

**Refresh of  
2007 NVRC Indoor Recreation  
Facilities Strategy  
Final Report**

Submitted by: Professional Environmental  
Recreation Consultants Ltd.

Submitted on: January 26th, 2015

Submitted to: City of North Vancouver



**Professional Environmental Recreation Consultants Ltd.**  
**Suite 400, 505 – 8840 210<sup>th</sup> Street, Langley, BC V1M 2Y2**

**Tel: 604.868.3604    [www.perconline.com](http://www.perconline.com)**

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Background .....	2
Updated Information .....	4
The Official Community Plans .....	4
The Nature and Pace of Population Growth .....	5
Leisure Behaviour Data .....	6
Changes to Infrastructure .....	10
The High Level Indoor Recreation Facility Strategy .....	11
Specific Spaces Needed At Harry Jerome .....	12
The 50 Meter Pool Question .....	13
Addendum A – Excerpt From 2007 NVRC Indoor Recreation Facility Strategy .....	1
Addendum B - The 50 Meter Pool Question .....	1

## Introduction

In August of 2014 PERC was retained to undertake a high level update of the 2007 North Vancouver Recreation Commission Indoor Recreation Facilities Strategy. Much had changed since that report was prepared and the City wished to have refreshed information and direction as one of the bases for making decisions on how to proceed with a renewal of recreation facilities on the Harry Jerome Recreation Centre site.

In the course of this review the consultants:

- Reviewed the 2007 Indoor Recreation Facilities Strategy and the May 2008 Recommendations prepared by the North Vancouver Recreation Commission (NVRC) for indoor recreation projects presented to both City and District of North Vancouver;
- Obtained and reviewed the draft Official Community Plan for the City of North Vancouver and 2012 Official Community Plan for the District of North Vancouver to determine if anything in either plan might indicate some changes to the recommendations made in 2007;
- Solicited and obtained current population estimates and projections for both the City and District of North Vancouver to determine if any changes in the pace of population growth, the location of growth or the types of residents making up the future population might indicate some revisions to the 2007 recommendations;
- Obtained and reviewed current recreation facility usage data from the NVRC to determine what, if anything, had changed in terms of leisure behaviour patterns in public recreation facilities over the seven intervening years;
- Obtained information on changes to the supply of indoor public recreation infrastructure since 2007;
- Facilitated a workshop of NVRC staff on the topic of “what has changed since 2007” to obtain staff understanding of what has changed in terms of types and amounts of leisure behaviour;
- After reviewing all current information as noted above, drafted a report which was discussed with the City’s Project Manager and the Director of the NVRC;
- Prepared a final report based on the above meeting.

The consultants would like to thank Barb Pearce of the City of North Vancouver and Heather Turner of the NVRC for their guidance and input, as well as the NVRC staff that attended the workshop and or provided background files. However, any errors or omissions in the information provided are the consultants’ responsibility.

This report incorporates some refinements to the overall strategy for the provision of indoor recreation facilities in North Vancouver and a list of required spaces for the Harry Jerome Recreation Centre project for consideration by the City of North Vancouver staff and Council.

## Background

In 2005 the NVRC commissioned two studies. The first was a Recreation Needs Assessment for all types of recreation activities in the City and District of North Vancouver. The second focussed on those needs that could be accommodated in indoor public recreation facilities. It provided both a general strategy to guide recreation facility planning in North Vancouver over the next ten years as well as specific recommendations for retrofit, expansion, development and phasing out of recreation facilities during the same period. Both were published in 2007. The Executive Summary of the second report is included herein as **Addendum A** and forms a base for this refresh.

