVEL 3 / LIVING QUARTERS
- Individual living units
- Communal domestic spaces
- Social areas + open air court yard
- Nursing station + medical distribution

LEVEL 2 / THERAPY + PROGRAMS
- Visitation areas
- Learning spaces
- Counseling + therapy
- Spiritual + cultural ceremony
- Administration

GROUND LEVEL / COMMUNITY INTEGRATION
- Social + play spaces
- Commercial kitchen + cafe
- Justice services + meeting rooms

LOWER LEVEL / COMMUNITY INTEGRATION
+ PHYSICAL HEALTH
- Dog care + training
- Fitness facilities
FIGURE 42 - LATITUDINAL SECTION - NORTH FACING

FIGURE 43 - LONGITUDINAL SECTION - WEST FACING
5.4 DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL CONNECTEDNESS

Maintaining and developing social bonds and support systems as a tool for coping and rehabilitation is one of the most pronounced points of difference between the needs of women versus men in prison. This concept, as explored in section 2.3, has helped to inform the design, most significantly on the ground, community level and the third floor domestic quarters.

Despite the heavy zoning requirements in order to control varying levels of security and access, design features have been integrated that work as a connector between the outside community and those at the facility. One of the predominant expressions of this is the triple multi-story façade glazing along the west wall that span from ground level to the full height of the second storey. Hanging in each of these is a large textile banner that runs the full length of the curtain wall (Figure 44). The pieces pass between levels through a shallow opening in the floor plate of the second floor and are also clearly

FIGURE 44 - TEXTILE BANNERS AT WEST FACADE
visible travelling up the stairs from the lower level (Figure 43). These banners provide a type of connective tissue between the levels. From inside, the banners draw the eye up in recognition of the building’s primary functions taking place on the second level (Figure 45). From the outside, the partial peek inside and the strong graphic nature of the banners entice onlookers to come inside (Figure 38).

The inspiration for the banners were drawn from one of the predominant uses of totem poles, those traditionally placed on the edge of a community to welcome visitors. Each of the three distinct banners display abstracted animals that symbolically represent the main tenets of the Koza Centre: family and partnership, strength and protection, and change and transformation.¹⁰

Much like the welcome banners, visibility and transparency are used to create connections. Using transparency as a design feature is not meant as an opportunity for spectacle but, rather, as one for normalization. The segregation and alienation of federally convicted women from their communities creates opportunities for assumptions and biases to go unchallenged about what type of person someone is who has offended. It becomes much more difficult to assert these, predominantly unfounded, notions when one has direct interactions with that population. In this sense, the Koza Centre creates the opportunity for individuals in the outside community to come to their own conclusions, rather than perpetuating stereotypes based on the myth of offender.

This visibility and connectivity to the community also eases what can be a very scary step FSW face when reintegrating into a community post-release. By providing this level of accessibility to the community through a highly structured environment, it is my hope to alleviate some of the anxieties associated with reintegration, making the transition

¹⁰ The banners shown here provide an example of the visual impact that large textiles could have. If this project were to be realized, appropriate members of Canada’s indigenous communities would be consulted or commissioned to create the artwork. This is in respect of cultural sensitivity and to ensure that no cultural misappropriation has occurred.
upon release easier. This has been done not only through visibility, but also in the programming and understanding the role that community participation plays in the construction of women’s self-image, self-worth, and development of social capital. Upon release, further potential exists for this facility to act as a beacon of support for those that have completed their sentence. Past offenders will be welcome to return to the facility as a member of the outside community, providing a sense of comfort and familiarity if needed.

FIGURE 46 - ELEVATION - L1 SOCIAL AREA WEST

MAINTAINING AND DEVELOPING SOCIAL BONDS AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS AS A TOOL FOR COPING AND REHABILITATION IS ONE OF THE MOST PRONOUNCED POINTS OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE NEEDS OF WOMEN VERSUS MEN IN PRISON.
DESIGN STRATEGIES

PHYSICAL WELL-BEING

- stairs situated close to elevator
- stairs as design feature to encourage use
- access to nutritional & healthy eating education

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

- security hub @ vertical access point
- entrance to centre requires clearance by security
- access to & views of nature with large depth of field
- filtered light/daylighting
- simulation of natural features
- prospect + refuge

SOCIAL WELL-BEING

- connection to community through kitchen service (meals-on-wheels, quarterly dinners)
- commons area offering imaginative space that encourages play for all ages & community events
- seating to encourage social interaction
5.5 GROUND LEVEL

The main point of access to the facility is just off of the park’s town square along the west side of the building. Through the vestibule, visitors enter a secure screening area where they are checked and vetted. They must pass through a metal detector, have their photo taken, and their identification digitally scanned to maintain a record of all visitors.

The ground level consists of publicly accessible spaces including a café, social areas, and a justice services office run by the Elizabeth Fry Society. Two meeting rooms as well as a community kitchen are also available for use by the public for a fee. Offset from the public area, a restricted zone on the east side of the building has a secondary entrance with a processing area for FSW entering into the program. This entrance is also responsible for controlling access to the adjacent loading zone for deliveries.

THE COMMONS

The play area, known as the community commons or, simply, the commons, is a unique design feature occupying the large double-volume space along the north end of the building in support of social well-being (Figures 48-51). It is a space for play and social engagement without specifically prescribing what is to take place there. Unlike a play area for children, the community commons has been designed to appeal to all ages.

