



**Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition
Stage One Competition Brief**

May 2005

Introduction

Halifax Regional Municipality, in partnership with Southwest Properties Limited, now invites entries to our international design competition to create a master plan for the regeneration, restoration and renewal of Point Pleasant Park.

Point Pleasant Park: A Symbol of Halifax

Point Pleasant Park lies on a rocky 75-hectare (185 acre) promontory jutting into the Atlantic Ocean at the eastern end of the Halifax peninsula, in Nova Scotia, Canada. This park has been a place of recreation for the citizens of Halifax since the city's founding in 1749. Before that, it provided hunting and fishing, and was a ceremonial area for the indigenous Mi'kmaq people. Until 1866, Point Pleasant was primarily a military bastion, but in that year it was leased to a newly-formed commission for a public park. Trees were planted in its early years as a park and it soon became an urban forest where citizens could find an oasis of peace close to the bustling city. This much-loved park is open year-round for a variety of uses, including walking, picnicking, skiing, cycling and dog walking. Its shoreline provides magnificent views of ships and yachts entering and leaving Halifax's busy harbour and it has a complex system of roads and trails that wind among rocky hills, low cliffs and valleys. For many people Point Pleasant Park is a symbol of Halifax, and of the way they choose to live their lives: in a city, close to the land and forest, close to nature, close to the sea.

Hurricane Devastates Park

In late September 2003, Hurricane Juan, a category two hurricane, made landfall in Nova Scotia, not far from Point Pleasant Park. The maximum force winds from the eastern eye-wall of the hurricane that swept over the park, and the city, caused millions of dollars of damage, and destroyed more than 75,000 trees in Point Pleasant Park alone.

Point Pleasant Park closed in order for work crews to perform cleanup operations. Nine months later, the Park was reopened to the public. Minus almost 85 per cent of its trees and with its shoreline damaged, much of the park looks and feels desolate; it appears beyond repair and park users feel a tremendous sense of loss.

An Opportunity for Renewal

There are also problems with the forest ecology of Point Pleasant Park. A combination of rocky terrain and the repeated removal of cut timber over the past 250 years have left what little soil there is deficient in nutrients. The destruction caused by the hurricane is seen as an opportunity to plan a sustainable ecosystem for the future. It is also an opportunity to renew the park in order to meet the needs of park users. With this in mind, Southwest Properties Limited and Halifax Regional Municipality formed a partnership to begin a renewal process. An international design competition informed by local technical experts and public consultation was chosen as the way to find the best ideas for the park.

The Public Responds: Return the Forest, Respect the History

In preparation for the competition, a public consultation process took place to determine how people wish their park to be renewed. The number of responses was unprecedented and the overwhelming majority of citizens made it clear they want to see Point Pleasant Park's forest regenerated, and the park's character restored. The public also recognized the park as a significant place of cultural history and expressed its wish to have the cultural resources integrated into future plans.

The Point Pleasant Park Challenge

What were the characteristics of Point Pleasant Park that created its tranquility and the sense it had of being a larger forest than it really was? How do we manage the forest so that generations to come will have healthy trees to walk under? What kind of trees grow best, look best, and where do we plant them so that they grow healthy and strong? How do we balance the popularity of the park with its overall ecological health? What views do we want to keep and what views do we want to block? What are the new opportunities that have opened up as a result of the hurricane devastation? What do we include in a master plan that will support the day-to-day management plan of the park? What does a Nova Scotian coastal urban forest park look like and feel like?

These are the challenges we will present to you in our upcoming master plan competition. The competition is now open, and the design brief will be posted to <http://www.pointpleasantpark.ca> . Best of luck to all!