The guidance provided within that second report was essentially organized into two categories. The first was a general strategy to guide the provision of indoor public recreation infrastructure in the two municipalities. It suggested approaching recreation infrastructure in terms of three levels of service provision as follows:

- **Sub-regional Level of Service** – Several specialized facilities requiring a large market area to justify their use and a large tax base to finance them would be provided at this high highest level to cater to users willing to travel across the sub-region to use them. Examples include arenas, indoor tennis courts, indoor pools, a gymnastics gym and performing arts facilities. As far as possible, these spaces would be centralized on a high profile, easily accessible, centrally located site like the Harry Jerome Recreation Centre site, added to other Community Recreation Centres, or built as part of Capilano College. However, a few (e.g. indoor tennis, ice arenas) would be on their own sites that need not be as easily accessible or high profile because most use is preplanned, and users access the sites primarily via private vehicles.
- **Community Level of Service** – In each of five initial communities of 25,000 to 30,000 residents (Upper and Lower Capilano, Upper Lonsdale, Lower Lonsdale, Lynn Valley, and the Mount Seymour area) and eventually, through anticipated growth, two additional communities (i.e. Lower Capilano/Norgate separating from Upper Capilano, and the Maplewood/Moodyville Area), a Community Recreation Centre would be developed with a wide variety of multipurpose and dedicated indoor dry floor spaces, so that the vast majority of the population is within 2 km of one of these centres.
- **Neighbourhood Level of Service** – Several neighbourhoods of roughly 5000 residents each would make up a community within the service hierarchy, but very little indoor recreation space can be justified in so small an area, other than some community access to schools; especially school gymnasia.

Within that general strategy, the report also offered some very specific recommendations on what changes to existing infrastructure were required over the subsequent ten years to replace and expand the existing spaces to meet leisure needs. Those recommendations are summarized below:

- **Community Recreation Centres (CRCs):** Initially five centres including one new 31,000 sq. ft. facility to replace and consolidate Delbrook and William Griffin serving both the Upper and Lower Capilano area, a second new CRC to replace the Harry Jerome Recreation Centre serving the Upper Lonsdale/Queensdale area, and one each continuing at John Braithwaite serving the Lower Lonsdale community, Parkgate serving the Mount Seymour community and Karen Magnussen (requiring some added

multipurpose space) serving the Lynn Valley area; and eventually one also at Maplewood/Moodyville area (a potential new site for replacement for the Ron Andrews Recreation Centre) and one in Lower Capilano/Norgate area as it grows into its own community.

- **Arenas:** Add one ice sheet and replace two existing sheets (at Karen Magnussen and Harry Jerome) so that the result is two complexes with six sheets, one on the east side and one on the west side of the sub-region, operating much more cost effectively than some existing single sheet arenas;
- **Indoor Pools:** Consolidate four small pools into three new larger structures at Harry Jerome (the largest), Karen Magnussen (with added rectangular tank), and a replacement for Ron Andrews, so the net result is 33% more capacity in a much more cost effective configuration, with significantly reduced net subsidy per swim;
- **Indoor Tennis:** Add two indoor courts at North Vancouver Tennis Centre (recommendation later changed to three courts with consultant's support);
- **Gymnastics:** A larger dedicated gymnastics gym; possibly within a retrofitted Karen Magnussen arena once the ice has been relocated;
- **Gymnasia:** Six provided in five CRCs initially, with two at the Harry Jerome CRC replacement, as well as increased access to neighbourhood and community level gyms in schools and a new Sport Tournament Centre at Capilano College.
- **Seniors:** Most of the seniors activities would be within the CRCs and sub-regional facilities above, but also recommended was a replacement for Silver Harbour within a Harry Jerome CRC redevelopment project (with more capacity through access to the multipurpose spaces).
- **Closing several older small facilities:** as new ones above consolidate all service in more efficient and accessible service delivery hubs.

In summary, the recommendations would have resulted in a large project at Harry Jerome Recreation Centre site which would position it both as a Community Recreation Centre serving the Upper Lonsdale community and enhancements that would make it a sub-regional centre serving all of the City and District of North Vancouver. It would have comprised about 94,000 sq. ft. of net usable space (more when support spaces are added) including:

- An enhanced 33,000 sq. ft. CRC with gymnasium, fitness space, multipurpose rooms, arts and crafts studios, dance/martial arts/aerobic studio, youth centre, seniors space, and pre-school program centre;
- A new aquatics centre with two large tanks – one ten lane 25 meter rectangular tank and one large leisure tank;
- One additional 8,000 sq. ft. gymnasium (for a total of two, replacing the two at Memorial Recreation Centre and the Mickey McDougall Recreation Centre);
- A new studio theater/rehearsal space of about 10,000 sq. ft.
- A 10,000 sq. ft. replacement for Silver Harbour Seniors Centre in partnership with that organization.
- The existing Centennial Theater on the same site.