The commons is an example of drawing from evolved human-nature relationships, an attribute of biophilic design, to develop spatial scenarios that humans are inherently drawn to. The feature floor mimics a vast natural landscape (Figure 49). Hills provide opportunity for climbing and unique views of the space (prospect), while a valley in the room’s south east corner creates a more intimate, protective area (refuge). Plateaus throughout can be used for sitting, or as a stage to address crowds during a special event.
Large swings for gentle swaying that have been adapted from the modular pendant lights suspended above are situated in clusters throughout the space. They appear like deconstructed, oversized cocoons that users can sink comfortably into and engage in conversation with nearby friends or strangers (curiosity and enticement).

Due to the large volume of the commons space, materials have been selected for their sound dampening qualities. This is done to avoid adding environmental stressors—particularly unpredictable, intermittent noise—that has been shown to increase anxiety levels of users (Sternberg, 2010; Wener, 2012). Wooden slat acoustic panels cover the ceiling and wrap down the top third of the walls. The hanging pendants and swings lined with soft felt, and the linoleum flooring provide added acoustic absorption. The entrance from the rest of the floor, a large curtain wall cut into the existing brick partition, has been specified with added thickness to increase its acoustic performance while still allowing for maximum visibility into the space.
FIGURE 51 - PERSPECTIVE - COMMONS FROM NE
The services offered on the ground and lower level have been selected for their potential to benefit both the community and the FSW who will have paid employment providing some of these services. The café provides opportunities for applying skills related to small business management. Rental of the industrial, community kitchen is available to the public, but the first function of it is as a teaching kitchen for the women to gain culinary skills. The community benefits from this as the food prepared is distributed in partnership with the local Meals on Wheels chapter. As a community building event, seasonally-themed dinners will be hosted quarterly by those FSW in the culinary program.

5.6 LOWER LEVEL

The dog daycare, training, and grooming facility is run by women at the centre who have undergone a canine training certification program. This was inspired by my visit to the Nova Institution for Women (NIW) in Nova Scotia where the Pawsitive Directions Canine Program (PDCP) is offered. FSW in this program are trained in various aspects of dog care that are organized into certification levels.

Dogs from the local animal shelter are brought to the prison, where they are trained, greatly increasing their potential for adoption by the public as a result. NIW’s acting Warden, Laurie Bernard, commented on the popularity and success of the program, one that helps dogs find a permanent home and benefits the women by reducing their stress levels and visibly elevating their moods (personal communication, August 17, 2015).

Although the Koza Centre does not have the capacity to house dogs on-site on a 24 hour basis, the program has been adapted to suit this project and the community with a daycare, grooming, and dog training program. In addition to the skills training and positive interaction with the animals, this service also provides opportunity for the women and the dogs’ owners to develop professional relationships. With the same individuals using the service
PHYSICAL WELL-BEING
- stairs situated close to elevator
- stairs as design feature to encourage use
- access to fitness spaces

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING
- open spaces with clear views of interior surroundings
- large corridors
- natural light

SOCIAL WELL-BEING
- connection to dogs reduces stress and promotes caring, empathy, and responsibility
daily, it creates opportunity for more meaningful interactions to take place where FSW are able to display their skills and potential on a more personal level.

The large dog facility includes flexible space for play and training that can be partitioned into three separate spaces by the use of movable walls, if required. Additional areas for crating, dog grooming, and dedicated stairs with an adjoined dog run leads to a fenced-in play area outdoors.

In addition to the dog care services provided, the remainder of the lower level houses fitness areas for FSW and their children to use. Providing dedicated spaces for exercise, including an equipment room and a studio for activities such as yoga and
dance, is important for promoting physical well-being and positive mental health. As discussed in section 2.4, physical activity increases physical health, elevates one’s quality of life, and helps to manage stress and depression (Carlson, Millstein, & Sallis, 2011).

Since dogs will be present in a building where food is prepared and served, access to the lower level has been fully partitioned off from the rest of the main level. The stairs have been designed with an extra deep tread and a riser height lower than the average step, as well as an adjoined ramp (Figure 53). This makes it easier for dogs to navigate between levels.

The stairs create a large cut in the floor plate of the ground level and remain open to above. Since they are situated along the west wall, parallel to the multi-storey exterior glazing facades, daylight is able to penetrate deep into the core of the lower level. The integration of natural daylighting is important for biophilic design that suggests that humans prefer dynamic light that shifts direction, intensity, and color cast throughout the day, over that of a static light source (Kellert et al., 2008). Ensuring that daylight penetrates deeper into the core of the building is also an important consideration for LEED-guided design because of the reduced electrical load required to maintain sufficient light levels (U.S. Green Building Council, 2013).

5.7 LEVEL 2

Moving from the lower levels that primarily emphasize the benefits found in fostering community connections, the focus of the upper floors shift to the well-being and rehabilitation of the women at the facility. On the second level, a variety of spaces are offered that promote personal growth and development including learning spaces, counseling, art and group therapy, and areas for cultural and spiritual practice.
DESIGN STRATEGIES

PHYSICAL WELL-BEING
- stairs situated close to elevator
- stairs as design feature to encourage use

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING
- security hub @ vertical access point
- entrance from L1 secured
- programming (therapy, counseling, spiritual practice)
- prospecting view (L3 stairs)
- views of nature with large depth of field
- spatial + sensory variability
- central focal points
- natural motif (round room)

SOCIAL WELL-BEING
- large exterior glazing creates visual connection between community and centre and its multiple levels
- seating to encourage social interaction
- space for visitations
- access to spiritual/cultural practice
- limited space for employees-only encourages dynamic security over static
A security hub is strategically situated with a clear view of the primary spaces, including access points from the lower and upper levels, the visitation area, and the large, open general assembly space where individuals can convene between programs (Figure 55). The security hub also strategically separates the family room and visitation space from the rest of the floor. Coming up from the ground level, visitors enter a waiting room with seating and storage lockers, where security will buzz them into the visitation areas. This added level of control ensures that someone from the main level cannot gain access to the restricted program areas of the facility.

