AN ARCHITECTURAL TOOLKIT FOR COMPLEX SITES:
EXPLORING CO-CREATION WITH COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS

MONIQUE ST. PIERRE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL AFFAIRS IN FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF:

MASTER IN ARCHITECTURE PROFESSIONAL

CARLETON UNIVERSITY
AZRIELI SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND URBANISM
OTTAWA, ONTARIO, CANADA

MONIQUE ST. PIERRE © 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all who participated in my thesis. I am truly appreciative and grateful for the time, knowledge and interest given by all of you; this thesis would not have been possible otherwise.

Thank you to my family who have always been very supportive of me; my sister Nicole, for all the last minute edits and words of advice. Thank you Joel, you are the most loving, caring and supportive person one could hope for in life.

Lastly, I am very thankful for the support from various professors and staff at Carleton. I would like to thank my advisor particularly, Janine Debanne, for venturing into new territory with me to produce a thesis very different from the norm.

ABSTRACT

The architectural profession is at a pivotal point in redefining its relationship with the public. This thesis seeks to develop a 'toolkit' of alternative tools and techniques intended for the use of architects to engage community stakeholders in co-creation. Relying on contribution from participants, the toolkit acts as a vessel for envisioning the future of a contested site in Ottawa, the Chaudière Islands. The widely divergent visions this site has inspired – from that of the private developer, Windmill, to that of the late Algonquin Elder, William Commanda – make clear the need for new tools for the architect. While applied here to a particular case study and Indigenous working group, the thesis aims to provide a model of public engagement for other projects of complexity in the future.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Thesis Map Diagram
2. Fuzzy Front End of Design
3. Path of Expression
4. Conceptual Diagram of: Methods that Study What People Say, Do and Make
5. Stakeholder Web
6. Zibi Protest & Support Poster Collage
7. Map of Site and Surrounding Context
8. Historical Timeline of Site
9. List of Attended Events, Conversations or Interactions
10. Photo of Toolkit Mapping
11. Toolkit Diagram Breakdown
12. Two Scaled Maps of Site for Semi-Structured Interview
13. Image Answers of Elder
14. Illustrated Map of Interview with Elder
15. Image Answers of John Cook
16. Illustrated Map of Interview with John Cook
17. Image Answers of Douglas Cardinal
18. Illustrated Map of Interview with Douglas Cardinal
19. Image Answers of Dan Clement
20. Illustrated Map of Interview with Dan Clement
21. Image Answers of Gilbert Whiteduck
22. Illustrated Map of Interview with Gilbert Whiteduck
23. Phase One Analysis Diagram
24. Post-it Wall (Photo)
25. Workshop Boxes (Photo)
26. Blank Key Card
27. Table with Provided Materials (Photo)
28. Idea Play Back (Photo)
29. Researcher Leading Group in Curating Ideas (Photo)
30. Table Set up for Creative Design Exercise (Photo)
31. Verna's Key Card
32. Participants Working on Site Location (Photo)
33. Closing Reflection (Photo)
34. Anon. Workshop Findings
35. Shady's Workshop Findings
36. Jessie's Workshop Findings
37. Phase Two Analysis Diagram

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 2

ABSTRACT 3

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS 5

Chapter One: 7

In Search of a New Toolkit for Architectural Engagement 7

INTRODUCTION 8

ARCHITECT AS NAVIGATOR IN THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT DISCOURSE 12

GUIDED TOOLKIT DESIGN 15

PERSONAL COMMENTARY: The Path that Brought Me Here 20

Chapter Two: 22

In Search of a New Toolkit for The Chaudière, Albert and Victoria Islands 22

SITE CONTEXT: Buildings of Significance 26

PERSONAL COMMENTARY: The Research Process 27

HISTORICAL TIMELINE OF SITE: From Sacred to Zibi 28

AN APPROACH TO PRELIMINARY AND FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH 29

Chapter Three: 31

Gathering Knowledge to Define and Design a Toolkit 31

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 34

PERSONAL COMMENTARY: Finding Inspiration in Conversation 35

PHASE ONE: Semi-Structured Interviews 36

PHASE ONE: Findings 38

INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ILLUSTRATED: Elder 40

INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ILLUSTRATED: John Cook 42

INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ILLUSTRATED: Douglas Cardinal	44
INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ILLUSTRATED: Dan Clement	46
INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ILLUSTRATED: Gilbert Whiteduck	48
PHASE ONE: Interview Analysis	49
Chapter Four:	50
Gathering People to Design a Place to Gather	50
Personal Commentary: Defining the Architects [My] Place	52
PHASE TWO: Creative Workshop Framework	53
PHASE TWO: Workshop Outcomes	57
PHASE TWO: Workshop Analysis	66
Chapter Five:	67
Conclusions	67
APPENDICES	69
Appendix A: Phase I - Recruitment Letter	70
APPENDIX B: Phase I - Phone Script	71
APPENDIX C: Phase I – Consent Form	72
APPENDIX D: Phase One- Semi-Structured Interview Questions	74
APPENDIX E: Phase One - Interview Images	75
APPENDIX F: Phase Two - Consent Form	76
APPENDIX G: Phase Two - Reflection Questions from Workshop	78
APPENDIX H: Presentation Script	79
APPENDIX I: Additional Photos of Workshop Boxes and Artefacts	83
APPENDIX J: The Other Architect's Response (presented at defense)	89
Bibliography	90

Chapter One:

In Search of a New Toolkit for
Architectural Engagement

INTRODUCTION

The architectural profession is at a pivotal moment in defining its future relationship with the public. In response to social demands for a more inclusive and environmentally sustainable built environment, the architectural profession has evolved in recent years. This evolution has included a broadening of the definition of architecture and of “what architects can do”.¹ The “other architect” – subject, and title, of a recent exhibition at the Canadian Centre for Architecture – has emerged as a result of this shift, out of a variety of new approaches, a product of many people, locations and times.² The other architect is a new kind of practitioner who searches for new ways of working and different collaborative strategies. The other architect is also involved in the creation of new tools and techniques to explore concepts in non-traditional ways.³ Recent art and architectural award recipients reflect this shift, from *Assemble*, winner of Tate Britain’s 2015 Turner Prize, to *spacetoplace* design Inc., the winner of the Royal Architecture Institute of Canada’s 2016 National Urban Design Award.⁴ As the first ‘non-artists’ to win the prize, *Assemble* pushes the status quo in their ability to “...draw on long traditions of artistic and collective initiatives that experiment in art, design and architecture. In doing so they offer alternative models to how societies can work... [and are] able to drive and shape urgent issues.”⁵ *Spacetoplace* also value a strong connection to the public, claiming as their slogan “we connect people with their environment.”⁶ Significantly, jurors praised the *spacetoplace* project team, saying it was “...transparent in their engagement of the community and brought specific community wishes to fruition.”⁷ In this period of flux, architecture occupies a unique position as a profession that has the ability, beyond solving specific problems, to “establish what requires attention today.”⁸ Furthermore, these developing processes are helping to close the gap between architecture and its reception.

The “other architect” engages with his or her client and the public by developing a new or alternative toolkit of engagement. The Austrian philosopher, Ivan Illich, first conceived an

¹ Canadian Centre for Architecture. “*The Other Architect*.” 2016. Accessed April 2016. <http://www.cca.qc.ca/en/issues/20/the-other-architect/37827/first-report-from-tokyo>.

² CCA, *The Other Architect*. This concept of ‘the other’ architect was discussed in detail at the thesis defence. The question was raised on whether another title such as ‘the compassionate architect’ might be a more suitable replacement; by self-titling this architect appropriately.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Mark Brown. “Urban regenerators Assemble become first ‘non-artists’ to win Turner prize.” 2015. *The Guardian*. December 7. Accessed April 11, 2016.

<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/dec/07/urban-assemble-win-turner-prize-toxteth>; RAIC. “National Urban Design Awards — 2016 Recipient 2016.” *Royal Architecture Institute of Canada*. Accessed April 2016. <https://www.raic.org/awards/national-urban-design-awards-%E2%80%94-2016-recipient-3>.

⁵ Brown. “Urban regenerators Assemble become first ‘non-artists’ to win Turner prize.”

⁶ spacetoplace design inc. “*spacetoplace*.” 2016. Accessed May 15, 2016. <http://www.space2place.ca/>.

⁷ Royal Architecture Institute of Canada, “National Urban Design Awards — 2016 Recipient 2016.”

⁸ CCA, *The Other Architect*.

alternative approach after identifying, “People need not only obtain things, they need above all the freedom to make things among which they can live, to give shape to them according to their own tastes, and to put them to use in caring for and about others.”⁹ In response to this need Illich defines the notion of ‘convivial tools’ (a concept expanded later in detail by Liz Sanders). He explains that convivial tools provide something unique, the tools, “...give each person who uses them the greatest opportunity to enrich the environment with the fruits of his or her vision... Most tools today cannot be used in a convivial fashion.”¹⁰ In this approach the designer or architect innovates and creates an approach that brings the people they serve into the design processes in the likelihood that their needs and hopes for the future are met.¹¹ A toolkit that can take many forms serves this need by adapting a variety of techniques which could include: meetings with persons involved in or affected by a given architectural project, creative work sessions, group or individual mapping and design exercises.¹² This unique character of the toolkit is especially significant for complex sites of development that contain many levels of consideration.

This thesis builds on the works of Ivan Illich and Liz Sanders, as well as Shawn Wilson and Priscilla Settee (contribution to be discussed later), and aims to create a toolkit for use on sites of complexity and projects involving Indigenous stakeholders. To better focus the work, a specific case study in Ottawa is used to provide the necessary context to build a toolkit. The complexity and interest in the site in question, the islands around the Chaudière Falls, stands for a divide between two visions – land that is sacred and unique as public, and land that is sellable and transferable to the private realm. The divide is a dramatic one, and one that underscores the need for a deeper exploration into the consultation processes and evaluation of this site’s future. While this research operates within the confines of academia and may have no influence on the current development proposal (Zibi), it does seek to make a positive contribution to public design processes in Canada. The changing Canadian urban landscape demands a more contemporary outlook and design approach for the future: one which is more inclusive and reflective of all its inhabitants. As the capital city of our Canadian nation, Ottawa proves to be an ideal location and precedent for the entire country and for other similar sites in the future.

This thesis is a written reflection that centers on a qualitative study involving human participants with vested interest in the Chaudière, Albert and Victoria Islands. This

⁹ Elizabeth Sanders. *Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design*. (Amsterdam: BIS Publishers, 2012) 6.

¹⁰ Sanders, *Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design*. 6-7.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹² *Ibid.*, 65. Sander’s defines the differences: a tool, is a physical thing that is used as a means to an end – versus – a technique, the way in which this tool is employed.

research, done in two phases, is presented in Chapters 3 and 4, both as an intention and as it actually unfolded. The objective in the first phase was to investigate current opinions of stakeholders in the site using semi-structured interviews. The second phase involved a creative design workshop with Indigenous people -- a people who have often been left out of the conversation on land development in Canada -- using tools and techniques informed by Indigenous knowledge systems.¹³ While adapted for this particular project, they aim to provide a model for public engagement for other projects on contested sites in the future. This research will explore the search for effective tools of engagement in architecture using a generative design approach.

¹³ The word Aboriginal and Indigenous are terms sometimes used interchangeably, for the similarity in worldview and status shared by first peoples around the world.

An Architectural Toolkit for Complex Sites: Exploring Co-Creation with Community Stakeholders

Figure 1: Thesis Map Diagram

ARCHITECT AS NAVIGATOR IN THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT DISCOURSE

Throughout the last twenty years approximately, critical architectural practices have shifted their outlook from asking what it means to design *for* to asking what it means to design *with* dwellers. Out of this shift, new methods of co-design, collaborative strategies, or participatory design (PD) have developed to include non-designers in the design process.¹⁴ These non-designers are generally potential users, stakeholders or professionals from different (non-design) fields who are integrated into the process from the beginning. Furthermore, a range of experiences, roles and interests are brought to the project as a result of the diversity of people involved.¹⁵ This method of design then becomes transdisciplinary and, "...applicable across cultures and genres of projects."¹⁶ As seen in the writing of Tiwari, Lommerse and Smith (2014) transdisciplinary practice is not totally new but making it a necessary aspiration in the building process is; so is including it across a project rather than only bringing in multiple contributors at core moments for consultation. This is also where an opportunity exists for architects to embrace their valuable, multi-disciplinary skillset to involve community engagement and to employ these skills in new ways through the extension of services in this newly standard practice.¹⁷ In this context, architects can be facilitators of localised design and place-making, enabling communities and local agencies to maximize potential of space or place.¹⁸ The architect's role as a facilitator and as a person who helps communities articulate their visions is becoming clearer and more formalized at this time of disciplinary and social fluidity.

Processes such as co-creation/design, or participatory design have emerged as a way of creating a more democratic, transparent, and inclusive approach to design from the bottom up.¹⁹ By the late 1990s public participation in the planning and design process was being recognized by government and the public— not only for the empowerment it was often linked with – but for the ability to bring about faster progress and development in communities.²⁰ Societies with “prosocial norms, and interpersonal networks that

¹⁴ Elizabeth Sanders, Eva Brandt B.-N., And Thomas Binder. " A Framework for Organizing the Tools and techniques of Participatory Design." 2014. *Maketools.Com*. Accessed February 2016. [Http://Www.Maketools.Com/ArticlesPapers/Pdc2010exploratoryframeworkfinal.Pdf](http://www.maketools.com/articlespapers/pdc2010exploratoryframeworkfinal.pdf).

