



**EXPERIENTIAL LIGHT FIELD**

	<b>A - CREATE A SPACE OF DISCOVERY</b>	<b>B - ESTABLISH A UNIQUE IDENTITY</b>	<b>C - APPROACH THE PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE FROM MULTIPLE SCALES</b>	<b>D- RESPOND TO THE EXISTING PHYSICAL FORM OF THE SITE</b>	<b>E - DESIGN FOR A WINTER CITY</b>	<b>F - EMPLOY DURABLE MATERIALS &amp; STRATEGIES</b>	<b>G - IMPROVE CONNECTIONS</b>
5	C1 Every visit will be a new, interesting experience (Pt. 1)	C1 Can't think of any other underpasses like this  C1 Unique – but desire still exists for vertical engagement	C1 Strongly agree – 4th Street being a high pedestrian corridor				C1 Introduction of bicycle and wider pedestrian facilities
4	C1 Agree, as long as the lighting does not cause any distraction (Pt. 2)  C1 Increased attention on the blank wall & transition to the sky; people are focused an need to be drawn up; like the strength of our sunlight  C1 Yes, Sounds appealing; Yes, Changes constantly  C1 Does the oculus material cover all, or, alternate with open sky?	C1 Unique from the other underpasses; relationship to the sky is special  C1 Very unique  C1 Yes, but not sure @ with technical solutions to achieve effect  C1 Yes, potentially very unique moment in grey underpass		C1 Public art represents the limitations of the site  C1 Responds to sky & light; want the transition to the sky	C1 Widening improves things, as well as restoring the staircase  C1 Visuals will be excellent @ winter (Pt. 1)		C1 Improves the situation but falls short because of site limitations  C1 Assume success
3			C1 Addresses immediate walking experience in the 'oculus' but not under the underpass; Does not improve experience of vehicular realm  C1 Does it address pedestrian experience for people above? There is a pedestrian experience entering the underpass.  C1 Emphasizes overall experience rather than focus on impacting the public realm; what does it look like from the 9th avenue bridge? Unclear; What does it look like on dull days? Does the light effect impact driver safety?  C1 Neutral. Unsure that this is multi-scale or only pedestrians walking through the underpass	C1 Neutral  C1 How does this impact 'oculus' view of the sky? Does not enhance dark environments below bridges- very important;	C1 Consider grey light & short daylight in winter  C1 Snow – does it filter down through like a chain link fence idea or will it collect on top and make space dark?	C1 Neutral – we don't know what the materials are going to be  C1 Neutral  C1 Who will maintain & how (over road)? Not clear about materials, durability; Does it impact adjacent buildings?	C1 Neutral  C1 Does not impede the pedestrian realm, but it is not clear the lighting is too bright or bright enough
2	C1 Extend concept of edge of underpasses, increase length.		C1 Disagree	C1 Nice for the open space, but does not respond to the physical forms  C1 Not doing much to change existing conditions	C1 Provides light but could struggle with wet and heavy snow build-up on the web  C1 There will be issues suspending 'object' over the road (icing, snow, etc) (Pt. 2)  C1 Disagree	C1 Keep materials simple and resilient; does this have a higher potential to breakdown quickly and take on higher wear and tear? Would like to see forecasts for 5 & 10 years	C1 Not a step up or down from current connectivity
1	C1 Does not at all address the space under the underpasses; can it continue under the underpasses?					C1 Unclear on the durability, need more information	
Avg. Rating	3.25	4.33	3.17	3.0	2.83	2.4	3.5

**URBAN TRAVERSE**

	<b>A - CREATE A SPACE OF DISCOVERY</b>	<b>B - ESTABLISH A UNIQUE IDENTITY</b>	<b>C - APPROACH THE PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE FROM MULTIPLE SCALES</b>	<b>D- RESPOND TO THE EXISTING PHYSICAL FORM OF THE SITE</b>	<b>E - DESIGN FOR A WINTER CITY</b>	<b>F - EMPLOY DURABLE MATERIALS &amp; STRATEGIES</b>	<b>G - IMPROVE CONNECTIONS</b>
5	C2 Creates interest from different locations	C2 Very unique personal experience, interactive	C2 Improved pedestrian crossings (possible surface improvements) @ 10th Ave and 8th Ave would definitely encourage pedestrians	C2 Uses the existing walls as a canvas	C2 Short days its most visible; design appeals in winter; appears to be lack of wear and tear; the activity gives sense of safety	C2 Low need for maintaining; want to be able to update imagery; don't see need for elevated pedestrian	
4	C2 Yes, in low light; Needs darkness, does it do it during sunlight?  C2 Night: Great opportunity at night (0.5)  C2 Constantly changing; ensure that experience is still pleasant during the day  C2 Allows people to discover different places, if the images were to change	C2 Will it hold interest in the long term?  C2 Very unique when activated; is it unique when there is no movement? Is it unique during the day?  C2 Can display different art or images from pertinent events such as Stampede or Olympics  C2 Agree	C2 No illumination below underpass; Varying programming through seasons/over time?; Is there light when there is no movement?  C2 Visible from further away and also have up close interaction	C2 Responds to sides and across the road; would be nice to incorporate sky & vertical walls  C2 Want to extend condition north and south	C2 Works best in winter  C2 Concern over floor surface; pedestrian challenge and maintenance issues		C2 Agree
3	C2 Maybe lighting that is reactive is too dynamic; 'conversation' across underpass is forced – it doesn't happen!		C2 Concern about grates  C2 Touches the pedestrian as they walk through; is there a pedestrian experience from above? Ignores experience beyond the pedestrian  C2 Addresses immediate environment and 'transports' users to a different realm. Could provide accessibility challenges with guide dog confusion and walking surface. For the videos to be visible, the general lighting may be too dark. Does not improve under the underpass experience.	C2 Yes, but only on retaining walls	C2 Unsure – no information on material	C2 Neutral  C2 Unsure – no info on materials	C2 Does it improve experience for users other than pedestrians? Will it be distracting for drivers?  C2 Draws you through the space, but perhaps not during the daytime. Lacks of daytime presence.  C2 Utilitarian – user experience, but only pedestrian.
2	C2 Day: Daytime opportunities are limited (0.5)			C2 Must consider under the underpass. Lighting and art must continue.  C2 'Art as infrastructure' – this I probably too much art. Too dynamic for functional infrastructure.	C2 Not addressing winter. It is too cold in winter to stop and interact.	C2 Pedestrian floor concerns. If the walk had LEDs, this could be a serious maintenance concern  C2 Panel images need constant updating and management; a lot of electronics, sensors, etc to go wrong – who will manage? The City will not appreciate taking on additional maintenance	C2 Disagree – nothing is proposed other than pedestrian facility
1	C2 People on the opposite sidewalk are too far to associate with on a human scale/ Nobody looks across the street when traversing an underpass; responding to two people at night is more likely to elicit discomfort than discovery						
Avg. Rating	4.0	4.2	3.67	3.33	3.6	3.0	3.0