Since 2007 a number of changes to infrastructure have been planned or implemented. Also, both municipalities have embarked on new Official Community Plans that will guide the nature of development, amount of development and location of development in the two municipalities over the foreseeable future.

A great deal of planning work has also been completed for new and/or retrofitted recreation spaces in the area of the existing Harry Jerome Recreation Centre. The City has directed that this “refresh” of the original recommendations be undertaken as part of that planning work. The hope is that this report, as well as several others, will be used by council in 2015 to as a foundation for making some informed decisions about if and how to proceed with that project.

## Updated Information

The information most relevant to refreshing the 2007 recommendations has been compiled and reviewed. It is summarized below under four headings.

### The Official Community Plans

The City and District have both embarked on new Official Community Plans since the 2007 report was submitted. The District approved a new OCP in 2012, and the City’s new OCP is currently in draft format. Both have implications on the 2007 report as follows:

- The City’s draft OCP speaks to densifying development around major corridors and hubs in a more sustainable way. It is fully in alignment with what was envisioned in the 2007 recommendations, in that it would support positioning major recreation facilities at hubs at the north and south end of the Lonsdale corridor in a way that is easily accessible and sustainable.
- The District’s OCP envisions a “network of communities” which collectively make up the municipality. It foresees a total of eight community hubs (some larger and some smaller) with increased service in each so that the vast majority of residents can walk to the densifying service hub closest to them. It also foresees slow growth (relative to the rest of the region) focussed on three of those centres. There is a great deal of alignment with the 2007 report which embraced a concept that most indoor recreation services would be provided at Community Recreation Centres within walking distance of residents. However, the 2007 report ignored the municipal boundaries, and combined the seven smaller OCP town centres into fewer, larger communities of 25,000 to 30,000. Therefore, it positioned the District’s Queensdale community as part of the Upper Lonsdale community and the Lower Lynn as part of either the Lower Lonsdale area or the long term emerging Maplewood/Moodyville community. It also combined the Deep Cove town centre with Mount Seymour community which would collectively have one CRC.

Overall, there is a remarkable level of congruence between the two documents. Both would support a new CRC in the Edgemont area (which translates to the new CRC on the William Griffin site), one in the Lower Capilano/Norgate community (which would be served by the planned new CRC in that area), and continuing evolution of CRCs at Parkgate (serving the Seymour community), Karen Magnussen (serving the Lynn Valley community) and eventually one in the Maplewood/Moodyville community (including a redevelopment of the Ron Andrews Centre). However, the OCP would support smaller

recreation centres in Lower Lynn and could support some increased indoor recreation infrastructure in Deep Cove and Queensdale.

In summary, then, the planning in both the City and the District is largely in line with what was envisaged in 2007, with small exceptions resulting in some relatively minor differences in where the growth is likely to be concentrated over the next ten years.

### **The Nature and Pace of Population Growth**

The most recent information available in both the City and District of North Vancouver is included in municipal reports that summarize trends based on the previous two national censuses. They show a profile which is remarkably consistent between the two municipalities. The most relevant statistics and trends for the two municipalities that will impact recreation behaviour are summarized below.

- **Very slow growth** - The City's growth has been less than 1% per year for the past ten years, while the District's growth is marginally less than that; as compared to a Metro Vancouver regional average of about 2%. The projected growth for the next 25 years or so is anticipated annually to be about 1% overall on average between the two communities with just over 1% in the City and just under 1% in the District. That will increase the population within the two communities to about 154,000 in 2021, 167,000 in 2031 and 182,000 in 2041.
- **Aging population** – In the City the proportion of youth under 20 years of age declined by .5% between the last two census, while the proportion of the adult population increased by .3% and the proportion of seniors increased by .6%. More than half of the City's families do not have children living in the home, and more than half the remainder have only one child at home. The situation is similar in the District.
- **High proportions of single parent families** - Over one-fifth of the City's families are headed by a lone parent. The proportion of lone parent households in the District is somewhat lower and the regional average is lower still.
- **High proportion of single adults** – In the City, more than half the adults (over the age of 15) are currently single. No information on status of marital status of adults was available for the District.