¹⁵ Sanders, " A Framework for Organizing the Tools and Techniques of Participatory Design."

¹⁶ Reena Tiwari, Marina Lommerse, and Dianne Smith, *M2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement*. (Singapore: Springer, 2014).

¹⁷ Royal Institute of British Architects. "Guide to Localism Opportunities for architects Part two: Getting community engagement right." *architecture.com*. Accessed 2016.

[Https://Www.Architecture.Com/Files/Ribaholdings/Policyandinternationalrelations/Policy/Guidetolocalism-Part2gettingcommunityengagementright.Pdf](https://www.architecture.com/files/Ribaholdings/Policyandinternationalrelations/Policy/Guidetolocalism-Part2gettingcommunityengagementright.Pdf).

¹⁸ Tiwari, *M2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement*.

¹⁹ The use of the word democratic used here was meant to imply a process which is more reflective of its users, one which is more inclusive. This point was brought up during the thesis defense.

²⁰ Tiwari, *M2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement*.

emphasize reciprocity are more likely to experience positive economic, political, and social development than those lacking these characteristics.”²¹ Furthermore, the architect and the profession at large seem also to benefit from such processes. The architect’s public profile is expanded and seen to better align with the people whom he or she serves by creating occasions to better listen and communicate with those who interact with their work.²² In participatory formats, the architect could also feel a deeper sense of contribution to their own community.²³ There are many forms of interaction and engagement based on the size of the project, location and complexity among other considerations.²⁴ While there is ‘no one size fits’ all approach when using such interactive processes in design and construction, the challenge of coordination and engagement is worth the happier communities it produces. This is not to say that all such approaches produce this result, however, when executed well, it often does.²⁵

Public consultation, PD and co-design, all are becoming standard practices replacing “pure” top-down design in Canada. The *Duty to Consult* principle, affirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada, guides relations with Aboriginal peoples, “...where it [the Crown] contemplates decisions or actions that may adversely impact asserted or established Aboriginal or treaty rights.”²⁶ Although written into formal Interim Guidelines in 2008, the legal requirement is still struggling to fully manifest itself in practise in Canada.²⁷ A stream of events however, including the public apology to former residential school students, the Truth and Reconciliation Committee, the Inquiry on Missing and Murdered Women, and an increased emphasis on Canadian-Indigenous relations by the current Prime Minister, “We will renew the relationship between Canada and Indigenous Peoples,” indicate a growing sense of social responsibility and interest in improved relationships with Indigenous Peoples in Canada.²⁸ This responsibility and accountability to society and the public also extends to the architectural profession and is written into the Canadian Handbook of Practise for Architects:

²¹ S. Wakefield, & B. Poland, Family, friend or foe? Critical reflections on the relevance and role of social capital in health promotion and community development. *Social Science & Medicine*. 60, no. 12 (2005): 2819-2832.

²² Monique St. Pierre, *Public Engagement & the Role of the Architect*. Professional Practise Course. Professor: Christopher Knightley. Carleton University. Ottawa, April, 2016.

²³ (Chodikoff 2011)

²⁴ Tiwari, M2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement.

²⁵ St. Pierre, *Public Engagement & the Role of the Architect*.

²⁶ (Government 2016)

²⁷ "Aboriginal Consultation and Accommodation - Updated Guidelines for Federal Officials to Fulfill the Duty to Consult - March 2011," Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada; Communications Branch, March 2011, accessed May 14, 2016, <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100014664/1100100014675>.

²⁸ Stephen Harper. "Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools." Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. June 11, 2008. Accessed April 30, 2016, <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1100100015649>.

PROFESSIONALS MUST ALSO EMBRACE THE SPIRIT AND THE LETTER OF
THE LAWS GOVERNING THEIR PROFESSIONAL AFFAIRS, AND
THOROUGHLY CONSIDER THE SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
OF THEIR PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES...THEIR RESPONSIBILITY TO
PROVIDE INDEPENDENT AND, IF NECESSARY, CRITICAL ADVICE TO
THEIR CLIENTS AND FOR THE EFFECTS OF THEIR WORK ON SOCIETY AND
THE ENVIRONMENT...FURTHERMORE, PROFESSIONALS ARE EXPECTED
TO PROTECT NOT ONLY THE PRIMARY INTEREST OF THEIR CLIENTS BUT
ALSO THE INTEREST OF THE PUBLIC.²⁹

These sentiments are compounded in this case by the growing agency and self-determination of Aboriginal people in Canada – seen in the recent *Idle No More* movement.³⁰ The future of development and planning in Canada must therefore grow to include the recognition of Aboriginal people's role in the process. For this to happen, a restructuring of standard practice is needed. The inclusion of new knowledge systems and involvement of stakeholders are essential components of this change.³¹ With the growing agency of Aboriginal peoples and the formalizing of community consultation or inclusion processes, it is paramount that Indigenous Knowledge Systems be incorporated within this evolution of process and new methods be developed to address these changes.³² The architectural profession is uniquely placed to, "...appropriately engage with local people and local issues, right from the beginning, designing 'with' rather than 'for' communities".³³ The recognition of Aboriginal culture and its potentially transformative effects on the design and planning process are essential considerations in navigating a path for future architectural and urban re-developments of culturally significant sites within Canada.

²⁹ Royal Architecture Institute of Canada. "The Architectural Profession." In *The Canadian Handbook of Practice for Architects, Second Edition*, Edited by Jon Hobbs et al., 2009, 2.

³⁰ John Ralston Saul, *The Comeback* (Toronto: Penguin Group, 2014), 1-2.

³¹ (Porter 2013); Priscilla Settee, *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems* (Vernon, British Columbia: Charlton Publishing Ltd., 2013), 2.

³² Settee, *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 4-6. The term *Indigenous Knowledge Systems* is used in reference to First Peoples worldwide who, "...share common beliefs, practises, and knowledge, including cultural destruction caused by Western development."

³³ Tiwari, M2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement.

GUIDED TOOLKIT DESIGN

In framing and designing the toolkit, it was necessary to draw from precedents and be guided by different research paradigms. The complexity of the site considered in this thesis necessitates a more dynamic approach to the process of consultation, one that considers First Nation perspectives. While it was a difficult task to find applicable literature, a select few scholarly sources guided my work in developing a toolkit that could respond to the social, economic, and historical context of the site. Two works were especially helpful: *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems* by Priscilla Settee; and *Research is Ceremony, Indigenous Research Methods* by Shawn Wilson. These works provided insight into the existing basis of Indigenous knowledge.³⁴ Furthermore, the toolkit design was directly influenced by the methodology of Liz Sanders, as presented in her book: *Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design*.

Liz Sanders' approach, called *generative design research*, provided the initial structure from which to start design on the toolkit. Sanders' generative design research is a somewhat new co-creation method that is based on the idea that all people are creative.³⁵ Sanders book is not limited to a certain field, intended for people who work or aim to work in the front end of design processes (See Figure 2).³⁶ Co-creation is taking place in many spheres of society: within communities, between companies and their business partners, between companies and the people they serve and even within organizations.³⁷ The process is "interested in finding out what people's values and needs are in the future, and how these values and needs can be served by design through the development of new concepts for experiences, products or services."³⁸ Sanders' book was ideal for this thesis as it addressed the changing role of the designer as facilitator, one who can offer relevant experience and

Figure 2: The shape of the design development process has changed in response to the shifting foundations in the design research landscape.

³⁴Settee, Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems, 4-6. The term Indigenous Knowledge is used in reference to common, "...beliefs, practises, and knowledge, including cultural destruction caused by Western development," that First Peoples share around the world.

³⁵Sanders, Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design, 21-22, 32. Generative design research is most closely linked to the area of Participatory research.

³⁶ Ibid., 32; Image Source: Ibid., 22.

³⁷ Ibid., 25.

³⁸ Ibid., 156.

Sanders describes the experience of creative expression in terms of a “path of expression” (See Figure 3).³⁹ Her principles and theories on creative thinking are then put into action through generative design research tools and techniques aimed at setting participants on

Figure 3: The experience of the moment (now) is connected to past & future through memories and dreams. The path of expression (right) shows how a person’s awareness can be guided in steps by thinking first of the present, then of the past, then looking for underlying layers, in order to move toward the future.

this path of expression. For Sanders, it is crucial that the *toolkit* be based on a “...people-centred framework: *What people say, What people do and What people make.*”⁴⁰ It is the addition of the ‘what people make’ category however, that sets apart Sanders’ design research from those before her. ‘What people make’ is the most closely linked with the design practice and also provides the most opportunity to explore personal experience at a deeper level (See Figure 4); however, Sanders also suggests using these exercises in conjunction with ‘Say and Do tools/techniques.’⁴¹ This thesis adapted the use of such tools and techniques, employing “say”, “do”, and “make” tasks to engage participants in the research. Sanders’ book provided a contemporary reference and offered thorough instructions on a process that could be adapted to an architectural perspective.

Figure 4: Methods that study what people Say, Do, and Make help access different levels of knowledge.

The books on Indigenous knowledge and research, *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life*, *Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems* and *Research is Ceremony*, *Indigenous Research Methods*, were essential in creating a holistic framework and philosophy from which to base the techniques being developed for the toolkit. The framework derived from this literature included traditional, and largely universal, Indigenous values and teachings. One such notion is *collectivity*, as defined by Settee.⁴² She describes this notion (both central to

³⁹ Ibid., 24; Image Source: Ibid., 55.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 64.

⁴¹ Ibid., 66.

⁴² Settee, *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life*, *Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 6-7.

Indigenous being and a result of immemorial teachings) as a structure that creates “positive relationships within the extended community.”⁴³ Collectivity is about maintaining good relations where the community is considered an extension of the family, the animal world, and the natural environment.⁴⁴ This notion of collectivity and the commitment to maintaining relationships that are reciprocal (in contrast to the individualism common in Western paradigms) influence this thesis, in particular, the workshop component, as will be seen in the Chapter Three. It must be mentioned however that participant feedback and outside contributors also guided the toolkit (as would happen in a real project setting).

Storytelling is another technique that values the qualities of sharing and reciprocity and was operative in the workshop conducted as part of this thesis. Storytelling functions both as a literary technique as well as an oral tradition, used to impart knowledge to listeners and/or readers. Storytelling is an Indigenous cultural practise (that also extends across many cultures) and an alternative way to transmit knowledge. Stories also possess a powerful way of communicating values and life instruction to the listeners.⁴⁵ It is an approach that is “respectful, responsible, relevant, and reciprocal,” for all those involved and that can be attributed to various Aboriginal authors and researchers.⁴⁶ This circular approach involves a way of thinking and acting that keeps in mind the thinking and feeling of others. Storytelling as a methodology within this toolkit was meant to function as an inclusive tool, that also honoured, “Indigenous ways of knowing, understanding, and passing important life stories on to future generations.”⁴⁷

Storytelling as a literary tool in this thesis was informed by Shawn Wilson’s *Research is Ceremony*.⁴⁸ Inspired by his work, the two voices used in this thesis are intended to broaden the understanding or give more context on a single topic. Wilson’s use of different voices helps to build a relationship with the writer and accentuate the principles of relationality and relational accountability inherent to an Indigenous research paradigm.⁴⁹ Furthermore, Wilson explains that it is impossible to know who the reader might be or the relationship they might have to the writing. It is therefore essential, according to Wilson, to write from a common ground. Finding this common ground however, is one of the

⁴³ Ibid., 6.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 7.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 56.

⁴⁶ R. Barnhardt & A.O Kawagley. "Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Alaska Native Ways of Knowing." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36 (1): 2005; Settee, *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 51.

⁴⁷ Settee, *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 80.

⁴⁸ Shawn Willson, *Research is Ceremony, Indigenous Research Methods*. (Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2008), 6, 8, 22.

⁴⁹ Ibid. p 6, 62, 80, 97.

greatest struggles especially in cross-cultural communication.⁵⁰ In a communication process it is important that people can begin to understand things in a similar way. To avoid miscommunication, the reader must be able to follow the logic of what is told, similar points of reference, and to see what the writer sees.⁵¹

Wilson writes about relationality: “relationships do not merely shape reality, they *are* reality.”⁵² Relationality is about viewing ourselves as a result of the relationships (and not only relationships between people but also with the environment) that we engage in and are a part of.⁵³ Wilson quotes his friend Peter to whom he asks what being Indigenous means to him:

IT’S COLLECTIVE, IT’S A GROUP, IT’S A COMMUNITY. AND I THINK THAT’S THE BASIS FOR RELATIONALITY. THAT IS, IT’S BUILT UPON THE INTERCONNECTIONS, THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS, AND THAT BINDS THE GROUP...BUTS IT’S MORE THAN HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS. AND MAYBE THE BASIS OF THAT RELATIONSHIP AMONG INDIGENOUS PEOPLE IS THE LAND. IT’S OUR RELATIONSHIP TO THE LAND. THERE’S A SPIRITUAL CONNECTION TO THE LAND. SO IT’S ALL OF THOSE THINGS.⁵⁴

Relationality in this sense can also be seen in its connection to the notion of collectivity. The two terms evoke value in relationship building. Wilson employs the term “Relational accountability” to refer to the idea of respect of the researcher for the participant and the information they’ve shared. The research produced must be an accurate reflection of all participant voices, and reflect the researcher’s and participants’ common understanding of the topic.⁵⁵ This notion recalls Sanders’ design methods which emphasize the importance and impact of collaborative work.