**CONDENSER**

	<b>A - CREATE A SPACE OF DISCOVERY</b>	<b>B - ESTABLISH A UNIQUE IDENTITY</b>	<b>C - APPROACH THE PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE FROM MULTIPLE SCALES</b>	<b>D- RESPOND TO THE EXISTING PHYSICAL FORM OF THE SITE</b>	<b>E - DESIGN FOR A WINTER CITY</b>	<b>F - EMPLOY DURABLE MATERIALS &amp; STRATEGIES</b>	<b>G - IMPROVE CONNECTIONS</b>
5							
4	C3 Yes, if can provide a variety of experiences C3 Like that it brings in the sky (Pt. 1)	C3 Yes, but will novelty wear off?	C3 Yes, but not rest of retaining walls C3 Interacts with pedestrians above and below	C3 Leverages infrastructure – volume of sounds? C3 Doesn't respond to the enclosure of the wall and the spaces across	C3 Reflecting light (particularly low winter sun) will enhance pedestrian experience. Light could penetrate into below bridges.	C3 Durable. Likely easy to maintain. No electronics to maintain.	C3 Yes. What about motorists?
3	C3 When no activity above it doesn't add to experience; when it's busy, is it too crowded?; like the idea of drawing out from underpass but does it enhance the experience? C3 If this were an LED experience under the underpasses, people could expect an engaging space as they move from the exposed areas into the underpasses; could allow users to experience the at-grade experience in the below grade areas; would be nice if light effect continued through the entire space;	C3 Not as unique as other options C3 If this was just mirrors, it would only reflect what is already there. Sound could be distracting or overwhelming. Better not to amplify train or road noise. The sound should soften the experience - music on a loop could discourage encampments.	C3 United effect for corridor (Pt .1) C3 Provides a well-lit and engaging experience under the underpasses themselves. Perhaps it is too dark in the exposed areas especially in the 'oculus' area. C3 Not enough info at concept stage to comment significantly. Approach north on 4th Street is dominated by +15 bridge from Place 10 to parkade		C3 Unclear – no material info. Not sure experience at night versus day. C3 Not bright enough in exposed areas. Underpass area cannot rely on natural light alone. C3 Not changing the experience without added lights.	C3 Agree C3 Reflectivity will likely become less pronounced and faded with our winter and dirt.	C3 Doesn't change. C3 The two underpasses could draw you though the space. Media wall could be really great
2	C3 Don't like reflections of more buildings (Pt 2) C3 Hard to imagine effective 24 hours	C3 Making the site tighter and more dense is too much. We want the space to feel more open and comfortable. C3 When it's not busy, is it different from other underpasses?	C3 United effect for corridor (Pt .2)	C3 Built form is an 'underpass' – not a place to stand, enjoy and figure out reflections; have not included Place 10 bridge at south end of CPR bridge. It is still drawn in the wrong location; 'Sound' treatment is superfluous. Part of the charm of the underpass is the dynamic soundscape. I enjoy a train rumbling overhead or the echo of cars passing below. Don't force additional sounds. C3 Addresses median wall. Enhances existing structure. Reflecting unpleasant car and train environment through light and sound is a major challenge. Should be beautiful underneath.	C3 Concern for winter safety – not enough natural light.	C3 Mirrors could be a maintenance challenge if used. Locating lighting elements on median wall could reduce vandalism over outside wall locations.	C3 Doesn't really attract cyclists and transit riders. C3 Not as much impact for all user groups.
1				C3 Not a positive experience in corridor .		C3 Unclear – no materials info; Glare? Substrate will be aesthetically pleasing?	C3 Could be very distracting for drivers and cyclists.
Avg. Rating	3.0	2.8	3.3	2.6	3.0	2.6	2.5