The large pre-existing brick partition that runs the length of the building from north to south has been used to delineate the open, transparent meeting, learning, and
social spaces from the more sensitive programs and restricted areas that demand a higher level of privacy. Counseling spaces, art therapy, a non-denominational spiritual space, and a round room for group therapy and any indigenous ceremonies are more discretely located along the east side of the floor. Since the building is situated on the south east corner of the park, placing these programs on this side of the building adds more visual and acoustic privacy from the outside.
ROUND ROOM

The round room (Figure 59) is a key design feature of the second floor that draws from numerous attributes of biophilic design such as sensory and spatial variability, natural motifs, vaulted forms, and play with light and shadow (Table 4). Biophilia specifically inspired this space because the primary intention of the round room is to create a calming, comforting environment that promotes psychological well-being.

The transition from the large, open space of the general assembly area with abundant light and glass helps to punctuate the quiet, intimate nature of the round room. The atmosphere immediately shifts upon entering. The walls and ceiling are painted a deep underwater green providing a rich background for the wooden canopy that frames the tiered seating below. A gentle ramp from the entrance leads users into the lowered seating space.

FIGURE 58 - REFLECTED PLAN - L2 ROUND ROOM CANOPY
FIGURE 59 - PERSPECTIVE - L2 ROUND ROOM (GROUP THERAPY + ABORIGINAL SPIRITUAL PRACTICE)
Looking to the canopy above, a constellation of miniature recessed lights shine through the wooden slats that meet at varying planes and angles to create a natural motif. The forms wrap and envelope the user in a sense of security and natural beauty.

Because this space is used for group therapy as well as indigenous spiritual and cultural practices, I explored how interior design might influence the posture of those in the room to coincide with its intended functions. Rather than an intricate design pattern on the floor directing the focus down and inward, placing the focal point at the ceiling helps to draw users upward. In response, their chests are opened up and chins raised in a posture that reads of one being open and willing to receive communication. Interior design cannot force someone to share with others, but it can help to orient bodies within space in such a way that encourages openness between users.
5.8 LEVEL 3

The top level, the domestic quarters of the centre, is restricted to staff, women in the program, and any of their children living there with them. The strategies utilized on this floor are primarily focused on avoiding the typical characteristics of prison design that cause psychological hardship on FSW, and replace them with strategies that contribute to increased mental health and fostering positive relationships.

This level is organized into four major areas: an open air courtyard, a lounge, and two distinct wings. The north and south wings that accommodate 21 women and up to 12 children, house the individual living units, and communal areas for socializing, preparing meals, bathing, and laundry. The north wing is for women at the facility alone, and the south for those that have any children living there with them. Two of the rooms in the south wing are available, however, for any individual that would prefer to live on that side with the children and their mothers.

To encourage active living throughout the course of the day in support of physical well-being, the second and third levels are connected to one another by a unique staircase that includes built-in seating and a large planter at its base (Figures 56-57). At the top of the stairs, a vestibule bridges the courtyard and main lounge area. Users are greeted by staff at the security hub situated just inside this entry point, similar to the vertical access points at the ground and second levels (Figure 62). The security hub in this position, not only maintains an eye on those passing between floors, but it also overlooks the lounge area and protects the medical distribution and exam room immediately adjacent to it.

Taking a cue from Halden prison, dedicated staff areas are modest in size to encourage the staff to move out to the common areas and develop interpersonal relationships with the women and children. This approach, dynamic security, reduces the need for static security such as CCTV that adds psychological strain to individuals in prison. It is considered more effective in maintaining safety and minimizing interpersonal conflict (Benko, 2015, n.p.; D. Conley, personal communication, June 15, 2015).
DESIGN STRATEGIES

PHYSICAL WELL-BEING
- stairs situated close to elevator
- access to gardens
- access to play areas
- access to on-site healthcare

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING
- environmental user controls (temperature/lighting)
- security hub @ vertical access point
- spatial variety for optimal privacy (open/social, discreet/personal, private)
- large corridors with multiple access points
- labyrinth in courtyard for personal reflection
- access to & views of nature with large depth of field
- greenery
- oval organic shapes
- filtered light/daylighting

SOCIAL WELL-BEING
- communal spaces for cooking/dining/socializing/playing
- communal spaces spread out to reduce interpersonal conflict
- limited space for employees-only, encourages dynamic security over static
The communal lounge provides areas for children’s play, television, a variety of seating options, and two large bookshelves (Figure 62). To create distinction among the space without creating closed rooms, the area is organized into quadrants by large felt hanging panels that can be slid along tracks at the ceiling. Since the panels do not extend the full length to the floor and have a pattern of holes cut through them, visibility and safety are not compromised, while users are still afforded some control over their immediate surroundings.

The footprint of the original building at the third level was not able to accommodate all of the requirements specified in the programming. The largest portion of the building, along the west side, only went as high as the second floor. Its flat roof, however, provided opportunity for building upon and solved a significant constraint identified in the site analysis. That is, because the building is situated on the edge of a park, providing a secure area outside for the women to use meant having to take usable space away from the public; this could become a contentious issue among the outside community and risk a loss of public support. Placing an open air courtyard on the roof of the second floor between the two living wings benefits quality of life on the top floor in a number of ways. Now, all of the shared social spaces on the floor are facing out onto the courtyard with clear views of the sky, gardens, and wildlife it will attract. Drawing from Wener’s study that access to and views of nature reduce boredom and stress among those in carceral settings (2012), the addition of the courtyard will have a positive psychological effect on those in the domestic quarters.