The goal of this thesis is to prepare a new toolkit of engagement. The above research into Sanders’, Settees’ and Wilson’s works provided crucial guidance and the background for the toolkit conceived, and later implemented, as part of this thesis. As will be seen in Chapters 3 and 4, the toolkit was conceived to provide a place of respect and

50 Ibid. p 6-7.

51 Willson, Research is Ceremony, 7.

52 Ibid., 7.

53 Ibid., 80, 86.

54 Ibid.

55 Willson, Research is Ceremony, 101-2.

understanding of its research participants, as well as a place of relationship building, and, as much as possible, to support an honest portrayal of all those involved.

PERSONAL COMMENTARY: The Path that Brought Me Here

I include this personal voice section to emphasize the challenging and reflective nature of this research, hoping to create a sense of relationality with those reading this work who may wish to understand how I came to choose this topic and how I arrived at this point.

I grew up in a small town in central Ontario in a middle-income household. I was fortunate to always have a roof over my head but also a close relationship to the nature that surrounded me. My two siblings and I were always outside, where our parents would teach us about the different plants or animals that also lived there. I was raised by two very sensitive and compassionate people. My mother worked as a social worker for abused women for many years and she passed on to us an awareness of how we treat others, that our actions should reflect how we want to be treated. In this teaching was a principle of respect for all life around us and to always listen to our intuition.

Growing up in a small community, it was easier to see the connections among people and the impact these closer connections can have. From an early age into high school, we were encouraged to volunteer our time to community orientated projects and initiatives. Before studying architecture, I completed a degree in International Development with a focus on human rights and pursued involvements in Canada and abroad. These experiences confirmed that I wanted to continue to work with people and be involved in social justice.

I'm not sure when I first found out I had First Nations heritage, nor was I sure where to include this information here. Information I am still trying to place myself and also to learn more about my discovery. It was knowledge my Mémé felt uncomfortable revealing, so that our family still knows very little. It saddens me that she was ashamed of this connection and that societal values/norms made her shame acceptable in Canadian history. This is not the Canada I want to be a part of.

The Chaudière islands were identified early on as my point of interest, as a site closely located to where I live and often visit. When the site began to boast new signage for a proposed development, appearing in 2015, my interest was peaked. The site and proposed development quickly became a prominent topic, of an already ongoing conversation in Ottawa. I attended a panel discussion on the topic at Albert Island after the event was added to a local music festival line-up due to controversy of site use.⁵⁶ The panel included people from the Algonquin nation who were for, against and in-between, on the Zibi

⁵⁶ Arboretum Festival Talks 2015, Unceded Ottawa: The Algonquin and the Outaouais, Saturday August 22, 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5g79IPMrf6w>.

development. I started to wonder what the architect's role in this process was and how had the public, if at all, been included or consulted on the development. I also wondered if overlap in the two fields could exist here and where I might fit in this debate.

Chapter Two:

In Search of a New Toolkit for
The Chaudière, Albert and
Victoria Islands

The specific case study of the Chaudière, Victoria and Albert islands provided the necessary framework and point of reference from which to create the toolkit to then investigate. The islands hold great cultural, historical, and geographical importance, as a major transportation route, a sacred Aboriginal site and gathering space, neighbouring a natural wonder (the falls), and a former industrial hub – to name but a few characteristics. The complexity of interests in these islands is vast and includes but not limited to: two provinces and cities; aboriginal people (locally and nationally); environmental groups/advocates; historians and archaeologists; two provincial power companies; site developers; a crown corporation; and various members from the public (See Figure 5). This diversity of views has created controversy and frustration for some, over the future of the islands in the wake of the proposed Zibi development. The following work aims to respond to this frustration from a more positive place: from a starting point in the engagement process, or even from a place where the entire process could begin again.

Figure 5: Stakeholder Map created to show the connections of the stakeholders in the site. It also emphasizes the far reaching interest and complexity of the site.

The Chaudière, Victoria and Albert islands are situated on contested and un-ceded Algonquin land on the Ottawa River. For many in the Algonquin Nation (as well as First Nations people across Canada) the traditional territory which includes and surrounds the Islands, is sacred land.⁵⁷ The Chaudière and Albert islands are set for a future mixed-use development, namely – residential, commercial and communal – entitled *Zibi* and owned

⁵⁷ CBC News, "Ontario Municipal Board Dismisses Appeal Over Zibi Development," November 17, 2015, accessed April 12, 2016, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/omb-appeal-zibi-development-1.3323362>.

by the Windmill Development Group Ltd. The development also extends to land along the north shore of the Ottawa River, within Quebec, and, with soil decontamination recently completed there, ground-breaking is set for the fall 2016. The advances in the project's schedule were made possible after the latest legal opposition – a zoning challenge appealed to the Divisional Court – was quelled.⁵⁸ The case was brought forward by renowned architect, Douglas Cardinal, after the Ontario Municipal Board dismissed an earlier appeal on behalf of Cardinal and five additional appellants, filed in December of 2014.⁵⁹ This chain of events started after the initial sale of the land by the National Capital Commission to Windmill in January 2015 and then it was rezoned by the City of Ottawa in October 2015 to allow for Windmill's development plans.⁶⁰ Many have taken side with Cardinal, as attested by a number of peaceful protests and an open request to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to save the islands from being developed in this way.⁶¹ It must also be mentioned here however, there are some who do agree with the development plans, and some can be seen represented in an advisory panel made up of Algonquin-Anishinabe from various Algonquin and First Nations communities called, Memengweshii Council.⁶² Furthermore, there have been many public events to rally people both in opposition and alliance to the project creating a divide among people.

⁵⁸ Kate Porter, "Zoning Challenge of Zibi Development on Ottawa River Rejected Again," CBC News, May 26, 2016, accessed June 14, 2016, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/zibi-development-zoning-challenge-1.3602056>.

⁵⁹ CBC News, "Ontario Municipal Board Dismisses Appeal Over Zibi Development."

⁶⁰ Matt Cicero, "Condominium Development Threatens Protection of Algonquin Sacred Site," Rabble.ca, June 29, 2016, accessed July 1, 2016, <http://rabble.ca/news/2016/06/condominium-development-threatens-protection-algonquin-sacred-site>

⁶¹ Matt Cicero, "Condominium Development Threatens Protection of Algonquin Sacred Site."

⁶² Memengweshii Council, "Open Letter from Memengweshii Council," Anishinabek News, June 23, 2015, accessed February 18, 2016, <http://anishinabeknews.ca/2015/06/23/open-letter-from-memengweshii-council/>.

Figure 5: Drawing of mass media coverage of the Zibi project.

Figure 7. 1:7500m scale of islands; showing surrounding buildings of significance.

PERSONAL COMMENTARY: The Research Process

During this thesis work, I often found myself empathising with my interlocutors. I also found myself in a constant state of reflection, questioning what my position was in all of this (and questioned by others I encountered): was I a leader, an interpreter, a facilitator, or a gatherer of information and people? I struggled with defining this role throughout. Was it even right for me to be conducting such research? I would often even ask people what they thought of the research, I suppose in some way looking for validation. I was largely encouraged; they would say it was important to investigate such things, but I was also advised to be aware and cognisant of the role I would be taking on.

The process also helped point me to areas of contention – such as the consultation that had or had not taken place. There seemed to be a lot of strong opinions, yet some confusion as to the intention of the consultation process that the Zibi Developers were employing. The notion of ‘consulting’ kept surfacing: in a University course lecture about the growing agency of Indigenous communities and the need for consultation from architects in these cases; in the Ontario Municipal Board court case against the development; and in conversations with members of the public and Algonquin Nation, prior to the interviews.⁶³ Many of my realizations have been a result of this more informal information gathering and have helped to design and adapt the tools and techniques used in this thesis work.

⁶³ Milette, Daniel. 2016. "Indigenous Architecture in Canada." *Guest Lecture*. Ottawa, February 5.

HISTORICAL TIMELINE OF SITE: FROM SACRED TO ZIBI

Figure 8. Timeline of Events in the account of Chaudiere, Albert & Victoria Islands future.

Sources: (CBC News 2014); (Ottawa n.d.); (Cardinal n.d.); (BOZIKOVIC 2016); (Pimadjwowin 2009); (Ritchie 2106); (Butler 2015); (Asinabka n.d.); (Bond 1984); (deVolpi 1964).

AN APPROACH TO PRELIMINARY AND FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH

The final destiny of the Chaudière and Albert islands site is still in flux, as nothing has as yet been built there. An approach was needed that responded to this fluidity. The scope of the thesis has therefore had to adapt to new information and knowledge gained along the way. It is for this reason it was important to be open-minded, observant, and rigorous when looking for information pertaining to the current and/or future status of the islands. It has been necessary to be on alert for different workshops, hearings, meetings or even protests— in gathering information related to this topic. The islands are part of an ongoing story that continues to evolve and while a lot of information has been made available in the media, it is sometimes hard to decipher. Questions were raised about: where/whose culture and heritage were being represented in the project and to what extent; what were the plans on consultation and who was being consulted; was every Algonquin community consulted; what were some of the concessions/deals being offered to the Algonquin communities; were they meaningful; was it important/necessary that all were on board. This is why it was essential to seek out other avenues of information. The research process has involved an ongoing and on the ground approach to gathering both information and knowledge.

Various media outlets and publications were useful sources of information about the site and related development questions. These sources also helped in constructing a timeline of events and deciphering the current status of the islands. Reviewing various media publications and Zibi development documents also helped to produce an outline of what was being written in regards to the islands. This process also helped to identify potential participants for the semi-structured interviews and workshop.

I also sought out academics and professionals to gain preliminary information and insight into prevalent opinions and beliefs regarding the islands – both past, present and future. The inclusion of human participants made it necessary to quickly develop a methodology to submit to the University's Research and Ethics Board for approval (See Appendices A, B, C, and H for most of the application documentation). Upon gaining institutional ethics clearance, I was able to broaden the scope of feedback, and to talk to more people about the thesis work. Conversation could begin with individuals at different public events and in some cases, allowing new relationships to develop. This led to one-on-one conversations, to sitting in on public lectures, to a community classroom talk, and to participation in a workshop on Indigenous housing (a list of exact events is included in Figure 9). Peers and visiting architectural critics were also very influential in giving feedback and criticism in the development of the thesis work.

PIN-UP – peers, director, advisor

MEETING W PROFESSOR WILLIAMS (FROM GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT)– to talk about his course: Rethinking Urban Cultural Landscape(s) Exploring Urban Culture, Place & Identity – Past, Present and Future

MEETING WITH INDUSTRIAL DESIGNER PROFESSOR– discussed research methodology, possible design methods

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON LEBRETON FLATS

PIN-UP

LECTURE ON INDIGENOUS ARCHITECTURE - Daniel Milette

DESK CRIT WITH VISITING LECTURER AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ARCHITECT - Quilian Riano

INDIGENOUS HOUSING AND INTEGRATIVE DESIGN, SEMINAR & PANEL DISCUSSION

MEET WITH A COUPLE OF INDIVIDUALS FROM ALGONQUIN COMMUNITY- Talked about my thesis work and ideas.

PIN-UP– discussion on images: impressions, meaning, what to include, what overlaps

COMMUNITY CLASSROOM: DIVIDE AND CONQUER: FEDERAL INDIAN POLICIES- with Director of Policy & Research for the Algonquin Nation Secretariat, Peter Di Gangi

COLLOQUIUM 2

MEETING WITH ARCHITECT BILL SEMPLE– discuss his work with indigenous communities around the world and my Thesis work.

ZIBI PRESENTATION - on consultation work, and ethical principles

ABORIGINAL ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN PANEL - prepared by NCC for Aboriginal Day

JAN. 13/16

JAN. 19/16

JAN. 27/16

FEB. 5/16

MAR. 22/16

MAR. 24/16

END OF MAR./16

APR. 6/16

APR. 6/16

MAY 7, 2016

JUNE 21, 2016

Figure 4: List of events attended. Red Notebook as a retainer for all information gathered.

Chapter Three:

Gathering Knowledge to Define
and Design a Toolkit

The early stages of this work produced an organized chart of data (See Figure 10).⁶⁴ Two different objectives emerged from this: to gain more information and insight from those involved, and to create and explore alternative process for developing this land. It also became clear that two phases of work would be needed: an interview phase (Phase One) and a workshop phase (Phase Two). The Phases were further defined in the chart, with necessary information broken down according to: phase and objective, best approach for data collection, logistics, and content.⁶⁵ Under *logistics* for example, different questions were identified about the potential participants, such as: Who should be engaged and why? Should interactions be with an individual or a group? Where should the meeting take place? What kind of information is being sought out? What are some questions that could be asked? The chart helped to organise potential options, thoughts, as well as a rationale for the toolkit. The chart was re-organized several times, to reflect strategy decisions made before moving forward with the ethics application. The First Phase, would gain insight and information on the site context, as well as inform Phase Two; this phase would take the form of semi-structure interviews. Phase Two would be an interactive workshop that would bring to light alternative design for future use.