Table of Contents

1.0 BACKGROUND	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Theme	2
1.3 Competition Goal and Objectives	3
1.4 Design Principles	4
1.4.1 Balance	4
1.4.2 Ecological Sustainability.....	4
1.4.3 Park Use	4
1.4.4 Context and Connectedness	4
1.4.5 Accessibility	5
1.4.6 Implementation Process	5
1.5 Program	5
1.6 Current Renewal Projects	6
2.0 COMPETITION CONDITIONS	7
2.1.1 Eligibility	7
2.1.2 Conflict of Interest.....	7
2.1.3 Registration	7
2.1.4 Questions and Answers	8
2.1.5 Awards.....	9
2.1.6 Exhibitions	9
2.1.7 Timetable	9
2.1.8 Copyright	10
2.1.9 General Conditions.....	10
2.1.10 Exhibition, Publication and Return of Entries.....	10
2.2 Stage One Submissions.....	11
2.2.1 Acceptance of Conditions	11
2.2.2 Disqualification	11
2.2.3 Submission Format Requirements	11
2.2.4 Anonymity	12
2.2.5 Presentations	12
2.2.6 Delivery of Submissions—Stage One	13
2.2.7 Return of Submissions.....	13
2.3 Adjudication.....	14
2.3.1 Procedure of Adjudication	14
2.3.2 Jury	14
3.0 APPENDIX	15
3.1 Competition Structure	15
3.1.1 General	15
3.1.2 Technical Advisory Team (TAT) Report and Stakeholders Advisory Team (SAT) Report	16
3.1.3 Steering Committee and Competition Administrator	17

Stage One Competition Brief

1.0 Background

Point Pleasant Park is currently owned by the Government of Canada and leased to Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) for park purposes on a 999-year lease negotiated in 1866. Although the land has been managed as a park for over a century, Point Pleasant Park has been without a comprehensive master plan since its inception.

Over the last decade, Point Pleasant Park and its coastal forest have been significantly altered by insect infestation management, by ice storms and, in 2003, by Hurricane Juan, a class two hurricane. It is for these reasons that an international design competition has been undertaken.

1.1 Overview

The Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition is an open, two-stage competition for a master plan for Point Pleasant Park.

Stage One

This competition brief provides the rules, regulations and submission requirements for Stage One of the competition. It is based on steering committee recommendations and on two key documents: the Stakeholders Advisory Team Report, and the Technical Advisory Team Report. All three documents and the supporting information published to the competition website must be considered by competitors.

Stage One will last eight weeks and submissions will be judged to determine five finalists who will be invited to participate in Stage Two. Stage One finalists will be awarded \$5,000 (Can.) each.

Stage Two

Stage Two of the competition will last 8 weeks, and will require invited competitors to develop their Stage One work in accordance with the Stage Two design brief. This brief will be released after the selection of the Stage One finalists. The winner of Stage Two will be awarded \$50,000 (Can.). After an HRM review and approval process, the Stage Two winner will be invited to negotiate a contract with HRM to further develop their submission into a master plan and master plan guidelines for Point Pleasant Park.

Notes:

1. Southwest Properties Limited and Halifax Regional Municipality are working in partnership to sponsor the Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition.

2. The competition brief defines the competition process up to the awarding of the design prizes only. The awarding of a contract to develop the winning submission into a master plan is outside the jurisdiction of the competition and will involve a process of HRM staff review and recommendation, and approval by HRM Regional Council.
3. HRM will implement the final master plan in phases, as funding allows. The Point Pleasant Park Master Plan will be an essential document to attract funding from Federal, Provincial, and private sources.
4. The Stakeholders Advisory Team and the Technical Advisory Team reports included on the website represent consensus issues, expectations and visions for the park. The several public stakeholders have separate and at times differing interests in this competition. The opinion reports are provided on the competition website to advise the contestants and the jury. These two documents provide HRM parkland guidelines, stakeholder interests, technical information, background information, and recommendations.

1.2 Theme

Regenerate Restore Renew

The theme of this competition, *Regenerate Restore Renew*, reflects the relationship of the citizens of HRM with their park, and their hopes for its future. Point Pleasant Park is a place of spiritual regeneration, restoration and renewal: a place to take exercise before a stressful day, or to unwind at its end. It is a place to picnic by the sea with the kids, to meet friends, to walk the dog, to commune with nature, to laugh and to cry.

But the urban forest where people find such solace is in sad disarray. Much of it is reduced to a wasteland of broken tree trunks and overturned stumps.

Competitors in the Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition are challenged to create a master plan to regenerate, restore and renew this much-loved urban forest and its shoreline.