Growth projections for the two municipalities come from the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy. They have been incorporated into the 2011 District of North Vancouver Official Community Plan and the 2014 Draft City of North Vancouver Official Community Plan. The projections call for quite low levels of growth in both communities, with a slightly higher level of growth in the City. **Figure One** summarizes these projections.

**Figure One**  
**Summary of Population Growth Projections**

Municipality	Target Populations in Each Year				
	2011*	2013*	2021**	2031**	2041**
City of North Vancouver	49,559	50,915	56,000	62,000	68,000
District of North Vancouver	86,194	87,347	98,000	105,000	114,000
Totals	135,753	138,262	154,000	167,000	182,000

\* The 2011 and 2012 numbers come from the BC Statistics website.

\*\* The 2021 to 2041 estimates come from the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy

The general implications of the above noted demographic profile and projected growth for indoor recreation facilities are as follows:

- resist building much excess capacity hoping that growth will fill it in the short term future, as growth will continue to be slow;
- Fitness is a core service for populations with low numbers of children, aging adults, and a high proportion of singles;
- Prioritize facilities primarily used by adults, and move to somewhat lower priority those primarily used by children;

### Leisure Behaviour Data

The NVRC maintains quite detailed information about the numbers and types of uses of all public indoor recreation spaces in North Vancouver because it uses that information to determine the net costs between the two municipalities. The consultants reviewed the NVRC annual reports from 2006 to 2013. During the seven years since the 2007 report was completed, the population has grown marginally but the participation in indoor public recreation has not. In fact it has declined marginally as shown in **Figure Two**.

**Figure Two**  
**Summary of Changes in Overall NVRC Service Visits 2007-2013**

Facility	Total Annual Visits		% Change
	2008	2013	
Centennial Theatre	111,458	98,999	-11%
Delbrook Centre	223,926	198,430	-11%
North Vancouver Tennis Centre	72,992	67,164	-8%
Harry Jerome Centre (including Memorial and Mickey McDougal)	742,052	523,243	-29%
Ice Sports North Shore	65,023	65,467	1%
John Braithwaite Community Centre	410,258	507,160	24%
Karen Magnussen Centre	468,792	487,112	4%
Lynn Valley Centre	42,731	35,246	-18%
Parkgate Community Centre	353,296	308,966	-13%



Facility	Total Annual Visits		% Change
	2008	2013	
Ron Andrews Centre	404,792	426,929	5%
Seylynn Centre	23,326	18,008	-25%
William Griffin Centre	618,070	463,248	-23%
TOTALS	3,536,716	3,199,972	-10%

In part, the decline can be attributed to aging facilities that no longer meet current needs. This speaks to the urgency of updating facilities and refining the mix so that they do meet current and future needs. However, at least part of the reason for the decline at William Griffin was that it is closed down for the last month of that year and patrons starting finding alternatives to using it even before that.

The same database was also summarized into activity categories, and some of that is shown in **Figure Three**. Not all categories of activities are easy to separate out from the user data.

**Figure Three**  
**Summary of Changes in Facility Use by Category of Use 2008-2013**

Types of Uses	Total Annual Visits*		% change
	2008	2013	
Indoor Pools	716,314	537,792	-25%
Arenas	312,137	310,108	-1%
Indoor Sports**	159,651	89,056	-44%
Indoor Tennis	82,158	74,818	-9%
Fitness Membership	929,835	1,182,830	27%
Fitness Programs	71,698	87,997	23%
Racquetball/Squash	17,870	21,028	18%
Curling***	16,833	14,643	-13%

\* One visit equals a single use by a paying patron. So, for example, for an indoor pool, it represents the total number of times a person changed into a bathing suit and entered the pool enclosure.

\*\* Indoor sports do not include sport group rental uses, just program and drop in sport uses

\*\*\* Curling uses are subsidized by the NVRC but no longer occur in NVRC operated facilities.