Figure 10: The chart helped to map out the toolkit.

After broadly identifying the two phases and their objectives, the research reviewed different visions for the site, including that of the *Zibi* development; the vision of late Algonquin Elder William Commanda, from Kitigan Zibi Reserve, who saw the islands as a

⁶⁴ Carleton University Professor, Lois Frankel was instrumental in guiding the researcher to various design methods.

⁶⁵ These terms were created by the researcher to organise questions/information arising and needing to be organised.

place of healing and gathering; and *Free the Falls*, a group who wants to see the Chaudière Falls undammed. These differing visions pondered the question: “might a kind of compromise exist among them?” The idea of an “architecture of compromise” was briefly explored. It emphasized the possibility of a threshold that might exist between differing opinions, in pursuing alternative future use for the islands.

Nonetheless, as the work progressed, the idea of an architecture of compromise and mediation became problematic. There was no compromise to find. It felt disingenuous to ask First Nations people who would be participating, to compromise on land that was so important. Despite the positive power of compromise in many situations, a new process deciding on the site’s future could not rely on compromise. A truly new approach, would involve the inclusion of indigenous belief or practise. As registered by the title of this thesis, the thesis shifted to become a search for a toolkit of engagement. The term “toolkit” seemed appropriate to the creative, yet practical, nature of the architecture profession. “Toolkit” implies a collection of different tools chosen and in some way sculpted by the craftswoman to reflect intended use or purpose. This is what was starting to happen.

After continued conversations about the proposed work, the islands, the development, and the deeply connected history, some changes were made. Initially only Chaudière and Albert islands (as they were implicated in immediate development plans) were part of the thesis work to maintain a more manageable scope of work, it soon became clear that Victoria Island needed to be included as well. To only look at two islands and exclude one would be a negation of the islands’ shared meaning and connection as a whole.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Figure 11: Research methodology diagram.

PERSONAL COMMENTARY: Finding Inspiration in Conversation

I had chosen a site; I had determined the direction of developing a toolkit of engagement.

Phase One would act as an information builder and contributor to Phase Two; however, I still needed to determine the context for Phase Two. As I mentioned earlier on, the consultation process surfaced as a pain point during this phase. A studio session with a visiting architect, Bill Semple, raised an important question about my toolkit: *at what point would the toolkit, for Phase Two, be used for consultation during a development?*⁶⁶ The answer was: the beginning. Starting here also corresponded to Sander's sentiments that the earlier, "co-creation occurs, the greater and broader the likely impact."⁶⁷ The answer seemed so clear, it felt like it hit me in the face upon realization. We discussed the context of Phase Two further, answering questions like: how could the workshop concept be more clearly defined? What exactly did the workshop ask participants to respond to? We talked about Phase Two being based on Indigenous practises of consensus building, and how this could set a precedent for everything else that would happen on the site, including redevelopment. In fact, Phase Two would become a symbolic new beginning. It's goal, now, would be not to redesign the whole area, nor to prepare a full counter-proposal to the Zibi project, but rather, quite simply: to design the first structure that would be built on the site. This first structure would house a gathering of people who would have the first conversation about the Chaudière Falls site. By beginning a process based on understanding and respect, a more positive, constructive and responsive architecture could result.

⁶⁶ Studio Session with Bill Semple & Thesis Advisor, Janine Debanné; Carleton University, Architecture Building. I am very grateful to Bill for his insight and experience in contributing to the discussion and development of my Thesis Toolkit.

⁶⁷ Sanders, Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design, 28.

PHASE ONE: Semi-Structured Interviews

1.1 Overview

Phase One provided an overview of the various stakeholders involved in the study, as well as insights into the relationships among them. Information gathered from this phase also offered some understanding of the public consultation in this case, and helped define the framework for the activities of Phase Two. For example, using the toolkit at the beginning of a public engagement process as a way to build relationships and consensus.

Phase One marked the first interaction with participants and employed *Say* (interview notes and transcripts), *Do* (photos and observation notes) and *Make* (illustrative/annotative map) techniques.⁶⁸ The goal was to interview 3-5 stakeholders in the site. This pool of people was drawn from: Algonquin Nation, local Architects, Windmill Development Group, and potentially, the National Capital Commission or Free the Falls. This number was chosen to give a sample of the various parties involved and related to the study, but still manageable for the scope of work. The participants were contacted and asked to participate via phone or email.

The conversations took on the form of a semi-structured interview lasting, minimally, 30 minutes. Participants were given the choice of being audio-recorded and to remain anonymous.

1.2 Interviews with Participants: Questions and Actions

Participants were asked to answer a series of questions, some of which were accompanied by visual aids. The choice of questions also touched upon Sanders' notion of the path of *expression* (See again, Figure 3); the questions were meant to help participants connect to past experiences with the site, as well as to the present and the future.

To start the interaction, each individual was asked to print out one of two different scaled maps (See Figure 12) of the islands, and to illustrate prior to the interview meeting. The map tool was employed as a *sensitizing* technique, described by Sanders' as, "Insight into

Figure 12: The first map is at 1:2500 & the second 1:7500.

⁶⁸ Sanders, *Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design*, 199.

the deeper layers of understanding requires that the participant has been thoroughly involved in the problem or situation for some time.”⁶⁹ The maps were therefore to help the individual to start thinking about their experience with islands and the interview prior to meeting.

On the day of the interview, participants were asked eight questions. The questions contained flexibility so that conversations could lean towards participants’ areas of interest (See Appendix D for list of questions). The second and third questions involved choosing three-to-five images from a total of twenty, to answer. The challenge here was to create a deck of “associational image cards.” I chose the images based on various themes associated with the islands in collective memory. For example, I selected an older image of the site: a watercolour of the falls, pre-damming both as a direct representation of the location and one of its most defining features but also because of the image represented the past, the site in its natural state. My aim with the images was to help each participant formulate his or her opinions on the site. The idea was: in choosing the images, participants could give an indication of what visions he or she might have for the site – what qualities, what feelings, what atmospheres – he or she believed were inherent to the site. The images were to enable a more open-ended conversation. I also hoped, with the image cards, to add a more comfortable and playful element to the interview.

The interviews were also intended to gain a better sense of what activities, events, rituals or functions were felt to be appropriate for the site. The images therefore needed in some way to anticipate all of these concepts or at least present enough diversity from which to choose. It was difficult however to choose images that were not leading in some way. This project recognizes these inevitable flaws, and the fact that the images contained biases. The strategy for correcting this problem was to include images from different categories. Some images were more atmospheric and abstract, while others showed more realistic scenarios including buildings that might be built on the site. My peers and thesis advisor tested the images in a mock interview setting, and helped pare the set down so as not to have too many overlapping themes. Likely and possible outcomes were determined: that the islands be a busy place, a quiet place, a place of gathering, a place of solitude, a place of joy, a place of reconciliation, a place of mourning, a place of distraction, a place of healing, a place of buildings, a place that is unbuilt, a place that is connected to the surrounding city (Ottawa and Gatineau), a place that is connected to the surrounding environment, a place that is isolated, a place that provides access to the water, a place that provides views to the water (See Appendix E for a look at all images).

⁶⁹ Sanders, *Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design*, 55.

PHASE ONE: Findings

2.1 Overview

Five people were interviewed. The interviewees' included, in order of conversation date (first to last):

- *Elder, Kitigan Zibi Reserve, (chose to remain anonymous)*
- *Architect and Professor at Carleton University, John Cook*
- *Indigenous Architect, Douglas Cardinal*
- *Project Manager, Dan Clement, Windmill Development Group Ltd.*
- *Chief of Kitigan Zibi Reserve, Gilbert Whiteduck*

Of the five participants only two were audio-recorded, Douglas Cardinal and John Cook. One interview had to be conducted over the phone, due to the inability to meet in person. Only one individual chose the option to remain anonymous; an additional person was interviewed and ended up withdrawing their participation from the study for personal reasons. Themes were drawn from each of the conversations and incorporated in map drawings to illustrate the findings of the interaction in addition to a written commentary of each interviewee.

2.2 Interview with an Elder

The interview with this individual was the first. He did not regularly use the internet, all conversations prior to meeting were over the phone. This also meant that he was unable to engage with the first tool: the two different scaled maps to illustrate or write on. The two maps were therefore brought to the interview and used as an aid in conversation. He was invited to illustrate some of the things he talked about on the map, but seemed uncomfortable doing so. He did not mind however, that the researcher did so as he spoke on different topics related to the site. He was very interested in the image-aided questions, and closely looked at them all before choosing. He tended to choose photos that directly reference the ideas he was trying to convey rather than more abstract associations to his thoughts.

The Elder belongs to the circle of Elders from the closest Algonquin reserve (Kitigan Zibi) to the Islands; and as such, it is the community often involved in ceremony on the Islands. He has therefore spent much time on Victoria Island (the island of most significance to him presently and historically) particularly for ceremony. He shared some of these experiences and his knowledge of the area. He was happy that the northern shoreline was going to be cleaned. Although there is a defined border that includes the islands within the province of Ontario, he emphasized the importance of the land being seen as a whole, not divided. He emphasized the importance of the dependence and ability to work together within the Elders' circle, as this is often how decisions are reached. He also talked about the land as un-ceded and the importance of resource sharing for the future of First Nations communities.

Figure 13: Image answers for Question One at top, Question Two below.

Q1:

Q2:

2.3 Interview with John Cook

The interview with John Cook, partner in the Ottawa architecture firm GRC (Griffiths Rankin Cook Architects) followed my plan more closely. As an architect with a particularly sensitive appreciation of the Chaudière Falls site for Indigenous people and Canada at large, Cook offered much information. He was the only person to complete the first question and illustration, returning the larger scale map upon meeting for the interview. He chose the larger map because he saw the Islands as having great importance, and significance to the public even emphasizing its extension to an international level. While acknowledging the important Indigenous history, he also commented on the multiple histories that exist here. He began to unpack the different layers he saw for the site (and illustrated on his map): a site that connects the wildness/nature to the structured civil centres; a site that connects industry to the public; a site with multiple geographical characteristics and history; a site that appeals to the senses (sound of the falls mentioned). A cultural landscape.

After discussing the map, the interview questions were introduced. John Cook is well versed in the history and controversy of the site, and easily weighed in on it all. His interests in the Islands led him to reflect on its current use/plans, and its immense potential as a destination within an urban centre, the beauty to be witnessed.

The second question, which focused on what some hopes or visions would be for the future, he chose images that reflected more minimal development and preserving the natural qualities of the site; perhaps more temporal, vital interventions. There was an emphasis on the benefit and exploration that can take place when there is less structured/organised activity in a space. He chose images such as the greenhouse and the eagle, to reflect the recovery of plants and as an indicator of land and water in good health.

The conversation continued into discussion on the sale of the land, its rezoning, the role of the NCC and city in these decisions and consultation with the public.

Figure 15: Image answers for Question One at top, Question Two below.

Q1:

Q2:

2.4 Interview with Douglas Cardinal

As both a prominent architect and public advocate against the development, Douglas Cardinal offered a wealth of information and knowledge based on his experiences. He spoke on his connection to the falls and the surrounding land as Anishinaabe. He described his people and the matriarchal society that traditionally existed: a loving, caring environment and one in which *you spoke from your heart*. He emphasized the significance of the Chaudière Falls location where rivers meet from different directions. This location was therefore a meeting point for many people traditionally, and connects him here.

Cardinal chose cards that were more natural in their reflections such as the eagle and the Falls for his first image question. The Eagle because it was well populated along the river in the past, and it represents the east, “...people from the East would come there [Falls area] to go up the Ottawa River and give offering to the Great Kettle.”⁷⁰ He chose an image of a wolf in the brush and one of a canoe as embodiments of, “...the beauty of what the Creator makes, which is nature itself.”⁷¹ He expanded on his long history with this area and his hopes for a cultural space that supports peace, balance and harmony. A place to “...teach to love the earth as we do”.⁷² He expressed his disappointment that the land was not returned to parkland (as is outlined in Greber’s plan) under then NCC representative, John Baird. He seemed to hold much hope that the Islands would be returned to Indigenous people. He also expressed his very deep belief that the sacred site need be protected, pointing to International Human Rights Law, the right to practise ceremony. It is the sacredness of the site that keeps him fighting for it, as he said, “...[we] can’t be separated from the land...we are the land.”⁷³

Figure 17: Image answers for Question One at top, Question Two below.

⁷⁰ Douglas Cardinal, *Phase One: Semi-Structured Interview*, Douglas Cardinal Architect Office.