1.3 Competition Goal and Objectives

Within the theme of *Regenerate Restore Renew*, the goal of the competition is to generate designs that:

- a) define a comprehensive, ecologically sustainable vision for Point Pleasant Park, its urban forest and its coastal landscape;
- b) choreograph the Park to enhance it as a place of interest, enjoyment, and discovery for citizens and visitors;
- c) explore recreation, education, and programming opportunities that enhance the casual, enjoyable and friendly atmosphere of the Park;
- d) restore and enhance the landscape character of the park that existed before Hurricane Juan;
- e) interpret the importance of Point Pleasant Park to its urban context on the Halifax peninsula and within HRM;
- f) suggest a phased approach to master plan implementation that incorporates specific renewal projects beginning within the following time frames: 1 year, 2 to 5 years, 6 to 20 years, and 21 to 50 years;
- g) set the direction for future management and operations plans for the Park.
- h) provide creative solutions to screening and/or interpreting the neighbouring container pier and helipad in the lower parking lot;
- i) ensure that the main entrances to the park reflect the park's sense of place, are welcoming, and effectively orient park users;
- j) ensure that the parking lots place safe pedestrian movement first, are environmentally and user friendly, and support multiple uses;
- k) provide an amenity building/bathing pavilion in anticipation of harbour cleanup and reinstatement of swimming at Black Rock Beach;
- l) define cultural programming spaces for that do not adversely impact on the forest or fortifications;
- m) provide a strategy for shoreline protection.

1.4 Design Principles

All competitors must adhere to the design principles listed below.

1.4.1 Balance

The design should balance all aspects of the park in order to maintain its ecological health, its usage, its natural beauty and its sense of place in Halifax. Point Pleasant Park needs to be balanced in many ways: for example, between use and ecological protection; between forested and open areas; between community activities and solitary activities; and between the natural and the cultivated.

1.4.2 Ecological Sustainability

A primary objective of the park's renewal is to achieve a healthy forest environment. Therefore, the design must result in a sustainable environment for all aspects of the park's ecosystem. The master plan must lead to work that will eventually create harmony between the flora, fauna, soils and hydrology of the park.

1.4.3 Park Use

The design should describe park activities that can exist with minimum conflict between uses. The design must reflect the park's primary character as a casual, enjoyable, friendly place that provides opportunities for solitary and social enjoyment. The design should integrate the various uses in such a manner that the park's carrying capacity is not exceeded.

1.4.4 Context and Connectedness

The design must recognize and reflect the various contexts within which the park exists, for example, the HRM urban landscape, the HRM park system, local and regional geography and its historical social context.

The design must demonstrate connections on many levels. Ecological connections must exist vertically from treetop to bedrock, as well as horizontally from the city through the forest and to the ocean. Nature-to-nature connections must support the long-term ecological health and natural beauty of the park.

The people who use the park are connected with its ecosystem. Public feedback indicates that park users love the park's environment for its intrinsic natural beauty, its educational value, and its contrast with the urban environment.

Point Pleasant Park has long been a place where people meet in a beautiful natural setting. Whether through casual recreation or at formal ceremonies, the park is seen as a very special place of social connection and community. It is also valued as a place where people connect with personal, local, provincial, and national history.

1.4.5 Accessibility

Point Pleasant Park must be accessible to all and should embrace universal design principles. Universal design seeks to create products and environments that are useful to and useable by everyone, and that do not segregate or stigmatize any group of users. Preferably the same means of use is provided for all; identical wherever possible and equivalent when not. While the park must be accessible to all, conflicting uses may necessitate that not all of it be accessible to all users at all times.

1.4.6 Implementation Process

The design for Point Pleasant Park must be capable of being translated into a master plan that can be implemented in phases. Projects within the master plan must have the ability to be phased in a way that is economically achievable in both the short term and long term. Phased projects should not have to rely on future phases in order to demonstrate a sense of completion and to be useable.

Phased projects must be environmentally friendly in form and function, minimizing conflicts with adjacent uses and concurrent activities. Master plan projects must consider current renewal projects taking place in the park, as listed in Section 1.6.

1.5 Program

Please refer to the Stakeholders Advisory Team Report and the Technical Advisory Team Report for program direction. The current park program can be found in the Existing Program drawing in the maps and drawings section of the website.