In addition to the planter boxes for flowers and vegetables, there is a large labyrinth at the centre of the courtyard. Not to be mistaken for a maze with high walls meant to disorient the user in their attempt to make it to the centre, a labyrinth is a maze-like pattern on the ground that does not impede one’s sight. A labyrinth has no wrong turns or dead-ends, but a single, winding path that will inevitably guide the user to the central endpoint. In recent years, labyrinths have been making an appearance in supportive design environments such
as hospital and treatment centres for their therapeutic qualities (Sternberg, 2010, p. 63). Sternberg explains that they provide an opportunity for individual reflection and meditation as one slowly travels along its winding path, knowing the journey will always lead them to the centre. Since the design is not actually build up beyond ground level, the feature does not cut into the limited footprint of the courtyard.

The labyrinth is just one element of the design emphasis on the top floor in providing tools for users of the space to actively manage their psychological well-being. The courtyard, tactile tiles along the corridor walls that one can run their fingers along while walking the continuous loop (Figure 63), and the creation of personal nooks through sliding wall panels or seating that envelopes the user, all help to create calming, comforting spaces for use (Figure 66). Strategies such as these recognize that rehabilitation requires working through difficult emotions and design can be used as an active tool for support in situations like this.
Throughout the floor, user control is another strategy utilized to help reduce the stress of confinement. Each area on this floor is equipped with light dimmers and various lighting scenario options, as well as operable windows for temperature control and air flow. Small design accommodations such as these can give a sense of control back to individuals in prison to help reduce unnecessary stress levels.

A variety of seating types and arrangements create opportunities for one to be fully immersed socially in a group, playing with their children, or still amongst company while in areas off to the side. Understanding the psychological importance of having a space of one’s own to reduce feelings of territoriality, crowing, and lack of privacy (Wener, 2012), each woman has her own individual living unit. For those that have children there with them, an adjacent room with a single bed and a second one that can be folded down from the built-in unit to create a bunk bed is provided.
(Figure 65). The mother-child units are connected by a pocket door that can be opened up to create an apartment-like feel. This helps to create a sense of home and normalcy for these families.

To reduce potential conflict due to sound distribution between units, the rooms have been organized in such a way that a child’s room is never adjacent to an adult's room that is not their mother. Instead, mother-child units are mirrored next to one another so that the children's’ rooms are side-by-side. To accommodate for new mothers, two of the living units in the south wing are a larger nursery-style room with a crib, changing table, and rocker for newborns.
COMMUNAL KITCHEN + SOCIAL AREA

The communal kitchen and social area in the south wing is all about bringing people together and providing child-friendly spaces for nurturing relationships and social bonds. Since incarcerated mothers cited being away from their children as their most significant problem faced while in prison (Van Gundy & Baumann-Grau, 2013), it was important to ensure that the mother-child experience was specifically addressed in the design.

The courtyard provides a striking backdrop for the kitchen and social area through a large expanse of windows. Seating nooks in the window are created by deep vaulted frames where one can sit and enjoy the natural view. While working in the kitchen, women have a clear sightline to the designated play area for children.

This play corner includes a large bookshelf to encourage storytelling and strengthening communication skills and bonds. If the child would like to participate in cooking and meal prep, a custom island has been designed with stepped levels on one side to accommodate those who might not yet be tall enough to reach the tabletop.

As stressed in the U.N. Bangkok Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners, emphasizing and maintaining bonds between mother and child in an environment that fosters these relationships is monumental to the well-being and health of all those involved (United Nations, 2010). Keeping mothers united with their children during incarceration avoids unnecessary damage that can be caused by separating them, and can increase a mothers chances of successful rehabilitation while lowering her chances for recidivism. The choice seems clear.
CONCLUSION

I embarked on this practicum with an interest to explore prison design, curious to know if the mental images of abjection, deprivation, and abuse that the word conjured, in any way reflected the reality of incarceration today. As a student of interior design, the idea of a typology with the intent to segregate, punish, and subjugate those confined within, seemed to me to be the antithesis of design’s ultimate goals. What this education has taught me, consistently and repeatedly, is that smart design provides solutions to problems, understands the needs of the users and responds accordingly, creates ease through functionality and utility, and elicits joy in its beauty. Of course, one could argue that the formation of prisons were sought out as a solution to the problem of criminality, and the needs of the client were to impose constraints upon those sent there. Yet, design as I understand it—or perhaps how I choose to participate in it—is not something that should contribute to the detriment of others.

This contradiction created a unique and stimulating challenge: if it was true that prisons, despite their face-lifts and varied models, still caused harm on those sentenced to time there, was there an alternative solution? Could I apply what I understood to be the ideals of interior design to a project like this, one that, by its very nature imposes power on its users?

SUPPORT IS THE KEY WORD THAT ALL ASPECTS OF THIS DESIGN CAME DOWN TO—SUPPORT FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THOSE AT THE CENTRE; SUPPORT FOR GENDER-APPROPRIATE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES TO HELP WITH REHABILITATION; AND SUPPORT FOR EASING REENTRY THROUGH THE INTEGRATION OF FAMILY AND THE OUTSIDE COMMUNITY.
In order to accurately address and research this topic, I needed to narrow it down to clearly defined parameters— I chose to focus specifically on women within the federal carceral system in Canada. Before I started my research, I questioned whether I would find enough about women’s experiences of prison to be able to present a design of gendered space specifically for women. The current literature and research published to date has helped me to understand that issues surrounding FSW is dense and multi-layered, even contradictory depending upon the perspective from which the facts are being presented.

