4 Design Strategy

4.3 Design Approach4.3.8 Option 02 - Typical Floor

Stage 01 Proposals Typical Floor Options

It is on a typical floor plan that the fundamental differences between the two options become most apparent. Option 2 rotates the atrium along the eastern facade, creating clustered lab/ write up and office space around social and breakout spaces.



Option 02

Option 02 pushes the atrium to the eastern facade of the building. With the atrium shifting per floor this creates a dynamic space and allows lab/ write-up and offices to cluster.

Pros:

- Clusters of labs, write-up spaces and PI offices around social and breakout space
- Atrium shift creates natural wayfinding in the building
- Small travel distances between lab and write-up spaces
- Rooftop and first floor plant frees up floorspace for occupiable space.
- Write-up space benefits from views out over the school playing fields and the city
- Flexible and efficient adjacencies

Cons:

- Pl offices to the south do not benefit from views out from the campus
- Services need to transfer vertically from roof and first floor plant rooms, and transfer horizontally across floor plates from risers
- Building control would need to be worked with closely to ensure that fire control and access are well resolved across the full height atrium
- Will encourage a more secluded laboratory nature

The LMS vs. Existing Facilities

The drawing here aims to illustrate the scale, proportion and key layout differences between the LMS Stage 1 design, CRB & ICTEM.

This option shows how the clustered model of the existing CRB building has been adopted into the LMS model. Creating 3-point axis of circulation routes around lab/ write-up and PI offices with social and collaboration space at the centre.

The write-up orientation of the ICTEM model has also been adopted to maximise the views out over the green space to the east.



4 Design Strategy

4.3 Design Approach4.3.9 Options 01 & 02 - Social Space

Stage 01 Proposals Top Floor Options

It is the relationship between the entrance/ atrium and the top floor social engagement space that creates the identity of the institute. Poised on the edge of the campus with amazing views out over The City of London, the elevated social space of the LMS will be a key feature of the building and of the institute.



Option 01

Option 01 sees the social space occupy the southern end of the building, adjacent to the top of the vertical atrium

Pros:

- Relationship between atrium and social space
- Opportunity to have a small external terrace area to the south
- Director offices at the top floor will benefit from excellent views
- Large formal meeting space

Cons:

- Views to the south east are excellent, but views to the north, over the Linford Christie Centre would be best
- Noise of external and internal spaces with extents of surrounding plant will need to be monitored in the coming design stages



Option 02

Option 02 locates the social space at the end of the sloped atrium path to the north east of the site.

Pros:

- Relationship between atrium and social space
- Opportunity to have a small external terrace area to the north
- Ideal views out to the north-east
- Formal meeting space

Cons:

Hawkins\Brown © | 22.09.17 | 17034_170908_Stage1Report | RIBA Stage 1 Report



	_ ' '			
1 1	1		4 1	1
	_'	·		
			1 1	
 		_	_	
	_			
1 1	1		l i	1
<u> </u>	_'	·	'	
	-		1 1	1
	_			-
	-			+
1 1	1			1
		1	1	
	_			

- Large plant, possibly double stacked