1.6 Current Renewal Projects

Funds have been committed to the following renewal projects, which should be taken into consideration:

1. Brown Spruce Longhorn Beetle Compensation Program: Tree planting and forestry management.
2. Cultural Resource Management: Protection and interpretation of the park's historic cultural resources.
3. HRM Infrastructure Renewal Fund: General park improvements (washroom improvements, etc.)
4. Active Living Project: Provide amenities in Point Pleasant Park that encourage active living.
5. Federal Disaster Relief Funding: Remediation work resulting from the effects of Hurricane Juan

2.0 Competition Conditions

2.1.1 Eligibility

The Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition is an open competition for individuals and multidisciplinary teams. Collaborative entries by multi-disciplinary teams are encouraged. Application for registration may be made in the name of an individual or a team. Individuals may participate in more than one submission. Student teams are encouraged to enter the competition.

2.1.2 Conflict of Interest

All those likely to be in conflict of interest are excluded from this competition, including but not necessarily limited to the following:

Arboriculturists, architects, artists, ecological scientists, engineers, environmental designers, foresters, landscape architects, planners, recreation specialists and urban designers, or members of the team closely associated with, employed by, or having a close family tie with the steering committee, Technical Advisory Team, Stakeholders Advisory Team, competition administrator, jury, the HRM Real Property and Asset Management Real Property Planning Department.

Teams wishing to clarify whether the inclusion of members would violate conflict of interest requirements may seek clarification in writing from the competition administrator during the Question and Answer time frame. The competition administrator will publish a written response in the Question and Answer pages of the website.

2.1.3 Registration

The registration process will take place under the supervision of the competition administrator. Registration methods: mail; expedited mail or courier. See below for conditions.

In order to be eligible, registrants must include the following:

- a) a completed registration form (see registration section of website)
- b) a registration payment by a cashier's cheque, money order or credit card (MasterCard, Visa or American Express) in the amount of \$ 100.00 (Canadian funds only), payable to Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition.

For mail deliveries:

PPPIDC Registration
c/o HRM Real Property Planning
6th floor Alderney Gate
P.O. Box 1749
Halifax NS B3J 3A5

For courier and expedited/registered mail delivery:

PPPIDC Registration
c/o HRM Real Property Planning
6th floor Alderney Gate
40 Alderney Drive
Dartmouth NS B2Y 2N5

Registration must be received by Friday, 15 July 2005, 4:30 p.m. (ADT).

Notification of registration will be sent to competitors by e-mail. Neither the PPPIDC Steering Committee, HRM, Southwest Properties Limited or other competition supporters/sponsors, or the jury bear any responsibility for the safe and timely delivery of the registration documents to the PPPIDC.

Questions about registration procedures should be addressed to the competition administrator through the web site: <http://www.pointpleasantpark.ca> , via fax at: 902-490-6233, or by e-mail: pointpleasant@halifax.ca .

2.1.4 Questions and Answers

After the design brief is posted and the competition opened, all communication with the competition organizers and members of the jury in regards to the PPPIDC is forbidden, with the exception of questions addressed to the competition administrator.

Questions must be received on or before 12 July 2005.

All questions and their associated replies will be posted on the competition website. Assume that answers will be processed and posted within 10 working days. The final posting of questions and replies will be no later than 15 July 2005. The participants will be responsible for their access to this website. All the questions and answers will be distributed to the members of the jury.

2.1.5 Awards

Stage One

The jury will award prizes of \$5,000 (Can.) to the top five competitors. These five competitors will then be invited to compete in Stage Two.

Stage Two

The winner of Stage Two of the competition will receive \$50,000 (Can.).

The awards announcement will be posted on the competition website on 29 September 2005.

Honourable Mentions may be awarded at the discretion of the Jury.

HRM guarantees that payment of the cash prizes will be made in a timely fashion coincident with the announcement of the awards.

2.1.6 Exhibitions

The submissions will be exhibited to the public after the competition closes. The location, date, and time of the exhibition will be posted on the competition web site. They will also be shown on the competition website.