More detailed information was provided by the NVRC user data base to explain some of the overall shifts shown in **Figure Three**. Further analysis follows.

**Pool Use** - Use of the four indoor pools has declined by roughly 200,000 swims per year as the facilities continue to age, but within that overall trend, aquatic sport club rentals accounts for an increase of about 100,000 swims (see **Figure Four**), swim lessons have

remained quite constant, and all other categories of swims have declined by about 300,000 swims. Aquatics staff members report that the largest category of aquatic service, recreational swimming, has declined the most due largely to transfer of activity from North Vancouver to West Vancouver and other jurisdictions. When the William Griffin Pool closed toward the end of 2013, it caused some significant transfer and disruption in swimming. As swim lessons were a priority, they were rescheduled elsewhere and comparison between first quarter swims in 2013 and 2014 show constant numbers of swim lesson visits. Also, aquatic sport club activity was largely maintained because the clubs were sufficiently flexible to use previously off peak and previously closed timeslots in pools to preserve the number of swims between the two same two quarters. The largest decline between the first quarter of 2013 and 2014 was in recreational swimming.

It is interesting to note that the increase in number of swim club training swims between 2007 and 2013 corresponds directly to the increase of about 12.8% in swim club combined membership over the same period as shown in **Figure Four**.

**Figure Four**  
**Changes in Total Aquatic Club Membership 2007-2013**

Types of Uses	Total Members		% change
	2007	2013	
Swimming	365	411	13%
Diving	103	72	-30%
Synchronized Swimming	57	57	0%
Water Polo	121	189	56%
Total	646	729	13%

**Ice Use** - Ice use has remained relatively constant at full capacity with ongoing waiting lists for minor hockey. This corresponds to the membership increases in minor hockey and female hockey, but corresponding declines in adult hockey, ringette and figure skating. Late night adult rentals have declined as adult users appear to be more willing to travel to other communities to get ice at earlier time periods.

**Indoor Tennis** - Indoor tennis visits declined somewhat from 2008 to 2013, but early indications in 2014 show that indoor tennis has increased significantly when the new courts opened late in 2013.

**Use of Spaces by Seniors** - Use of all spaces by seniors is on the increase as the population ages. However, seniors are increasingly more likely to use mainstream spaces that are used by other age groups, and less likely to focus their activity on so called “seniors centres” which are used only by seniors. Use of all types of mainstream facilities is increasing while the membership of the Silver Harbour facility has remained constant and is now down to about 5% of the current population over 60 years of age.

**Use of Spaces by Youth** – While the number of pre-teens and teens has declined over the past ten years, membership in most sports clubs has increased, and registration in mainstream activities like sports camps and swim lessons has increased, so proportions of

youth active appears to be increasing. At the same time, use of the youth centres at Harry Jerome and John Braithwaite youth centres declined about 20% over the past three years.

A few other pertinent changes in leisure behaviour were reported by the staff of NVCR in a workshop. They include:

- Ongoing high levels of interest in organized sport and intensive physical activity generally; with growing participation levels in many indoor sports;
- Ongoing high levels of interest in fitness activities of all kinds; not just organized and formalized interest in fitness labelled activity but also in all kinds of activity (e.g. walking, cycling ; with more seniors involved and higher levels of personalized fitness services and lower attendance at large group aerobic classes;
- Continually increasing interest in health issues as the general age of the population increases;
- Continually increasing interest in the social dimension of all leisure activity, engaging with others before, after and during recreation activity;
- Continued flexibility of the public and organized sports groups in using off peak times in facilities, with a shift away from peak loading and towards more continuous use of spaces during all opening times, and even some previously “dark” hours, possibly due to increasing numbers of retirees, part time workers and those that work from home and have more flexibility in their schedules;
- Decrease in dry floor uses of arenas;
- Gradual decline in the school use of NVRC spaces during school hours; especially in pools and arenas;
- Women’s only swim periods are becoming increasingly popular;
- Private and non-profit agencies in dance instruction report growing demand and participants;
- Female interest in soccer is increasing to the point where there is now gender parity in most areas of youth soccer;
- Interest in all kinds of basketball is increasing;
- There is growing interest in new dry floor gymnasium activities like pickleball and floorball;
- Spaces previously dedicated to one age group (especially seniors or youth) are now more likely used by different groups at different times on an “as needed” basis, and this has increased off peak use of previously dedicated spaces;
- All facilities are experiencing increasing numbers of patrons with special needs requiring significant personal support from staff.