⁷¹ Cardinal, *Phase One*.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

Q1:

Q2:

INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ILLUSTRATED:
DOUGLAS CARDINAL, ARCHITECT

2.5 Interview with Dan Clement

As Sr. Director of Project Delivery for Zibi, Windmill Development Group Ltd., Dan shares the role of project delivery for the buildings in both Ontario and Quebec. He is in charge of executing the vision of the Master Plan for Zibi. This means he is involved in every aspect of the 'development' of the total 6 phases. The conversation began talking about this connection and the complexity of the project because it spans into two provinces. He spoke on the challenges of this and the need to consult with different ministries, both cities and the NCC, to name a few.

For the first question he spoke about the project as building a community and the projects inclusion of its historical past. He chose a picture of a work of architecture as a representation of the modern architecture that is planned for the islands. The complexity was again mentioned and represented in one of his image choices. He was very interested and receptive to using the images in his responses. When asked about the future, he spoke about honouring Algonquin friends in the project and also including the industrial history in moving forward. He also mentioned the new housing, as well as the playful and fun character of events that the development would bring.

The remainder of the conversation touched on the consultation that was done in different Algonquin communities and recognizing the culture and history that exists here. The Master Plan and its inclusion of One Planet, and its 10 basic principles, which the development is to adhere to. Dan also shared some of his previous experience in which he was involved in socially impactful projects.

Figure 19: Image answers for Question One at top, Question Two below.

one planet principles

8 development districts

provincial border

proposed public parks

potential adaptive re-use

health & happiness

equity & local economy

culture & community

land use & wildlife

sustainable water

local & sustainable food

sustainable materials

sustainable transport

zero wastezero

zero carbon

QUEBEC

ONTARIO

Q1:

Q2:

Q3:

Q4:

Q5:

Q6:

Q7:

Q8:

Q9:

Q10:

Q11:

Q12:

Q13:

Q14:

Q15:

Q16:

Q17:

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

Q21:

Q22:

Q23:

Q24:

Q25:

Q26:

Q27:

Q28:

Q29:

Q30:

Q31:

Q32:

Q33:

Q34:

Q35:

Q36:

Q37:

Q38:

Q39:

Q40:

Q41:

Q42:

Q43:

Q44:

Q45:

Q46:

Q47:

Q48:

Q49:

Q50:

Q51:

Q52:

Q53:

Q54:

Q55:

Q56:

Q57:

Q58:

Q59:

Q60:

Q61:

Q62:

Q63:

Q64:

Q65:

Q66:

Q67:

Q68:

Q69:

Q70:

Q71:

Q72:

Q73:

Q74:

Q75:

Q76:

Q77:

Q78:

Q79:

Q80:

Q81:

Q82:

Q83:

Q84:

Q85:

Q86:

Q87:

Q88:

Q89:

Q90:

Q91:

Q92:

Q93:

Q94:

Q95:

Q96:

Q97:

Q98:

Q99:

Q100:

INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ILLUSTRATED:
DAN CLEMENT, WINDMILL DEVELOPMENT GROUP

2.6 Interview with Gilbert Whiteduck

As Chief and a prominent voice from Kitigan Zibi, Whiteduck straight away made the connection to the late William Commanda and his vision. He discussed his own openness to engage in respectful dialogue with the NCC and Windmill on different occasions about the Islands. He mentioned he found it limiting to have to negotiate with these two bodies, and stated that “our goal is to safeguard the island.”⁷⁴ To do otherwise, Whiteduck felt, would be a compromise of position. He explained that he came forward to say he was against the development plans. He added that he respected the decision of others not to, but he did not agree. He spoke of a vision of the area as one for all Canadians, and that reconciliation is beyond just words and involves action too. Whiteduck further discussed the significance of the Islands and how the land came to be viewed in its current status, as private.

Whiteduck drew from his connection to the land and for the first image-aided question, he chose the falls. The falls reflected the natural state and connection to the history of his people. Historically, it is a place where Algonquin people would have to portage, and as such there was also a burial area nearby. People would give offering here but were forced to stop. In discussing the future, he re-iterated the vision for the islands to be a public space, a gathering place. An echo of William Commanda’s vision, a spiritual place.

Gilbert Whiteduck spoke with such conviction and deep interest, there was much to take in. The conversation drifted to the topic of consultation, and his sense that no meaningful concessions (within a larger time frame) had ever been made to Indigenous people on a site with such a special place in their history and culture. The development offered opportunity but he felt it was compromising for the shorter term benefit it offered. He felt a clearer process could be possible, in which limitations are revealed from the beginning and negotiated. Gilbert expressed his hope for an Indigenous centre on Victoria Island, under First Nation stewardship, which could be a place of peace and true reconciliation among nations.

Figure 21: Image answers for Question One at top, Question Two below.

⁷⁴ Gilbert Whiteduck, *Phase One: Semi-Structured Interview*, Phone Conversation, May 18, 2015.

INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ILLUSTRATED:
GILBERT WHITEDUCK, KITIGAN ZIBI CHIEF

Q1:

Q2:

* approximate location as identified by interviewee

PHASE ONE: Semi-Structured Interview Analysis

Question Overview & Mapping Diagram

PRIOR TO INTERVIEW:

1 Question: Familiarity with Content

- to engage people in thinking about site & personal experience or connection, prior to interaction

The maps were not an effective tool, with only one person actually completing the task; this may have been different however, if the maps were delivered in person. One individual did not have internet.

The image aided questions were better received and helped to open-up conversation with interviewees. Most people were curious and interested in the photos, particularly the abstract ones.

Image Sources: Researcher;

INTERVIEW:

2 Questions: Image-Aided Answers

- images were intended to help connect interviewee connect to past & present experiences with the site; also to think about future
- also intended to add a light & fun element to interview

INTERVIEW:

5 Questions: Verbal Answers

- to learn from interviewees how they felt about the site: past, present, future
- what activities, events or functions were felt to be appropriate

Chapter Four:

Gathering People to Design a
Place to Gather

The workshop component of this public engagement process followed the mapping, interviews with image selection exercise. The workshop mandate was to design a new starting point (at the front end of design) for the process of public engagement when developing significant lands. An attempt at an alternative process, the workshop brought participants together to collectively envision not a master plan, but a first building, for the site. More specifically, the participants would design the first gathering space on the site, either a temporary or permanent space, where a real and open discussion about the site's future could take place. The first building for the first conversation.⁷⁵ Phase Two drew upon practises like collectivity, which as mentioned earlier, places emphasis on maintaining positive and shared relations, that can be extended out to a wider circle.⁷⁶ The workshop similarly reflects Wilson's, relationality, and specifically, the connection here to the environment/land. He elaborates on this relationship:

THE SPACE AND THEREFORE THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN PEOPLE OR BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THEIR
ENVIRONMENT IS SEEN AS SACRED A KEY CONCEPT
WITHIN MANY INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' SPIRITUALITY.
BY REDUCING THE SPACE BETWEEN THINGS, WE ARE
STRENGTHENING THE RELATIONSHIP THEY SHARE.
AND THIS BRINGING THINGS TOGETHER SO THAT
THEY SHARE THE SAME SPACE IS WHAT CEREMONY
IS ABOUT. THIS IS WHY RESEARCH ITSELF IS A
SACRED CEREMONY WITHIN AN INDIGENOUS
RESEARCH PARADIGM, AS IT IS ALL ABOUT BUILDING
RELATIONSHIPS AND BRIDGING THIS SACRED
SPACE.⁷⁷

The design of a space of gathering also pays tribute to the history of the site as a gathering place, and seemed an appropriate and respectful connection to make, in moving forward.

⁷⁵ Studio Session with Bill Semple & Thesis Advisor, Janine Debanné; Carleton University, Architecture Building.

⁷⁶ Settee, Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems, 6-7.

⁷⁷ Willson, Research is Ceremony, 86-7.

PERSONAL COMMENTARY: Defining the Architects [My] Place

I struggled in defining my role within Phase Two. I mentioned earlier it was something asked of me: what authority do I (the architect) have in prompting or organizing consultation on Indigenous territory? I sought the advice and guidance of so many others precisely because I did not see myself as an authority. In the role of architect, I see myself as an agent who brings people together, lends expertise, helps people reach deeper levels of creativity and understanding. The listener and learner. The one to work with participants, to bring together, to start from a positive place and move forward based on a respectful, responsible, relevant, and reciprocal relationship.

Throughout this research, I was often asked if I was with the developers or this side or that. It was only as a neutral outside interest that individuals often felt more comfortable talking with me. Could an Indigenous person be better suited to do this? Yes, I am certain they could be. Does this mean there is no room to explore alternative processes for land development? Much room exists for the dominant western culture to learn from and adapt Indigenous knowledge. Canadian history is at an interesting and defining time and non-Indigenous Canadians can choose to do things differently than in the past, and help move toward a different future. But what will this look like, and how will a common ground be reached in order to do so?

PHASE TWO: Creative Workshop Framework

3.1 Overview

Phase Two acted as a simulated workshop of an Architectural engagement session, with the participation of key stakeholders in the site's future. In this case, the land recognized as un-ceded Algonquin territory, necessitated the presence and key involvement of the Algonquin communities (there are 10 in total across Ontario and Quebec) in the process of any kind of development. In a real world iteration of this process, representatives from each community would participate in the workshop; however, for the purpose of this research, a small sampling of available and willing people provided a valuable substitute.

The workshop was originally set to take place at the Architecture Building, at Carleton University, in a small and comfortable classroom with lots of daylight. This type of room maintained a connection to the outdoors and reflected an openness of space, as well as, conversation for the event. The whole interaction was expected to take place over the course of two hours, from 6:30-8:30 p.m., to allow participants time after work to reach the location.

The participants were asked to sign a written consent form (See Appendix F) to participate, and to verify consent on anonymity and for photographs to be taken. If consent was not given by an individual however, the event could still take place without photos or identity being revealed after. Refreshments and food were provided for the participants.⁷⁸ A parting gift of a beeswax candle (made by the researcher) and loose leaf-tobacco – a gesture of respect for the participants' time and as an offering of appreciation – was also planned. This cultural practise was suggested during a conversation had with an Algonquin Elder. She emphasized that giving tobacco is an important act to include when asking individuals to share their thoughts and time (especially that of Elders). This suggestion also prompted an addendum to the ethics application, as is required any time something is changed or altered significantly from original plans. An addendum was created, noting this change and submitted to ethics for approval, and was quickly accepted.

The workshop explored a series of *Say, Do, Make*, activities that built upon each other as they progressed. The first activity included introduction and storytelling, followed by idea generating, and ending with a creative design exercise. Prior to meeting, each individual was given specific instructions via email, about the workshop and what to bring.

⁷⁸ I wish to thank my mother & thesis advisor for their financial contribution to the refreshments & parking.

3.2 Introduction and Warm-up Exercise (30-40 minutes)

The workshop started with a brief introduction of the researcher and workshop aid; followed by an overview of thesis objectives. These objectives included: outlining a toolkit for engagement and exploring an alternative process of consultation centred around indigenous perspective and knowledge. Furthermore, this involved trying out these different tools as a means of expression and gathering information, as well as a way to build consensus.

The warm-up exercise took shape in a talking circle format. The talking circle offered a respectful space in which to share information to the group and honours every voice that is present. The circle also helped to build a common understanding among the group from which to move forward in the workshop. This task was also intended as a way to engage participants in thinking about the site based on past and present experiences.

The first round of the talking circle began with introduction and ice-breaker. This was followed by a second round; participants had been asked to bring *an object from an important gathering they were a part of or something that reminded them of a time/place*. Each individual then had time to share their story and reasoning for their choice to the rest of the group.⁷⁹ This was an important part of the workshop, in which the story-teller shared some insight into their own experience and what they felt was an important consideration when gathering with other people. During this time, important themes or key words were

Figure 24: Photo from the play back of ideas, from the first exercise in the workshop. New ideas are added by the two additional participants.

recorded on sticky notes. The researcher then played back these ideas, one by one to the group as they were placed on the wall, to be considered (Figure 17). A last round of the circle continued, in which participants were asked to contribute any additional thoughts: to create a collective vision of important qualities. The colours were not representative of an underlying theme but merely arbitrary here. The group was then asked to look at the wall where the descriptive words were posted, and if they would remove any words that did not belong in the vision of

⁷⁹ Quilian Riano, Studio Workshop Session, Carleton University, Architecture Building.

a gathering space. This left two sets of grouped words on the wall: desirable, and “do not belong”. Those words served as reminders for the exercise that followed.

3.3 Creative Design Exercise (20-40 minutes)

The workshop was conceived to offer participants a way to explore deeper meaning and purpose for the site. Going back to Sanders’ convivial toolbox, *What people say, What people do and What people make*, the workshop event proper focused on the *what people make* side.⁸⁰ The exercise was also meant to appeal to the artistic side of the participant. Settee describes the importance of this connection,

“ART IS A GREAT TEACHER OF HUMAN VALUES SUCH AS PATIENCE AND TRUST, AS WELL AS SCIENTIFIC ONES, SUCH AS BALANCE, COLOUR, TECHNIQUE, AND CREATIVITY. ART IS NOT SIMPLY ART, BUT IT HAS A DEEPLY SPIRITUAL AND SACRED PURPOSE WITHIN THE NATIVE WORLD.”⁸¹

In this exercise, participants each retrieved one of the boxes provided (see Figure 13). Participants were then instructed to choose at least five materials from a table full of

Figure 25: Boxes for collecting materials; lids collectively make up the site plan, as it exists presently.