2.1.7 Timetable

The schedule may be subject to variation:

Stage One

27 May 2005 Brief posted / Registration Opens
12 July 2005 Question Period Ends @ 4:30 p.m. (ADT)
15 July 2005 Final Answers posted on website
15 July 2005 Registration Ends @ 4:30 p.m. (ADT)
25 July 2005 Stage One Submissions Deadline @ 4:30 p.m. (ADT)
27 July 2005 Technical Advisory Team Review
28 July 2005 Stakeholders Advisory Team Review
30 July 2005 Jury Deliberation
01 August 2005 Finalists Announced
01 August 2005 Finalists posted to website

Stage Two

04 August 2005 Stage Two Opens / Stage Two Brief posted to web site
17 September 2005 Question Period Ends @ 4:30 p.m. (ADT)

19 September 2005 Final Answers posted on website
22 September 2005 Stage Two Submission Deadline @4:30 p.m. (ADT)
23 September 2005 Technical Advisory Team Review
24 September 2005 Stakeholders Advisory Team Review
25 September 2005 Jury Deliberation
28 September 2005 Competition Winner Announced
29 September 2005 Winner posted to website / all entries posted to website
29 September 2005 - 31 October 2005 Exhibition of Entries

2.1.8 Copyright

The copyright of each design is to be retained by its author, who shall grant jointly to the HRM and the Competition Administrator the right to publish the entries, with full accreditations, in reports and publications about the competition.

2.1.9 General Conditions

HRM will be bound by the jury's decision. Should the project proceed within two years of the date of the award, HRM shall make use only of the winning submission for the intended project, and shall agree to enter into negotiations with the winning team in order to develop the submission into a master plan and master plan guidelines for Point Pleasant Park.

If the project proceeds either in whole or in part, HRM shall enter into a client/consultant agreement with the winner, which shall be in accordance with such terms and forms as are consistent with standard professional practice in Canada.

If the winner declines the commission, or if a contract cannot be satisfactorily negotiated, HRM has the right to implement the scheme with the services of another professional design team. In that event, notwithstanding 2.1.8, the winner shall transfer or license its copyright for the project to HRM.

Should HRM determine the winner to lack the experience or ability to carry out the commission, the winner may be required to associate with a professional practice of recognized experience and capability, of the winner's choice, and acceptable to HRM. Such acceptance shall not be unreasonably withheld.

2.1.10 Exhibition, Publication and Return of Entries

Entries will not be returned. Participants confer use of all or part of their entry to HRM, for publication and archival purposes only, free of charge. HRM reserves the right to organize and/or reproduce the submissions for subsequent exhibition or publication in any form. Projects may be exhibited or reproduced in part or in whole with accreditation.

2.2 Stage One Submissions

2.2.1 Acceptance of Conditions

Submission of an entry will constitute acknowledgement and acceptance of these conditions and their extension through questions and answers. Participants, by virtue of entering this competition, agree to save harmless the organizers, sponsors and any other person linked to the competition, for any delay, damage or loss, real or perceived.

2.2.2 Disqualification

A design shall be excluded from this competition if:

- a) received after the latest time stated under Section 2.1.7 Timetable or as revised by a published addendum.
- b) in the opinion of the competition administrator or jury, it does not substantially meet the requirements of the brief.
- c) a competitor discloses his or her identity, or improperly attempts to influence the decision.
- d) any of the mandatory requirements of the competition, as set out in Section 2.0 Competition Conditions, are disregarded.

2.2.3 Submission Format Requirements

Participants shall submit their submissions on two vertically mounted 1016 mm (40 inches) vertical x 762mm (30 inches) horizontal format boards 4.5mm thick. The presentation will be displayed to the jury with two boards abutting each other. The boards shall bear numbers in the lower right corner. Each board shall carry the title:

Regenerate Restore Renew
Point Pleasant Park
International Design Competition 2005
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

A brief written statement describing the contents of the panel shall be incorporated into each of the boards. In addition, participants shall submit an electronic file of each board at a resolution of 300 dpi and saved in JPEG format on a compact disk (CD). A black and white A4 (8.5" x 11") format hard copy of the text shall also be included. Text for submissions is to be in English. Minimum text font size: ten points.