Almost immediately, I came to understand that addressing women’s needs in prison required addressing the broader struggles and issues in their lives that lead to their conflict with the law in the first place. This helped me to develop thoughtful programming and an identification of the types of spaces that should be accommodated for. Research about the relationship between the physical attributes of prison and the experiences of prisoners, in addition to exploring concepts of well-being, helped me to develop specific design strategies that came to inform my project.

While Susan Comack has provided a significant contribution to my understanding of women’s first-hand experiences of incarceration, there is not nearly enough literature published that focuses explicitly on the design of prisons in relation to incarcerated women. As a result, this project relied upon studies about individuals’
experiences of prison design that were not always necessarily from women. I chose to include some of these studies in the literature I presented and allowed it to inform some of the design decisions because I believe that there are certain things that transcend gender and speak more to human experience. And yet, at the same time, I believe that even a gender-specific study might not be specific enough.

This contradiction exposes what might be the weakest aspect of this project. As Hannah-Moffat (2001) points out in her book about the history of governance of women in Canada, any emphasis that is based solely on gender issues presupposes a homogenous female experience and disregards other sources that shape us such as race, socio-economic standing, sexual orientation and age. I know that this project, or any other, would not have the capacity to effectively address all of the parameters that come in addition to gender. As specific as design should be, it must also accept a level of generality.

One of the most difficult challenges of this practicum was to let go of those critical issues that were beyond the scope of the project, and make sense of how interior design might positively affect the experiences of women in prison. I wanted to keep this project as focused as possible so I concentrated on design that would make a difference at the individual level. I needed a way to break down these big ideas and issues into something manageable so I looked at rehabilitation and what interior design might do to support that. Support is the key word that all aspects of this design came down to—support for the well-being of those at the centre; support for gender-appropriate programs and services to help with rehabilitation; and support for easing reentry through the integration of family and the outside community.

In the introduction I identified three research questions. The primary question, and the focus of Chapter 2, is what are the ways in which the design of typical prisons impact FSW—socially, mentally, and physically—and
CONCLUSION

Contribute to or hinder their sense of well-being. Well-being relates to this practicum for its strong connection to rehabilitation. I have argued that if rehabilitation is to be truly successful, the three primary realms of wellness must be adequately met: psychological, social, and physical. I have identified various aspects of prison, spatially and otherwise, that threaten the well-being of the users. Furthermore, I was able to identify those areas of well-being that are particularly significant for the majority of women and develop strategies for their inclusion, including community, family, and personal control over one’s environment. This question provided me with a focused and meaningful direction with which to approach the programming and design.

The second question that I have asked is whether the redesign of a women’s federal prison could more accurately reflect CSC’s philosophy and mandates, as well as other progressive, emerging opinions of the rights and responsibilities of the carceral system. CSC seem to support women’s issues in prison on paper but historically have fallen short when it comes to implementing change for the better. The precedent on Halden Prison in Norway with its humanistic approach to care for those in their custody helped me to gain an understanding of just how different a prison could look. This, in addition to the design strategies developed from the analytical framework have helped to create a space that better serves CSC’s philosophy and mandate rooted in rehabilitation, safety, and individualized care.

The final research question was whether interior design can and should be used as a tool for positive social change, and what are the limitations surrounding this. More than ever, this project has reiterated to me the importance and potential for design to support and help its users. With a hypothetical design project, there is no definitive way to say whether or not the design was successful in reaching its goals. What this practicum does is illustrate the importance of letting go of typologies that reflect outdated opinions and values, and pushing new and progressive ideas forward through design.
As Findley put it, “rearranging or erasing these spaces to reflect a new set of ideas, constituents and power relations is a long-term endeavor necessary to complete any political, cultural and social transformation” (2006, p. 5).

By acknowledging the extent of our reach, interior designers can focus their efforts on those aspects that are within our control. Design cannot change minds or policies but it can help to challenge our perception and provide spaces that reflect the ideals, intentions, and values of a society. With that comes a unique power of designers to illicit the imagination of others by illustrating what change and progress might physically look like. This is the idealized future that David Harvey recognized in design. And although not every problem is going to be solved, what is most important is the contribution to the conversation, towards a better solution. It may not even be the best solution, but at least a better one.
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FIGURE 72
REFLECTED CEILING PLAN - GROUND LEVEL
N.T.S.

LEGEND

- Armstrong Woodworks Grille Panel Ceiling
- Armstrong Metalworks Perforated Metal Ceiling
- Maple Wood Panel Ceiling
- Spruce Wood Panel Ceiling
- 5" 4W LED Atelier Utopia Drop Pendant 5'-0" to 6'-0" A.F.F.
- 6" 5W LED Recessed Can
- 12" 8W LED Philips Lux Space Surface Round
- 14" 9W LED Under-Counter Recessed Linear
- 5" 8W LED Surface Mounted Adjustable Track Light
- 4"x1" 8W LED Recessed Troffer
- 4"x2" 8W LED Recessed Troffer
- 4" 4W LED Form Us With Love Hood Pendant 11'-0" A.F.F.

NOTES
1. Typical ceiling: GMB 10'-0" A.F.F., unless otherwise noted.
FIGURE 73
REFLECTED CEILING PLAN - LEVEL 2
N.T.S.