In summary, usage trends suggest that there is increasing need for fitness spaces, arena ice, gymnasias for basketball, areas for social interaction and indoor pools. These needs were all anticipated within the 2007 report. However, it is possible that the need for fitness space is growing faster than anticipated in the 2007 recommendations. Also, there appears to be less

need for performing venues and spaces which focus on teens and seniors. These latter two needs were not anticipated within the 2007 report.

### Changes to Infrastructure

There have been several changes to the provision of indoor public recreation facilities since the 2007 Facilities Strategy. They are summarized in **Figure Five**.

**Figure Five**  
**Planned and Implemented Indoor Recreation Facility Projects 2007-2014**

The Project	Year of Implementation	Congruence with 2007 Recommendations
New Community Recreation Centre at William Griffin Centre site with added pool – a 72,000 sq. ft. (gross space) CRC with an added two tank pool totalling 7500 sq. ft. of water surface area which is about 36% larger than the previous pool.	Under construction, and will open in 2016	A new CRC to replace Delbrook and William Griffin was included in the 2007 recommendations, but this project was expanded to include some elements not included in a prototypical 31,000 sq. ft. net usable space CRC e.g. NVRC office space, racquet sport courts ) and also has a new pool which is over and above what was recommended in 2007
Expansion of North Vancouver Tennis Centre – added three additional courts and a practice area	Completed and opened in 2013	This project was recommended in the 2007 report
The opening of a new indoor pool with some controlled public access at the Pinnacle Hotel in the Lower Lonsdale area, with 136 lane hours each week in a five lane 25 meter tank.	Opened in 2007	Anticipated within the 2007 recommendations
Lower Lynn Neighbourhood Recreation Centre with 21,000 sq. ft. of net usable space recommended to serve rapidly expanding Lower Lynn Town Centre	In the planning stages	Could be incorporated with the Maplewood Community Recreation Centre along with a replacement for the Ron Andrews Pool or it would be an enhanced neighbourhood facility as anticipated to replace spaces like the Seylynn Hall
Lower Capilano Community Recreation Centre – a 21,320 sq. ft. net usable space (25,550 sq. ft. of gross space) planned to serve the emerging Lower Capilano/Norgate community	Planned for construction in 2021	Corresponds exactly with the 2007 recommendations, as a slightly smaller CRC to serve a community likely smaller than 30,000 residents at build out
Increased access to public school gymnasias	Ongoing - with more increase anticipated in the future	This was recommended in the 2007 report

In summary, what has happened since 2007 is generally in alignment with the 2007 report recommendations with the notable exception of the addition of an indoor pool at William Griffin CRC. Adjustments in location and timing of new indoor pool infrastructure can accommodate that deviation from the 2007 recommendations. Also, the pace of new indoor facility development has been delayed somewhat more than was anticipated in 2007.

It is worth noting what was recommended to happen in the 2007 report that has not happened. The 2007 report positioned several decisions around a new ice arena, a new gymnastics gym and the redevelopment of the Harry Jerome CRC as pivotal to all other decisions in a scenario where the dominos were to start falling with those decisions and could not fall without those decisions. Specifically, identification of a site for a three sheet ice arena on the west side of the sub-region to replace two existing ice sheets, and the relocation of the gymnastics gym from the Harry Jerome site to the vacated arena at Karen Magnussen would pave the way for redevelopment of Harry Jerome without those two spaces. This has not happened.