2.2.4 Anonymity

To ensure the anonymity of the submissions, the participants must abide by the following:

- a) presentation boards shall be wrapped twice in opaque paper;
- b) the outside wrapper shall contain the sender's name and return address;
- c) the inside wrapper and presentation boards shall be free of any identifying marks whatsoever;
- d) an unmarked, sealed and opaque envelope containing a copy of the completed official registration form together with one electronic graphic image of the entry submission and a copy of the written statement shall be affixed to the outside of the inner wrapper.

The envelope will not be opened until after the selection has been made. Successful competitors must be able to satisfy the assessors that they are the bona fide author of the designs they have submitted. Competitors should retain copies of the designs submitted.

Each submission will be allocated an identification number, which will be marked on the inner wrap, on the envelope, and on the back of the presentation boards upon opening. Anonymity of the participants will be reserved until after the decision of the jury. The envelopes will be opened only after the winning submissions have been declared, when the identity of the competitors will be revealed.

Note: Additional program rules and guidelines for Stage Two will be announced after the five finalists are selected.

2.2.5 Presentations

Presentation methods are at the discretion of the participants provided they fit the required board format. They must clearly illustrate the design concept and its content. The scale (numeric and linear) shall be metric and indicated on all drawings. Text is to be in English. Minimum text font size: ten points.

Minimum Requirements:

- a. Plan view of Point Pleasant Park at 1:2000
 - b. Sections, elevations, text to support the design concept and its content
- Three-dimensional representation of the project e.g. perspectives, axonometric drawings, photographs of models, are encouraged.

No models or objects will be accepted.

Each submission shall include, in written form, (to be included on boards), the following information:

Site Context and Analysis Plan

- a. Vision Statement - Approach to Park Renewal

Other Boards

- a. Vision Statement - Approach to Site Context
- b. Vision Statement - Approach to Park entrance design
- c. Description of Work

2.2.6 Delivery of Submissions—Stage One

All Stage One submissions must be received as one package, addressed to:

For regular mail delivery:

PPPIDC
c/o HRM Real Property Planning
6th floor Alderney Gate
P.O. Box 1749
Halifax NS B3J 3A5

For courier and expedited/registered mail delivery:

PPPIDC
c/o HRM Real Property Planning
6th floor Alderney Gate
40 Alderney Drive
Dartmouth NS B2Y 2N5

All submissions must be received before 4:30 p.m. (ADT) on Monday, 25 July 2005.

Delivered submissions will be acknowledged by e-mail. We recommend that materials be sent by registered mail, Purolator, FedEx, UPS, or other means that allows the sender to track the status of the materials. Neither PPPIDC Steering Committee or Halifax Regional Municipality, or other competition supporters/sponsors, or the jury bear any responsibility for the safe and timely delivery of the submissions to the PPPIDC.

2.2.7 Return of Submissions

No provisions will be made by PPPIDC to mail or ship any entry back to the competitors. It is strongly suggested that all competitors maintain a complete record of their submission.

2.3 Adjudication

2.3.1 Procedure of Adjudication

The jury will be composed of five members. It will review each submission as an entity created out of the combination of the context and analysis, area plan and site plan components. It will also evaluate the submission in terms of the particular components.

The judging of the projects will be carried out impartially and according to established judging criteria. The advice of the Stakeholders Advisory Team and Technical Advisory Team (see section 3.1.2 and 3.1.3) shall be taken into consideration in the jury's final judgment. All entries will be presented to the jury in identical conditions. The jury will examine all qualified entries before a final selection is made.

The jury will produce a signed report. The report will describe the general competition results and outline the design considerations that influenced its choices. The report may also include comments on any project submitted. The jury's decisions are at its sole discretion; they are final and determine the competition awards. The judging procedures will be indexed to the report. The report will be distributed to the organizers, sponsors and all competitors.

2.3.2 Jury

In the event of a juror being unable to continue to act through illness or any other cause, the competition administrator, in consultation with the steering committee, will appoint another juror. The jury shall base its judgment only on the information contained in the submissions; in the conditions of this competition; the question and answers published; the Technical Advisory Team Opinion Report and the Stakeholders Advisory Team Opinion Report. The jury shall refuse to consider any other information.

