Annapolis Royal
Nova Scotia

THE FUTURE OF THE TOWN WHARF

Construction of the current Town Wharf was completed in the 1980s and the past 40+ years have taken their toll. The Wharf has reached the end of its lifespan and is falling apart. Money has been spent to patch and repair, but Council needs to make a decision for the future of the wharf.

JOST+ Architects have identified six possible options for the future of the wharf. Each option has been explored to look at the pros and cons, future maintenance impacts, and the estimated lifespan and estimate high-level costs.

A summary of the options is presented here for the public's consideration. What option most appeals to you and why? Which option gives you the most hope for the future? Do you have any concerns or questions about the option?

JOST+ PUTTING THE PIECES TOGETHER ARCHITECTS

OPTION 1: ABANDONMENT

The Town lets the wharf continue to fall apart until it collapses.
PROS: No ongoing operation and maintenance costs
CONS: Increased risk to public safety and environment, Increased financial liability for the Town (personal injury, property damage and damage to the environment)
MAINTENANCE: None
LIFESPAN: Unknown
ESTIMATED COST: $4M (removal and disposal) + Fines ($1M+)



OPTION 2: REMOVAL

Remove and dispose of the existing wharf.
PROS: Reduces Town liability, No ongoing operation and maintenance costs
CONS: No public access or future development
MAINTENANCE: None
LIFESPAN: Not Applicable
ESTIMATED COST: $4M

OPTION 3: PARTIAL DEMOLITION & SEAWALL



Reduce the height of the sheet piling and remove unsupported material will create a sloped breakwater. Armour stone will be required to protect and stabilize the slopes.
PROS: Reduces Town liability, No ongoing operation and maintenance costs
CONS: No public access, Loss of visual identity as wharf, Loss of marine heritage
MAINTENANCE: Minimal to none
LIFESPAN: Infinite
ESTIMATED COST: $3.5M *assumes clean materials*

OPTION 4: REHABILITATION / ENCAPSULATION



Maintain the current configuration by encapsulating it with new poured concrete, or steel sheet pilings and concrete slabs.
PROS: Maintains public access, Base for future developments, Base for climate change adaptation and carbon reduction
CONS: Difficult to fund
MAINTENANCE: Annual inspection for the first few years.
LIFESPAN: 25-50 years
ESTIMATED COST: $2.2M *assumes existing tie rods are intact*

OPTION 5: REHABILITATION WITH LIVING SHORE



Reduce the width of the Wharf and install a terraced living shoreline
PROS: Maintains public access, Surface is suitable for a variety of uses, Funding sources available
CONS: Ongoing maintenance
MAINTENANCE: Annual inspection for the first few years. maintenance expected later in the lifespan.
LIFESPAN: 25-50 Years
ESTIMATED COST: $4M *assumes clean materials*

OPTION 6: TIDAL VIEWING AUDITORIUM



Option 5 plus additional construction of a watertight viewing area as a marine experience.
PROS: Unique and additional attraction to the Town, Possible funding sources,
CONS: Technically challenging, Most costly to build
MAINTENANCE: Annual inspection,
LIFESPAN: 25-50 Years
ESTIMATED COST: $5.6M *assumes clean materials*

SOLAR INSTALLATION - CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

Possible addition to Option 4 or Option 5