Figure 26: Key card used to write down materials and their meaning.

Legend Key Card	
Material Name	What does it represent?

provided materials (see Figure 14). Selection was based on what they believed belonged on the site. Participants also wrote down what the material meant, creating a legend of sorts, on a card provided to them. Each box was empty inside except for this key card, used to record participant rationale for choosing different materials (See Figure). Materials provided included synthetic materials like: mirrored paper, foam (red, yellow, green, black, white) and clay. Natural materials are also provided: coloured yarn, pieces of wood, feathers, clay, birch bark and dried cedar.

⁸⁰ Sanders, *Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design*, 66-7.

⁸¹ Settee, *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 67.

After a period of approximately fifteen minutes, each participant revealed the materials they had chosen to the group. Participants were then asked to share with the group: “which two materials do you think are the most important? And why?” Finally, upon hearing each response and explanation, participants were asked: “if you had to choose one material from someone else’s box, what might you choose? And why?” The materials chosen

then become the palette from which to build this first gathering space.

3.4 Closing and Reflection (15 minutes)

to trigger a wider variety of responses.⁸² The reflections were intended to provide the researcher with additional feedback about the workshop session.

PHASE TWO: Workshop Outcomes

4.1 Overview

The workshop took place at Odawa Native Friendship Centre, August 4, 2016, starting at 6:50 p.m. This change in venue (from the location of Carleton) occurred after a conversation with the Centre's Director, who offered the space as a possible familiar setting; it was also more closely located to the bridges connecting to Quebec (and the site) as well as the downtown core. The location was more accessible. A secondary session on the following Wednesday, August 10, 2015, in a conference room at Minwaashin Lodge, was run to supplement the workshop.

A NOTE ABOUT PARTICIPANTS:

In planning the workshop, it was a difficult task to arrange a day that worked for all potential participants. The time of year, summer, also made this commitment especially hard. With this in mind, the workshop planned and set to run with the minimum number of four participants. The day before/day-of there were three last minute cancellations, this meant that only one original participant was able to attend. To enable the workshop to run as planned, last minute additions were made to include: an architecture student and a Minister of Heritage employee. This was then supplemented by feedback from two of the originally planned participants at a separate occasion.

In engaging two additional participants on a separate occasion, I was able to supplement my findings with increased feedback. An adapted version of the workshop was able to function, as ideas and discussion from the workshop were summarized and relayed from the August 4th participants. This way the two additional people were able to add to, or bring in new ideas not previously discussed.

In attendance at the workshop August 4, therefore, were the three participants:

- *a resident and active member of Kitigan Zibi Reserve, Shady Hafez (open voice on the development)*
- *a classmate from my thesis group and architect intern, Jessie Kirkham*
- *a Heritage Minister employee, who wished remain anonymous*

And, the participants who supplemented the work on August 10 were:

⁸² Sanders, Convivial Toolbox, 45.

- *an employee of Minwaashin Lodge (Aboriginal Women's Support Centre) and resident of Kitigan Zibi, Verna McGregor*
- *a Carleton student and resident of Kitigan Zibi,*

At the workshop on August 4, Madeleine Hebert was also present, acting as assistant.⁸³

Madeleine helped with: set up, distributing materials (consent forms, reflection), taking notes and photographs. During the workshop, as facilitator, I would sometimes enact or demonstrate the activity prior to the participants. For example, when reaching

⁸³ My advisor Janine Debanné would have enjoyed attending but I preferred that no official members of the University Institution be present.

4.2 Introduction and Talking Circle

A Reminder of What Participants Had Brought with Them:

- *an object from an important gathering they were a part of or something that reminded them of a such a time or place*
- *optional: own materials to work with*

I was the first person to speak at the workshop. I introduced myself and my research, and introduced Madeleine. I introduced the idea of the talking circle format, after discovering one other person had been part of one before. The Circle was more of a half moon in set

Figure 28: Photo from the workshop of the researcher playing back ideas and helping the group to curate their ideas.

up, near a window and wall corner. This spot was chosen to utilise the wall for playback and maintain a connection to the openness of outside (see Figure 28).

The exercise was effective in building understanding and initial relationships among the group. Not one person however, followed through on bringing in an object. This absence was remedied with improvised stories about a place from memory or inspiration from photos I brought in (images from Phase One). The group was able to generate ideas and qualities for the gathering space however, the group seemed uncomfortable actually writing down their own answers to add to the wall and instead, I did for them. An elaboration of these findings can be seen in a graphic overview. Only two words out of those brainstormed were then considered undesirable for the space and were subtracted:

disconnected or surprising (Figure 20). The separation of the two word groups: desirable/undesirable qualities can also be seen below.

Figure 29: Photo from the workshop of the researcher leading participants in curating the qualities expressed during their object story.

4.3 Creative Design

For this exercise, we moved to a table nearby with the site boxes on a long rectangular table, and a separate table at the end of it with all the materials laid out (Figure 30). I

Figure 30: Table with site boxes and material at the end.

Figure 31: Key card from participant, Verna McGreggor.

Key Card	
Material Name	What does it represent
Cedar	- Cedar → medicine → smell cedar → this is the forest
Birch bark	Birch Bark - Algonquin - medicine
Circle-Heap	Circle-Heap → the circle
Yellow	Yellow → new day new beginning - birth
Clay	Clay → Pot - persisting

Figure 32: Participants taking time to assign meaning to chosen materials.

explained that each person was to take a box, and fill it with a minimum of 5 materials of their choosing. Madeleine gave each person a key card and I explained: *when you choose a material, make sure to write down*

its meaning on the card. For example, I might choose the copper wire for the site, it represents something which is bendable and dynamic but also something that can change over time. This example was well received, and one participant even chose my example as the material they would add to their box. Time was taken to carefully choose and record ideas by each person (see figure 31 for example of filled out key card).

Everyone seemed comfortable discussing their choices. Once this part of the exercise ended, it came to choosing a location. Images of the islands were provided to remind participants of different choices. The two late additions to the workshop seemed a little quiet to answer because of less experience with the site however, Shady had much to offer. Victoria Island was identified as the most appropriate location as it has, “...the closest connection to the community,” a sentiment echoed later at Minwaashin – it is “...a sacred, special place.” The option was discussed of somewhere near the heritage building that currently exists there. We discussed its past use, a space that has seen many things from ceremonial use to shelter for the homeless to a place of leisure to suicide. We also

discussed its removal. Everyone agreed that a location near the most natural part of the island would also be appropriate. It was mentioned earlier that at this point the workshop

Figure 32: Participants talking about a site location, and pondering the choice.

could move in one of two directions: *to closing reflections or take time to play with building the space on the site*. In the end, there was time to build but I made the decision to move to closing reflections (little time was left to build at Minwaashin though). I received 5 responses from participants describing the workshop as *helpful*, with one also circling *integral*. The reflections were essential in providing direct feedback on impressions, feelings and opinions on the workshop (please see Figure 37 for full analysis of findings).

Figure 20: Closing reflections before leaving the workshop.

Figure 34: Photo of anonymous participant box with chosen material: copper wire, green foam, wood veneer, birch bark and dried cedar.

Key card below box; Closing Reflection far right.

Key Card	
Material Name	What does it represent...
Boulevard	Mature trees, Fire Natural wood
Copper wire	Guitar strings, Heating buildings, parliament Sculptures, wood
Wood	that has been carved
Dried cedar	Herbs, good smell privacy
Green felt	grass, blankets

Leaving the workshop today I feel...

Intrigued about the future of the site - interested in finding more out about current plans for development

The workshop made me think more about...

Mechanisms for engaging public & stakeholders in the development of spaces. How to convert abstract observations into concrete designs

One thing I wanted to focus more on was...

The actual physical layout

I found this workshop to be _____ in helping to build consensus among the group. (Please circle one)

Integral ☒ Helpful ☐ Somewhat Useful ☐ Not Useful ☐

Can you please comment on the reasons for your answer above.

It's definitely interesting to get varying viewpoints on the site. I wasn't aware of the history of the building.

Figure 35: Photo of Shady's box with chosen material: birch bark, feathers, coloured-wooden beads, hoop (circle) and dried cedar.

Key card below box; Closing Reflection far right.

Key Card	
Name _____ Date _____	
Material Name	What does it represent...
Hoop	NOTES - Circular Gathering Space Indigenous view of time and space.
Feathers	- Space for both human and wildlife.
Bead	- Cultural space.
Cedar	- Healing Space.
Birch	- Space connected to environment.

Leaving the workshop today I feel...
Happy that non-indigenous people are searching for meaningful consultation alternatives.

The workshop made me think more about...
Alternative methods to consultation.

One thing I wanted to focus more on was...
Not too sure to be honest.

I found this workshop to be _____ in helping to build consensus among the group. (Please circle one)
Integral Helpful Somewhat Useful Not Useful

Can you please comment on the reasons for your answer above.
Definitely provides a safe space to express opinion on how spaces should be developed.

Figure 36: Photo of Jessie's box with chosen material: coloured-incense sticks, birch bark, feathers, wood veneer, and dried cedar.

Key card below box; and Closing Reflection to the far right.

Key Card	
Name	Date
JESSIE	
Material Name	What does it represent...
TREE	PROTECT THE EXISTING LANDSCAPE ON SITE
FEATHERS	CREATE A NATURAL HABITAT IN THE CITY
BIRCH BARK	GROW A FOREST FOR THE FUTURE
WOODSTICKS	BUILT STRUCTURES IN FIT IN W/ EXISTING NATURE URBAN PARK
INCENSE + COLOUR	COLOR OF BUILT STRUCTURES SHOULD BE CHOSEN W/ CARE

Leaving the workshop today I feel...

LIKE I WOULD LIKE TO GET MORE INVOLVED IN THE COMMUNITY AROUND ME.

The workshop made me think more about...

IT WAS INTERESTING TO HEAR DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES, IT OPENS YOUR EYES TO WHO OTHERS FEEL ABOUT SPACE + GATHERING.

One thing I wanted to focus more on was...

TO PUSH THE IDEA OF WHAT SHOULD BE ON THE SITE

I found this workshop to be _____ in helping to build consensus among the group. (Please circle one)

Integral ☒ Helpful ☐ Somewhat Useful ☐ Not Useful

Can you please comment on the reasons for your answer above.

IT WAS EASY + WELCOMING WAY TO PARTICIPATE

PHASE TWO: CREATIVE DESIGN WORKSHOP ANALYSIS

Process Overview & Mapping

Step 1: Introduction & Talking Circle

- Participants & researcher interact as a group
- Create comfortable environment
- Build relationships
- Idea generation
- Collectively envision qualities for gathering space

Step 2: Visioning Analysis

- Conducted by researcher
- Group words into categories (physical & phenomenological)
- Look for commonality/difference in choice of words
- Identify themes

The session began with a Talking Circle, three rounds total.

Ideas are captured on sticky notes & played back to the group before Round Three.

After Round Three ideas are curated by group before moving forward.

22 Descriptive words identified during the session

Two qualities are discarded:

20 Words Chosen for the Gathering Space

Qualities are organized by researcher first into 2 categories; then ordered into identified themes.

**Dashed cards are repeated for use in different themes

The Gathering Space Must:

- i. create an atmosphere that is friendly, respectful and open to those using the space;
- ii. be culturally relevant & connected;
- iii. always be connected to the surrounding environment;
- iv. evoke stimulating feeling or response;
- v. be built with geographical awareness & sustainable building systems (active/passive mechanical);
- vi. a space that enables free flow of people; human scale proportions;
- vii. be mindful to design for culturally appropriate activities & include a thoughtful placement of program

Step 3:
Creative Design
Exercise

- Participants make design decisions/choose material palette
- Gathering participants input
- Individual ideas shared
- Consensus Building & collective visioning

Step 4:
Material
Analysis

- Conducted by researcher
- Identify patterns, similarities or differences in materials
- Look for cross-over from previous exercise

Step 5:
Location

- Participants negotiate a site location
- Reflect on qualities discussed earlier
- Relate ideas to location

Step 6:
Participant
Analysis

- Participants reflect & evaluate workshop
- 'Complete the sentence' questions

Participants selected a box to collect 5 materials (from the 13 provided) desirable for the site and the gathering space

Each person then chose: 2 most important materials & 1 from another participant

The Gathering Space Must Include Qualities Reflected in
Material Choice:

Participants tended to choose traditional materials for palette

Participants were then tasked with collectively choosing a location for the Gathering Space:

Victoria Island Identified as Best Location

"...closest connection to the community."

Eastern half as the ideal location:

- this is where ceremony has been taking place
- contains the most natural surroundings on Island
- a space used by Indigenous community and public

Written Reflections were Requested to Close the Session

PARTICIPANTS LEFT THE WORKSHOP FEELING:

Intrigued, about the future of the site... More insightful

Happy that non-indigenous people are searching for meaningful consultation alternatives

When asked about the workshop's ability to build consensus, every participant listed the workshop was:

Integral Helpful Somewhat Useful Not Useful

Additional words used to describe workshop:

Definitely provides a safe space to express opinion on how spaces should be developed...