The jury shall prepare, in conjunction with the competition administrator, a concise report summarizing its decisions on the awards and giving brief reasons for these decisions. This report shall be presented to the competition administrator immediately following the judging of the competition.

The competition administrator, in the presence of the Jury and the sponsors, shall open the envelope of the winning submission to determine the identity of the winners. The jury shall meet with the sponsors and the competition administrator

immediately after the judging to disclose the results and make any explanations required.

3.0 Appendix

3.1 Competition Structure

3.1.1 General

The Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition (PPPIDC) is an open, two-stage competition for a master plan for Point Pleasant Park, in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition Steering Committee

The role of the Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition (PPPIDC) Steering Committee is to oversee the preparation of the competition brief and the initiation of the competition.

Competition Administrator

The role of the competition administrator is to oversee the running of the competition and to ensure that sponsors' and competitors' interests are safeguarded.

Technical Advisory Team (TAT)

The role of the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) is to provide guidance, recommendations and background information regarding the technical issues involved in the planning of Point Pleasant Park. The TAT is composed of experts in the fields of ecology, archaeology, history, park planning, recreation, forestry, soil science, and landscape architecture. The TAT members may be employees of the sponsors. No member of the TAT may be affiliated with any of the competitors in regard to their submission in this competition (See Section 2.1.2 Conflict of Interest).

Stakeholders Advisory Team (SAT)

The role of the Stakeholders Advisory Team (SAT) is to provide guidance, recommendations and background information regarding the stakeholders' interests in Point Pleasant Park. Stakeholders are considered to be: Parks Canada, HRM, Point Pleasant Park Advisory Committee, Mi'kmaq First Nation, and the citizens of HRM. The SAT is comprised of members from the various stakeholder groups. The SAT members may be employees of the sponsors. No member of the SAT may be affiliated with any of the competitors in regard to their submission in this competition (See Section 2.1.2 Conflict of Interest).

Competition Brief

The competition brief provides general objectives, design principles, and submission rules and regulations. A TAT Report and a SAT Report (representing HRM, public, and Federal Government interests) are also provided to inform, guide and provide recommendations to the competitors and jury regarding the renewal of this site.

3.1.2 Technical Advisory Team (TAT) Report and Stakeholders Advisory Team (SAT) Report

The Stakeholders Advisory Team and the Technical Advisory Team reports included on the website represent consensus issues, expectations and visions for the park. The several public stakeholders have separate and at times differing interests in this competition. The reports are provided to advise the contestants and the jury. These two documents provide HRM parkland guidelines, stakeholder interests, technical information, background information, and recommendations.

Note: the competition brief is differentiated from the TAT and SAT reports in that the brief represents the rules of this competition and the reports do not. The competition brief states the competition compliance requirements by which the submissions will be judged.

3.1.3 Steering Committee and Competition Administrator

The members of the Point Pleasant Park International Design Competition Steering Committee are:

Peter Bigelow, Manager, HRM, Real Property Planning
Kim Borgal, Marketing and Communications Assistant, HRM, Corporate Communications
Ruth Goldbloom, OC, Chair, Pier 21 Foundation
Janet Kitz, author, former Point Pleasant Park commissioner, and member of Point Pleasant Park Advisory Committee
Stewart MacMillan, Parkland Planner, HRM, Real Property Planning
Doreen Malone, General Manager, Neptune Theatre
LaJune Naud, Chair, Point Pleasant Park Advisory Committee
Frank Palermo, Professor of Architecture, Dalhousie University
Allan Robertson, retired management consultant, member of Friends of Point Pleasant Park
Michael Santilli, student of architecture, Dalhousie University
Gordon Smith, Landscape Architect / Planner, CBCL Limited
Michael Smith, artist
Jim Spatz, Chairman and CEO, Southwest Properties Limited
John Stuart, General Manager, Bishop's Cellar
Iain Taylor, retired geographer, President, Friends of Point Pleasant Park
Richard Wassersug, Professor Dalhousie University
Anne West, retired public relations consultant and park user

The Competition Administrator is:

Peter Bigelow, Manager, Real Property Planning, Real Property and Asset Management, Halifax Regional Municipality (or designate).