LEGEND

1. Typical ceiling DNB 10'-3" A.F.F. unless otherwise noted.
FIGURE 75

DETAIL ELEVATION - CUSTOM DOOR FRAME - TYPICAL

N.T.S.
FIGURE 76
DETAIL SECTION - DOOR JAMB
N.T.S.
FIGURE 77

DETAIL ELEVATION - DOOR UPPER CORNER

N.T.S.
FIGURE 78
DETAIL ELEVATION - DOOR LOWER CORNER
N.T.S.
FIGURE 79
DETAIL SECTION - DOOR SILL + RAISED FLOOR SYSTEM
N.T.S.
# APPENDIX B: FURNITURE + FINISHES

## TABLE 22 - ROOM FINISH SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>ROOM NO.</th>
<th>ROOM NAME</th>
<th>FLOOR</th>
<th>WALLS</th>
<th>CEILING</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>WEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND LEVEL</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>CPT-3</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>SOCIALIZING</td>
<td>LIN-1, WD-1</td>
<td>PT-2, CWT</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-5, WD-2</td>
<td>PT-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST. B</td>
<td>STAIR B</td>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>COMMONS</td>
<td>LIN-1, WD-1</td>
<td>PT-1, WD-3</td>
<td>PT-1, WD-3</td>
<td>PT-1, WD-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>WAITING</td>
<td>LIN-2</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>LIN-2</td>
<td>PT-2</td>
<td>PT-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>GENERAL ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>LIN-2, LIN-4, CPT-2</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>PT-1, PT-3</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>ROUND ROOM</td>
<td>LIN-2</td>
<td>PT-5</td>
<td>PT-3</td>
<td>PT-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST. E</td>
<td>STAIR E</td>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>LOUNGE</td>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>PT-7</td>
<td>PT-7</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORR. 3A</td>
<td>CORRIDOR 3A</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>COMMUNAL</td>
<td>LIN-3, CPT-1</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>PT-2</td>
<td>PT-2, CWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORR. 3B</td>
<td>CORRIDOR 3B</td>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3, CWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORR. 3C</td>
<td>CORRIDOR 3C</td>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORR. 3D</td>
<td>CORRIDOR 3D</td>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3, CWT</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORR. 3E</td>
<td>CORRIDOR 3E</td>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>PT-2, PT-3, CWT</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>LIVING UNIT (TYPICAL)</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>PT-1, PT-4, PT-6</td>
<td>PT-1, PT-4, PT-6</td>
<td>PT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

CPT  CARPET
CT   CONCRETE TILE
CWT  CERAMIC WALL TILE
LIN  LINOLEUM TILE
PT   PAINT
U    UPHOLSTERY
WD   WOOD

REMARKS

1  ALL CEILINGS TO BE PT-1 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

NOTES

N1  REFER TO FIGURES 80-82 FOR LOCATION OF FLOORING TRANSITIONS
N2  CWT TO BE APPLIED AT NORTH WALL IN CAFE AREA
N4  WD-3 TO BE APPLIED TO WALLS 20'-0" A.F.F. TO CEILING
N5  PT-3 TO BE APPLIED AT EAST AND SOUTH WALLS IN KITCHENETTE AREA
N6  PT-3 WHERE ON WALLS TO BE APPLIED 10'-0" A.F.F. TO CEILING
N7  CWT TO BE APPLIED AS BACKSPLASH ABOVE COUNTER TO UPPER CABINETS
N8  CWT IN CORRIDORS TO BE APPLIED 0'-0" – 4'-0" A.F.F.
N9  PT-4 AND PT-6 TO BE APPLIED IN RECESSED AREAS OF BUILT-IN SHELVING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>PATTERN/PRODUCT NAME</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>COLOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT-1</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
<td>BENJAMIN MOORE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>OC-17</td>
<td>WHITE DOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT-2</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
<td>BENJAMIN MOORE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>HC-172</td>
<td>REVERE PEWTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT-3</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
<td>BENJAMIN MOORE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>HC-147</td>
<td>WOODLAWN BLUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT-4</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
<td>BENJAMIN MOORE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>2024-50</td>
<td>JASPER YELLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT-5</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
<td>BENJAMIN MOORE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>2136-30</td>
<td>AMAZON GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT-6</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
<td>BENJAMIN MOORE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>2024-40</td>
<td>YELLOW FINCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT-7</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
<td>BENJAMIN MOORE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>CC-724</td>
<td>HOMESTEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT-8</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
<td>BENJAMIN MOORE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>2167-40</td>
<td>TOFFEE ORANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-1</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>CENTURY FARM</td>
<td>GCH452NALGZ</td>
<td>NATURAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-2</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>NYDREE</td>
<td>ACRYLIC IMPREGNATED WOOD</td>
<td>FPNFMAP23AC1LDM</td>
<td>MAPLE CITY FOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD-3</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>WOODWORKS GRILLE</td>
<td>BPWWGLC</td>
<td>LIGHT CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWT</td>
<td>CERAMIC WALL TILE</td>
<td>COMET</td>
<td>PENNY ROUND MOSAIC</td>
<td>FSHCOMAS</td>
<td>ASH (WINTER GREY GROUT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>CONCRETE TILE</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIN-1</td>
<td>LINOILEUM TILE</td>
<td>FORBO</td>
<td>GRAPHIC</td>
<td>5305</td>
<td>SCRABBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIN-2</td>
<td>LINOILEUM TILE</td>
<td>FORBO</td>
<td>STRIATO</td>
<td>3576</td>
<td>SLIDING GLACIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIN-3</td>
<td>LINOILEUM TILE</td>
<td>FORBO</td>
<td>UNEXPECTED NATURE</td>
<td>3566</td>
<td>SILENT SULPHUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT-1</td>
<td>CARPET TILE</td>
<td>MILLIKEN</td>
<td>DRIP PAINTING</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>AZUREOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT-2</td>
<td>CARPET</td>
<td>DANSKINA</td>
<td>FRINGE</td>
<td>650015</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT-3</td>
<td>CARPET (WALK-OFF MATT)</td>
<td>MILLIKEN</td>
<td>OBEX FORMA</td>
<td>11C</td>
<td>ASH 7010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-1</td>
<td>UPHOLSTERY</td>
<td>MAHARAM</td>
<td>DIVINA MELANGE</td>
<td>460830</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-2</td>
<td>UPHOLSTERY</td>
<td>MAHARAM</td>
<td>DIVINA MD</td>
<td>466150</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-3</td>
<td>UPHOLSTERY</td>
<td>MAHARAM</td>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>BLUSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-4</td>
<td>UPHOLSTERY</td>
<td>DESIGNTEX</td>
<td>SHIBORI STRIPE</td>
<td>3725-401</td>
<td>WATERFALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 80 - FLOOR FINISH PLAN - GROUND LEVEL
APPENDIX B: FURNITURE AND FINISHES