...welcoming way to participate

Chapter Five:

Conclusions

The toolkit developed for this thesis was successful in its attempt to include a meaningful sample of different stakeholders in the Chaudière, Albert and Victoria Islands site. The scope of the work sought to identify different gaps, such as the point of consultation and its contribution to the development process. The toolkit was effective in responding to this point of contention by proposing a meaningful, collaborative relationship be established among stakeholders at the beginning of a development. The kit attempted to work within an Indigenous knowledge system, in which a more reciprocal relationship is emphasized. Having finished the process of preparing and executing an alternative toolkit, hindsight shines on what could have been done differently. The workshop would have benefitted from affirmed or added feedback from interviewees on the process that was decided for Phase Two. It would have been both interesting and valuable to get these very different individuals opinions on this proposal. It would have also contributed to the circular thinking implemented in this work. Furthermore, the time taken to compile initial information (Phase One) and reaching not only a sufficient number of individuals but the right/appropriate ones, was long and arduous. A more realistic starting point for the present work might have been a more condensed version of Phase One, allowing more emphasis on developing Phase Two. It need also be mentioned that this workshop would likely be one of the first, and one of many needed, to bring the ideas into a further stage of development. Beyond the specific workshop session conducted, it is important to return to initial goals. The thesis aimed more broadly at shedding light on planning for contested sites in Canada, especially ones of concern to Indigenous people. In this light, it is important to ask: might the outcome of co-creation toolkit research be different in the real world, with an architecture firm possessing more resources and capacity than a sole researcher? It is in any case fundamental to underscore that a real world iteration of this process would benefit from reoccurring Indigenous partners in developing the toolkit, and from ongoing participation throughout the entire design process. This kind of relationship fosters a deeper connection and learning environment, that extends beyond traditional consultation to produce a project that is more meaningful, a project that a community can stand behind.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Phase I - Recruitment Letter

Dear _____,

My name is Monique St. Pierre, I am a Master's of Architecture student at Carleton University. I am currently working on a research project for my thesis under the supervision of Professor Janine Debanné, and hope you will be open to participating!

My thesis studies the tools that architects use to engage with the communities that their projects will be affecting, especially for projects sited on contested or significant public lands. I am studying how architects can effectively draw out community members' opinions and visions, with a focus on the "tool kit" used by architects to anchor their conversations. In order to ground this thesis, I apply my research to the Chaudière and Albert Islands in Ottawa, a site endowed with great significance for many people, and for which a redevelopment project is proposed.

Because you have a vested interest in the future of the Chaudière and Albert Islands, I am writing to you today to invite you to participate in my research. I hope you will agree to help me explore the toolkit for community engagement.

Your part will involve one interview lasting not more than 30 minutes, regarding your views on this site, and on your involvement with the project so far. The interview will take place in a mutually convenient, safe location. As a start, I will suggest that we meet in a meeting room in the Architecture Building at Carleton University, but I am happy to meet you at your workplace or other location that is convenient for you.

With your consent, interviews will be audio-recorded so that I can refer to them for my thesis writing. Once the recording has been transcribed, the audio-recording will be destroyed.

If this is your preference, care will be taken to protect your identity. In this case, your responses will not include your name. Within two weeks of the interview, you may also request that certain responses not be included in the documentation. Please know, also, that you will have the right to end your participation in the study at any time, for any reason, up until June 15th, 2016. If you choose to withdraw, all the information you have provided will be destroyed.

All research data, including audio-recordings and any notes will be encrypted. Any hard copies of data (including any handwritten notes or USB keys) will be kept in a locked cabinet at Carleton University. Research data will only be accessible by the researcher and the research supervisor.

In closing, please know that the ethics protocol for this project was reviewed and cleared by the Carleton University Research Ethics Board-B (protocol #).

I am very excited about this research, research which I hope will inspire new ways of bringing architects and the public together, and would be honoured and pleased to be able to speak with you.

In hopeful anticipation of a positive response to this request,

Yours sincerely,

Monique St. Pierre

moniquestpierre@cmail.carleton.ca

Department Tel: 613-520-2855

APPENDIX B: Phase I - Phone Script

Hello,

My name is Monique St. Pierre.

I am a graduate student at the Azrieli School of Architecture and Urban Design, at Carleton University in my final year.

I am calling you today to ask you if you might participate in my thesis research.

Do you have a moment to hear about the project?

(Is there a time I could call you back?)

Great, to give you a sense of my thesis....it studies the tools architects use to engage communities...especially for projects sited on contested or significant public lands. Im looking at how architects can effectively draw out community members' opinions and visions...but again, with a focus on the "tool kit" used by architects to anchor their conversations. In order to ground this thesis, I will apply my research to the Chaudière, Albert and Victoria Islands in Ottawa.

Because you have a vested interest in the future of the Chaudière and Albert Islands, I am calling you today to invite you to participate in this study.

It involves a one on one semi-structured interview with me lasting not more than 30 minutes, regarding your views on this site, and on your involvement with the project so far. The interview will take place in a mutually convenient location. As a start, I will suggest that we meet in a meeting room in the Architecture Building at Carleton University, but I am happy to meet you at your workplace or other location that is convenient for you.

Would you be interested in participating?

My research, you should know, has been cleared by Carleton University Research Ethics Board-B (Protocol #).

If yes, is it ok if I send you a more formal email outlining the project further and what it will entail.

Perfect, I am very excited for this opportunity to speak and learn more from you.

Do you have a preferred email? The email will be sent promptly.

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX C: Phase I – Consent Form

Title: Exploring Participatory Design Methods with Indigenous Stakeholders

Date of ethics clearance: To be determined by CUREB (as indicated on the clearance form)

Ethics Clearance for the Collection of Data Expires: To be determined by CUREB (as indicated on the clearance form)

I _____, choose to participate in a study on Participatory Design. This research investigates the tools that architects use to engage with the communities that their projects will be affecting, especially for projects sited on contested or significant public lands. **The researcher for this study is Monique St. Pierre in the Carleton, School of Architecture and Urbanism.**

She is working under the supervision of Janine Debanné in the Carleton, School of Architecture and Urbanism.

This study involves one 30 minute semi-structured interview. With your consent, it will be audio-recorded. However, if you do not consent, you may still participate in the research.

While risk is expected to be minimal, I will take precautions to protect your identity if you require. This will be done by keeping all responses anonymous and allowing you to request that certain responses not be included in the final project. Should you experience any distress during the interview, you will be provided with contact information for counseling services available nearby.

You have the right to end your participation in the study at any time, for any reason, up until June 15, 2016. You can withdraw by phoning or emailing the researcher or the research supervisor. If you withdraw from the study, all information you have provided will be immediately destroyed.

As a token of appreciation, you will receive a refreshment upon your arrival and compensated for your parking fees (if the meeting is at Carleton).

All research data and any notes will be encrypted. Any hard copies of data (including any handwritten notes or USB keys) will be kept in a locked cabinet at Carleton University. Research data will only be accessible by the researcher and the research supervisor.

Once the project is completed, research materials will be compiled into a book format for Faculty retention. Furthermore, all research data will be kept for five years and potentially used for other research projects on this same topic. At the end of five years, all research data will be securely destroyed. (Electronic data will be erased and hard copies will be shredded.)

If you would like a copy of the finished research project, you are invited to contact the researcher to request an electronic copy which will be provided to you.

The ethics protocol for this project was reviewed by the Carleton University Research Ethics Board, which provided clearance to carry out the research. Should you have questions or concerns related to your involvement in this research, please contact:

CUREB contact information:

Dr. Shelley Brown, Chair (CUREB-B)

613-520-2600 ext. 1505

Shelley.Brown@carleton.ca

Carleton University Research Compliance Office

ethics@carleton.ca

613-520-2600 ext. 4085

Researcher contact information:

Name: Monique St. Pierre

Department: Architecture & Urbanism

Carleton University

Department Tel: 613-520-2855

Email: moniquestpierre@cmail.carleton.ca

Supervisor contact information:

Name: Janine Debanné

Department: Architecture&Urbanism

Carleton University

Email: janinedebanne@cmail.carleton.ca

Do you agree to be audio-recorded: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Would you prefer your identity be anonymous: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Signature of participant

Date

Signature of researcher

Date

APPENDIX D: Phase One- Semi-Structured Interview Questions

What are the islands most important features? Please illustrate your thoughts on the map provided using words and sketches.

What is the nature of your interest in or connection to the Chaudière and Albert Islands?

When you imagine this connection, the things that come to mind with it – which 3-5 images best describes this interest? What about this image reflect your thoughts?

What about when you think about the future of the site, which image best reflects your feelings or opinions? Why did you choose this image?

Are you aware of any consultation conducted concerning the future plans for the site? If yes, what was the nature of consultation?

Do you think this has had any effect on the development plans for the Islands? If yes, how? / If no, why not?

Do the plans in any way include or reflect the cultural heritage of the Algonquin Nation? Why is this?

Do you have any other opinions about the site you would like to share?

Phase II of this study involves a group session, in which the participants will be asked to engage with a collaborative & interactive model to discuss alternative uses for the site. Would you be interested in participating in Phase II of the research?

Are there others you might suggest to talk to or for participation in the second phase of research?

APPENDIX E: Phase One - Interview Images

APPENDIX F: Phase Two - Consent Form

Title: In Search of a New Architectural Toolkit: Exploring Alternative Design Methods with Indigenous Stakeholders

Date of ethics clearance: March 22, 2016.

Ethics Clearance for the Collection of Data Expires: To be determined by CUREB

I _____, choose to participate in a study on Participatory Design. This research investigates the tools that architects use to engage with the communities that their projects will be affecting, especially for projects sited on contested or significant public lands. **The researcher for this study is Monique St. Pierre in the Carleton, School of Architecture and Urbanism.** She is working under the supervision of Janine Debanné in the Carleton, School of Architecture and Urbanism.

This study involves one 120 minute interactive activity. In the first part of the workshop, participants will take part in a storytelling and discussion activity; and in the second part, will engage in a creative building exercise with a toolkit of provided material. Finally, the researcher will evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop and invite participants back to the school for her critique, if they should be interested in attending.

With your consent, photographs will be taken of the workshop. However, if you do not consent, you may still participate in the research.

While risk is expected to be minimal, I will take precautions to protect your identity if you require. This will be done by keeping all responses anonymous and allowing you to request that certain responses not be included in the final project. Should you experience any distress during the interview, you will be provided with contact information for counseling services available nearby.

You have the right to end your participation in the study at any time, for any reason, up until August 17, 2016. You can withdraw by phoning or emailing the researcher or the research supervisor. If you withdraw from the study, all information you have provided will be immediately destroyed.

As a token of appreciation, you will receive refreshments at the event, compensation for your parking fees and a small gift of appreciation.

All research data and any notes will be encrypted. Any hard copies of data (including any handwritten notes or USB keys) will be kept in a locked cabinet at Carleton University. Research data will only be accessible by the researcher and the research supervisor.

Once the project is completed, research materials will be compiled into a book format for Faculty retention. Furthermore, all research data will be kept for five years and potentially used for other research projects on this same topic. At the end of five years, all research data will be securely destroyed. (Electronic data will be erased and hard copies will be shredded.)

If you would like a copy of the finished research project, you are invited to contact the researcher to request an electronic copy which will be provided to you.

The ethics protocol for this project was reviewed by the Carleton University Research Ethics Board, which provided clearance to carry out the research. Should you have questions or concerns related to your involvement in this research, please contact:

CUREB contact information:

Dr. Shelley Brown, Chair (CUREB-B)

613-520-2600 ext. 1505

Shelley.Brown@carleton.ca

Carleton University Research Compliance Office

ethics@carleton.ca

613-520-2600 ext. 4085

Researcher contact information:

Name: Monique St. Pierre

Department: Architecture & Urbanism

Carleton University

Depart. Tel: 613-520-2855

Email: moniquestpierre@cmail.carleton.ca

Supervisor contact information:

Name: Janine Debanné

Depart.: Architecture & Urbanism

Carleton University

Email: janinedebanne@cmail.carleton.ca

Do you agree to be photographed:

☐ Yes ☐ No

Would you prefer your identity to be anonymous:

☐ Yes ☐ No

Signature of participant

Date

Signature of researcher

Date

APPENDIX G: Phase Two - Reflection Questions from Workshop

Leaving the workshop today I feel...

The workshop made me think more about...

One thing I wanted to focus more on was...

I found this workshop to be _____ in helping to build consensus among the group. (Please circle one)

Integral

Helpful

Somewhat Useful

Not Useful

Please comment on the reasons for your answer above.

APPENDIX H: Presentation Script

Hello and thank you for being here today to listen to my thesis:

AN ARCHITECTURAL TOOLKIT FOR COMPLEX SITES: EXPLORING CO-CREATION WITH COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS

SLIDE 1

I would like to begin today, by introducing the story of my site... it is both extensive and an intricate one that took a few unexpected turns along the way...But let's start with the basics:

The three Islands: Victoria, Chaudière and Albert, have a long history, located in the heart of the nation's capital.

SLIDE

First as a sacred Indigenous site and main travel route, a place of portage and one for gathering & trading... evolving into a bustling site of industry for over a hundred years. However, there was an ambition within city urban planning, recognized in Greber's Ottawa Master Plan, to one-day return the islands to their natural setting.