FIGURE 81 - FLOOR FINISH PLAN - LEVEL 2
FIGURE 82 - FLOOR FINISH PLAN - LEVEL 3
APPENDIX C : BUILDING CODE ANALYSIS

/ BUILDING CODE COMPLIANCE


3.1.2.1 / Major Occupancy Classification
Third Floor:
• Group B Division 1 - Detention Occupancies

Second Floor:
• Group B Division 1 - Detention Occupancies;
• Group D - Business and personal occupancies (administrative offices);
• Group C - Residential occupancies (classrooms)

Ground Floor:
• Group B Division 1 - Detention Occupancies;
• Group A Division 2 - Assembly occupancies not elsewhere classified in Group A (café, kitchen)

Lower Floor:
• Group D - Business and personal services occupancies (dog care);
• Group A Division 2 - Assembly occupancies not elsewhere classified in Group A (fitness rooms)

3.1.3.1 / Separation of Major Occupancies
Major occupancies must be separated from adjoining major occupancies on the same floor by fire separations of the following fire-resistance ratings:
Lower Floor: 1 hr fire rated separation between dog care and rest of floor;
Ground Floor: 2 hr fire rated separation between offender admittance and rest of floor;
Second Floor: 2 hr fire rated separation between offices and rest of floor;
Third Floor: no separation of major occupancies

3.1.8 / FIRE SEPARATIONS AND CLOSURES

3.1.8.1 / General Requirements
Walls, partitions, or floor assemblies required to be a fire separation must be constructed as a continuous element of the proper fire-resistance rating
Openings in a fire separation must be protected with closures, shafts, etc.

3.1.8.4 / Determination of Ratings
A closure with a minimum fire-protection rating of 45 minutes is required in a fire separation with a fire-resistance rating of 1 hour; A closure with a minimum fire-protection rating of 1.5 hours is required in a fire separation with a fire-resistance rating of 2 hours.

3.1.8.6 / Maximum Openings
The size of an opening in an interior fire separation required to be protected with a closure shall be not more 11 m² (118.4 sq. ft.), with no dimension more than 3.7 m (12’ - 1½”), if a fire compartment on either side of the fire separation is not sprinklered.
3.1.17 / OCCUPANT LOAD

TABLE 24 – OCCUPANT LOAD DETERMINATION

| THIRD FLOOR:                                                                 |                                                                 |
| Dwelling units (x 26) = (71.1 sq. ft. typical) = 2 persons per sleeping room (as per 3.1.17.1b) |
| Kitchens (x2) = (259.5 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 2.6 (x 2) = 4   |
| Communal Lounge = (735.8 sq. ft.) / 1.85 m² (19.9 sq. ft.) per person = 37            |
| Communal Seating in Living wing (x2) = (609.5 sq. ft.) / 1.85 m² (19.9 sq. ft.) per person = 30.6 (x 2) = 60 |
| Security hub = (207.9 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 2.1                |
| Medical exam room (care/treatment) = (135.4 sq. ft.) / 10 m² (107.6 sq. ft.) per person = 1.3 |
| Medical distribution room (office) = (135.1 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 1.4 |
| Laundry (cleaning/repair) = (90.6 sq. ft.) / 4.6 m² (49.5 sq. ft.) per person = 1.8 (x2) = 2 |