SLIDE

In 1992, Confederation Boulevard was formed as both a ceremonial and discovery route for all visitors to the capital region. It is a route that foreign dignitaries and the Royal Family take to this day for processions and state visits...it reflects Canada, connecting many sites and symbols of national significance" (NCC) This symbolism can be recognized in the founding Nations of the country, namely: French, English and Indigenous.

SLIDE

Douglas Cardinal was first commissioned in 1985, then again in 1998 by the National Capital Commission to propose an idea for the First Nation's presence on this route...on the Islands specifically and taking shape in the form of a conceptual plan for a national indigenous centre. The NCC was then to submit this proposal to the Cabinet for approval.

SLIDE

The proposal was developed in line with the late Algonquin Elder, William Commanda's vision for the area. It focused on themes of: respect for Mother Earth, Racial Harmony and Peace-building. His vision also included alongside the Aboriginal centre: Freeing the Chaudière Falls, Creating a City Park and Historic Interpretive Centre, as well as a Peace Building Meeting Site.

Plans seemed to be moving in this direction in 1998, with the City of Ottawa zoning the area for "Parks and Open Space" and demolishing select industrial buildings over the years.

SLIDE

However, when the Domtar mills finally all closed by 2007, the land was put up for sale (while still un-ceded territory); the Treasury Board, under the Conservative Government at the time, declined to buy the land.

In November 2014 news broke of the private commercial development. At this time, you can see the complexity and interest, in land ownership alone.

SLIDE

This news was followed by the City of Ottawa approval to re-zone the islands from “Parks and Open Spaces” to ‘High Density & Multi-purpose’, ultimately allowing Windmill’s Zibi Development to exist.

There was no real public conversation had, until decisions had already been made. No real public consultation on the site’s future. This contradiction and transfer of the land to the private realm, left many people frustrated and outraged.

This is where my thesis took shape and has become a response to this missed opportunity. It is not meant to be another attempted redesign of the site but rather an exploration of an alternative process. My thesis involves deeper engagement with those who the site is effecting, and proposes this involvement from the onset of a project through to the end.

SLIDE 9

It is here that the concept of the ‘other architect emerges’. A practitioner who searches for new ways of working and challenges traditional design practise. It is here that this thesis exists. It seeks to develop a new kind of ‘toolkit’...which includes alternative tools and techniques to engage community stakeholders in co-creation from the beginning of a development project.

SLIDE

Phase One interviews became the necessary precursor to guiding the toolkit creation, and helping to develop a more meaningful toolkit for the site. It gave me a greater understanding of the historical and contemporary use of the site from various perspectives; as well as what people thought about the future.

I decided to illustrate key points from each conversation on a scaled map appropriate to the topics discussed. The interviews, while structured with particular questions, were flexible to discussion on the interviewees interests and knowledge. For example, the Elder I spoke with has a closer more intimate knowledge of the land and therefore, view of the site. We talked about the different ceremonies he has been a part of on Victoria Island, to the eagles that come to visit, to where the sacred fire is usually placed. This varied from that of John Cook who conveyed bigger urban planning concepts, and even pointed to the international significance of the site. We talked about confederation boulevard and the islands representation among it; as well as their ability to connect otherwise disassociated ideas like industry and parliament, and an urban context with that of wild nature. Phase One also allowed me to speak with individuals such as Gilbert Whiteduck, who had been involved in consultation on the islands and has since openly expressed his views against the project. We discussed his experience but also his belief that there could be a more positive and constructive process of engagement in future development.

The toolkit therefore occupied a space somewhere in between Phase One and Phase Two, where it was developed. My exposure to authors such as Elizabeth Sanders, Shawn Wilson and Priscilla Settee was necessary for the toolkit creation. Sander’s Say, Do, Make approach provided a contemporary reference from which to base the toolkit design. This meant including activities that appealed to different senses and therefore able to reach different levels of participant knowledge.

Priscilla Settee & Shawn Wilson however, gave the toolkit a more holistic framework by providing elements of Indigenous knowledge and philosophy from which to build the tools and techniques. A knowledge that involves a more circular way of thinking, acting, and treating all life around you.

SLIDE

The toolkit developed was then put to use in Phase Two, through the workshop. The toolkit acted as a vessel for gathering information. It was intended to guide the design for the first gathering space on the site. A space to house conversation and consultation on the site's future. This concept was conceived during a session with Bill Semple, who I am happy to see here today, Thank you Bill! With this in mind, the toolkit was designed for the first session (which would be the first among many in a real iteration). The toolkit was designed to both collect information and encourage conversation on desirable qualities for this gathering space; as well as a location for it.

It was a difficult task to create the toolkit without maintaining some biases in its design. The toolkit therefore, existed somewhere in between both the knowledge I knew and that I did not. I hoped however, that through the flexibility of its design, and the open discussion it provoked, it would begin to take on a course of its own discovery.

After finally securing 4 participants for the workshop (a little less than I had hoped for originally), it was able to proceed as planned. Last minute cancellations left me to add two non-indigenous participants, and also run a separate condensed version at a later date. The sessions were still considered a success with valuable contributions and a lot of information to digest.

I would like to invite you now to visit the site...if you could please come over to the table. Open a box, and take a moment to look inside...and take in the contents. You will see each contains a re-creation of the results from the workshop:

the materials chosen, a key card with identifiable qualities, and finally a written reflection on the workshop itself.

During the workshop the group was able to generate many ideas for this first gathering space. First from the talking circle exercise...characteristics that were both phenomenological and physical, such as:

A space that is culturally relevant and connected

A space that enables free flow of people

and one, that is considerate of its surrounding environment

The second activity, of material choice and associated meaning added to these ideas:

A sensibility to Indigenous representation in building

A sensitivity to material use and sustainable practise

But also an awareness of the future, and creating a more dynamic space

This brings me to, **"the other architect's response"** ...it is expressed here in these final material studies and unfinished drawings. They are intended as a working representation of the workshop. The copper wire illustrated here, reflects a

traditionally used material, yet it is dynamic and maintains the ability to change over time. The circular shape comes into small contact with the ground, yet enables a large gathering to exist. The structure is organic and fluid, and stands to contrast its neighbouring industrial heritage buildings.

While we were not able to progress to a point of building in this first workshop, this would be the goal in a later iteration. My drawings here are intended to counter the 'photo-finished renders of a typical development' and instead attest to this co-creation process.

I would like to close today by sharing a document that was given to me by a workshop participant, Verna McGregor. It was very thoughtful on her part and relevant for this thesis... its called the Tale of Two Companies:

The first says:

We don't do consultation, we do communication. Consultation is [when] you have a concept and seek feedback. That's not what we do. We already have the plans. We communicate but without an opportunity to change our plans.

The second:

We work within their culture and we support them. Its not whether we can give or take or whether we receive but how can we learn with Indigenous peoples.

APPENDIX I: Additional Photos of Workshop Boxes and Artefacts

APPENDIX J: The Other Architect's Response (presented at defense)

Bibliography

- Asinabka. *Asinabka*. n.d. Accessed February 2016. <http://www.asinabka.com/documentsALL.html>.
- Bond, Courtney C.J. *Where Rivers Meet: An illustrated History of Ottawa*. Windsor Publications, 1984.
- Bozиковic, Alex. "Land rights, city-building at odds in Ottawa's Zibi development." *The Globe and Mail*. January 8, 2016. Accessed March 2016. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/home-and-garden/architecture/land-rights-city-building-at-odds-in-ottawas-zibi-development/article28074115/>.
- Brown, Mark. Urban regenerators Assemble become first 'non-artists' to win Turner prize 2015. *The Guardian*. December 7. Accessed April 11, 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/dec/07/urban-assemble-win-turner-prize-toxteth>.
- Butler, Don. "Restoring public access to Ottawa's 'second Niagara'." *Ottawa Citizen*. April 30, 2015. Accessed March 2016. <http://ottawacitizen.com/news/local-news/restoring-public-access-to-ottawas-second-niagara>.
- Cardinal, Douglas. "The Sacred Lands in the Heart of the Nation's Capital." Ottawa. n.d.
- Chodikoff, Ian. "The New Generalist - Canadian Architect ." *Canadian Architect*. April 30, 2011. Accessed April 14, 2016. <https://www.canadianarchitect.com/features/the-new-generalist/>.
- deVolpi, Charles P. *Ottawa A pictorial Record*. Sherbrooke: Dev-Sco Publications Ltd., 1964.
- Government, Ontario. "Duty To Consult With Aboriginal Peoples In Ontario." *ontario.ca*. 2016. Accessed April 10, 2016. <https://www.ontario.ca/page/duty-consult-aboriginal-peoples-ontario>. Government.
- Group, Windmill Development. "Zibi is collaboration." *Zibi.ca*. 2016. Accessed January 2016. <http://www.zibi.ca/pdf-download/>.
- Harper, Stephen. "Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools." Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. June 11, 2008. Accessed April 30, 2016. <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1100100015649>.
- Harrigan, John E. "Human Factors Information Taxonomy: Fundamental Human Factors Applications for Architectural Programs." *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society* 4, no. 16 (1974.): 432-40.
- inc., spacetoplace design. 2016. *spacetoplace*. Accessed May 15, 2016. <http://www.space2place.ca/>.
- Kawagley, R. Barnhardt & A.O. "Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Alaska Native Ways of Knowing." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36 (1): 2005.
- Milette, Daniel. 2016. "Indigenous Architecture in Canada." *Guest Lecture*. Ottawa, February 5.
- Memengweshii Council. "Open Letter from Memengweshii Council." Anishinabek News. June 23, 2015. Accessed February 18, 2016. <http://anishinabeknews.ca/2015/06/23/open-letter-from-memengweshii-council/>.
- "Ottawa committee approves rezoning on sacred aboriginal site." *CBC News*. October 2, 2014. Accessed february 25, 2016. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/ottawa-committee-approves-rezoning-on-sacred-aboriginal-site-1.2785746>.
- Ottawa, City of. *Service Ottawa*. n.d. Accessed 01 27, 2016. <http://app01.ottawa.ca/postingplans/searchResults.jsf?lang=en&newReq=yes&action=qs&keyword=booth>.
- Pimadjowin, Omamiwinini. "Our Story." *The Algonquin Way*. 2009. Accessed 2016. thealgonquinway.ca.

Porter, Kate. "Zoning Challenge of Zibi Development on Ottawa River Rejected Again." *CBCnews*. May 26, 2016. Accessed June 14, 2016. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/zibi-development-zoning-challenge-1.3602056>.

Porter, Libby. "Co-existence in cities: The challenge of Indigenous urban planning in the 21st Century." *academia.edu*. 2013. December 4. Accessed 2016. http://www.academia.edu/8696159/Co-existence_in_cities_The_challenge_of_Indigenous_urban_planning_in_the_21st_Century.

Ritchie, Haley. "Douglas Cardinal appeals decision to allow Zibi development." *Ottawa Business Journal*. March 10, 2106.. Accessed February 2016. <http://www.obj.ca/Real-Estate/Construction/2016-03-10/article-4462300/Douglas-Cardinal-appeals-decision-to-allow-Zibi-development/1>.

Royal Architecture Institute of Canada. "National Urban Design Awards — 2016 Recipient 2016." *Royal Architecture Institue of Canada*. Accessed April 2016. <https://www.raic.org/awards/national-urban-design-awards-%E2%80%94-2016-recipient-3>.

Royal Architecture Institute of Canada. "The Architectural Profession." In *The Canadian Handbook of Practice for Architects, Second Edition*, Edited by Jon Hobbs et al. 30-34. 2009.

Royal Institute Of British Architects. "Guide to Localism Opportunities for architects Part two: Getting community engagement right." *architecture.com*. Accessed 2016. <https://www.architecture.com/Files/Ribaholdings/Policyandinternationalrelations/Policy/Guidetolocalism-Part2gettingcommunityengagementright.Pdf>.

Sanders, Elizabeth. *Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research for the Front End of Design*. Amsterdam: BIS Publishers, 2012.

Sanders, Elizabeth B.-N., Eva Brandt, And Thomas Binder. 2014. "A Framework For Organizing The Tools And TechniquesOf Participatory Design." *Maketools.Com*. Accessed February 2016. <http://www.maketools.com/articlespapers/Pdc2010exploratoryframeworkfinal.Pdf>.

Settee, Priscilla. *Pimatisiwin: The Good Life, Global Indigenous Knowledge Systems*. Vernon, British Columbia: Charlton Publishing Ltd., 2013.

St.Pierre, Monique. "Public Engagement & the Role of the Architect." *Professional Practise Course*. Professor: Christopher Knightley. Carleton Universtiy. Ottawa, April, 2016.

Tiwari, Reena, Marina Lommerse, and Dianne Smith. *M2 Models and Methodologies for Community Engagement*. Singapore: Springer, 2014.

Wakefield, S., & Poland, B. "Family, friend or foe? Critical reflections on the relevance and role of social capital in health promotion and community development." *Social Science & Medicine* 60, no. 12 (2005): 2819-2832.

Willson, Shawn. *Research is Ceremony, Indigenous Research Methods*. Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2008.