| SECOND FLOOR:                                                                  |                                                                 |
| Administrative hub = (1129 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 11        |
| Manager’s office = (211.5 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 2           |
| Aboriginal Connections office = (396.2 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 4 |
| Large Classroom = (553.8 sq. ft.) / 1.85 m² (19.9 sq. ft.) per person = 27         |
| Small Classroom = (396.8 sq. ft.) / 1.85 m² (19.9 sq. ft.) per person = 19         |
| Round room (assembly uses with non-fixed seats) = (998 sq. ft.) / 0.75 m² (8.1 sq. ft.) per person = 123 |
| Non-denominational spiritual space (assembly uses with non-fixed seats) = (639.2 sq. ft.) / 0.75 m² (8.1 sq. ft.) per person = 78 |
| Art therapy (classroom) = (309.4 sq. ft.) / 1.85 m² (19.9 sq. ft.) per person = 15 |
| General assembly (assembly uses with non-fixed seats) = (1575.1 sq. ft.) / 0.75 m² (8.1 sq. ft.) per person = 194 |
| General meeting room (assembly uses with non-fixed seats + tables) = (192.5 sq. ft.) / 0.95 m² (10.2 sq. ft.) per person = 18 |
| Waiting area = (258 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 2                  |
| Security hub = (230.3 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 2                |
| Family room (lounge) = (540.4 sq. ft.) / 1.85 m² (19.9 sq. ft.) per person = 27      |
| Visitation room (lounge) = (298.4 sq. ft.) / 1.85 m² (19.9 sq. ft.) per person = 15 |
| Copy room = (234 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 2                      |
| Large counseling room = (209.3 sq. ft.) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 2        |
| Small counseling rooms = (100.3 sq. ft. each) / 9.3 m² (100 sq. ft.) per person = 2  |
3.2 / BUILDING FIRE SAFETY

3.2.2.6 / Multiple Major Occupancies
In a building containing more than one major occupancy, the requirements of this Subsection for the most restricted major occupancy contained shall apply to the whole building. (See 3.2.2.7 and 3.2.2.8 for exceptions)

3.3.1.3 / Means of Egress
Access to exit within floor areas shall conform to Subsections 3.3.2 to 3.3.5, in addition to the following:
7) Two points of egress shall be provided for a service space if b) the travel distance measures from any point in the service space to a point of egress is more than 25 m (82 ft.).

(National Research Council of Canada [NRCC], 2010)
APPENDIX D: LEED ACCREDITATION ANALYSIS

/ RATING SYSTEM
LEED for Interior Design + Construction: Commercial Interior

/ MINIMUM PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS
permanent location on existing land
full project and land boundaries included in assessment
compliance with project size requirements (>250 sq. ft. gross floor area)

/ POTENTIAL CREDITS + REQUIREMENTS

• The potential credits listed in the table below are limited specifically to design elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEED Credit Categories / Abbreviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT = Location and Transportation Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE = Water Efficiency Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA = Energy and Atmosphere Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR = Materials and Resources Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ = Indoor Environmental Quality Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP = Regional Priority Credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 25 - LEED CREDITS + ASSOCIATED CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREDIT CATEGORY</th>
<th>CREDIT + OPTION (if applicable)</th>
<th>ACTION REQUIRED</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Bicycle facilities</td>
<td>• bike storage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WE              | Indoor water use reduction - prerequisite | • low flow fixtures  
|                 |                                 | • CEE Tier 3A commercial washers                                                 | 0      |
| EA              | Minimum energy performance - prerequisite | • low energy appliances and lighting  
|                 |                                 | • efficient HVAC systems (ex. VAV system)reduced lighting power density  
|                 |                                 | • automatic shut-offs  
|                 |                                 | • vacancy sensors  
|                 |                                 | • daylight switching plans                                                      | 0      |
| EA              | Fundamental refrigerant management - prerequisite | • no CFC-based refrigerants                                                    | 0      |
| MR              | Storage and collection of recycling - prerequisite | • waste management system for collection and sorting throughout building         | 0      |
| MR              | Interior life cycle impact reduction | • flexibility of spaces  
|                 |                                 | • accessible in-floor or ceiling systems (50%+ floor area)                       | 1      |
| EQ              | Environmental tobacco smoke control - prerequisite | • “no smoking within 25’ of this building” signs within 10’ of all entrances    | 0      |
| EQ              | Enhanced indoor air quality strategies - options 1 + 2 (mixed-mode system) | • walk-off mats/grates/grilles/slotted system that can be cleaned underneath, minimum 10’ at main entrances  
|                 |                                 | • proper exhaust system for areas needing direct ventilation (ex. laundry, copy rooms, housekeeping), minimum .50 CFM/sq. ft., self-closing doors, deck-to-deck partitions or hard-lid ceiling  
|                 |                                 | • ventilation of outdoor air equipped with minimum MERV filter 13  
<p>|                 |                                 | • carbon dioxide monitors in densely occupied spaces, installed 3’ - 6’ A.F.F. | 2      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREDIT CATEGORY</th>
<th>CREDIT + OPTION (if applicable)</th>
<th>ACTION REQUIRED</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EQ              | Low-emitting materials – option 1 product category calculations | • no VOC interior paints/coatings  
• low-emitting: furniture, flooring, adhesives/sealants, ceilings, walls, thermal, and acoustic insulation | 2 |
| EQ              | Thermal comfort                | • internal thermal comfort controls (air temp, radiant temp, humidity, and/or air speed controls), minimum 50% individual occupant spaces  
• group thermal controls for multi-occupant spaces | 1 |
| EQ              | Interior lighting – options 1 + 2 | • lighting controls (3 settings: off, on, mid), 90% individual occupant spaces  
• multi-zone control systems for group needs in multi-occupant spaces  
• separate controls for lighting at presentation walls  
• controls in same space and within sight of associated luminaires  
• lights with rated life of 24,000 hrs, 75% of connected light load | 2 |
| EQ              | Quality views                  | • unobstructed, direct line of site to outdoors, 75% of all regularly occupied floor area  
• views of flora/fauna, sky, movement, and/or objects a minimum of 25’ away  
• multiple lines of site to vision glazing in different directions, at least 90° apart | 1 |

**TOTAL POTENTIAL POINTS EARNED**  
(includes points related to non-interior design specific points not listed here)  
Certified 40-49, Silver 50-59, Gold 60-79, Platinum 80+  

51 to 86

(U.S. Green Building Council, 2013)