## **The High Level Indoor Recreation Facility Strategy**

The 2007 Indoor Recreation Facility Strategy had spaces provided at three levels in a coordinated fashion that would meet all needs for indoor public recreation within the City and District. Generally, that strategy still has relevance and still applies. In fact, positive steps have been taken to implement that strategy. However, several differences from what was originally recommended in 2007 are important to moving the strategy forward. The need for amendments is summarized as follows:

- Reduced need for performing space, thereby possibly reducing the need for a new rehearsal/presentation space as originally recommended in 2007;
- No available site for a new multi-sheet ice arena in the west half of the sub-region, which means that two of the existing arenas could stay where they are and an alternate site for a new sheet has to be found (possibly twinning one of the two); it also means that efficiencies in multi-sheet arena operation may not be available;
- Increased need for fitness space overall than originally foreseen in 2007;
- The new aquatics capacity provided at William Griffin will require adjustment to the future of aquatic service provision and mean that efficiencies of reduced number of pools will not be achieved;
- Shift in activity from age group dedicated space to spaces used by all ages and increasing use of all spaces by seniors will reduce the need for dedicated youth and seniors spaces overall with a corresponding increase in the need for multipurpose spaces;
- Planning for the Lower Capilano/Norgate Community Recreation Centre, which will simply expedite what was originally recommended in the 2007 strategy;
- Plans to add a new small Lower Lynn Community Recreation Centre may reduce the overall need for multipurpose space at the Ron Andrews CRC replacement serving the Maplewood/Moodyville Lower Lynn and the Karen Magnussen CRC multipurpose space additions;

- A decision of the City of North Vancouver council to investigate adding a gymnastics gym in the new Harry Jerome site redevelopment could add to that project.

The above impacts lead the consultants to recommend the following changes to the overall facility provision strategy from 2007:

- Delete reference to the need for a new performing space at the Harry Jerome/Centennial Theatre site;
- Reduce or delete the reference to a seniors space and a youth centre in a prototypical CRC and replace both with increased multipurpose space;
- Add to the size of the dedicated fitness space in a typical CRC by an additional 2,000 sq. ft. thereby increasing the size of a prototypical CRC to 33,000 and the CRC at the Harry Jerome site to 35,000 sq. ft.(excluding gross up)
- Retain or replace the ice surfaces at Karen Magnussen and Harry Jerome sites and add an additional ice surface either at the Karen Magnussen site, the Harry Jerome site or at the Ice Sports site to increase capacity for ice activity, especially for minor hockey use during prime time periods;
- Delete the reference to adding a new pool tank at the Karen Magnussen site in favour of the pool already under construction at the William Griffin site, and explore ways of reducing the capacity of the Ron Andrews pool when it is replaced to further compensate for the enhanced capacity at William Griffin – and reaffirm the size of the recommended pool tanks at the Harry Jerome site totally 11,000 sq. ft. of water surface area.
- Consider a dedicated gymnastics gym (for Flicka), and possibly on the Harry Jerome site, for consideration of City Council;
- Reduce the magnitude of the multipurpose spaces originally proposed for the Ron Andrews replacement (i.e. the Maplewood/Moodyville CRC) if the Lower Lynn Recreation Centre is developed.

## Specific Spaces Needed At Harry Jerome

The 2007 report made a case for redevelopment of facilities at the Harry Jerome site such that it would become both a Community Recreation Centre and a sub-regional hub serving the entire population of the City and District of North Vancouver. The result of redevelopment would have replaced the Harry Jerome Centre, the Mickey McDougall Centre, the Memorial Centre and the Silver Harbour Seniors Centre with a new facility on the same site as, and possible connected to, the Centennial Theatre. That project should proceed, but amendments to it should be considered as summarized in **Figure Six**.

**Figure Six**  
**Updated Recommendation for Spaces at Harry Jerome Site**

The Component	Size in Sq. Ft. of Net Usable Space	Comments
An enlarged Community Recreation Centre	35,000	With 10,000 sq. ft. of fitness (up from 8000 sq. ft. previously), one 8000 sq. ft. gym, two arts and crafts studios totaling 2500 sq. ft., multipurpose spaces totaling 8,400 sq. ft., an 800 sq. ft. youth centre and an 800 sq. ft. seniors centre, a 2000 sq. ft. dance/martial arts floor and a 2000 sq. ft. pre-school program centre
The originally recommended Indoor Aquatic Centre	24,000 sq. ft. pool enclosure	A 25 meter square ten lane tank, large leisure tank and hot tub, with appropriate deck space
The originally recommended second gymnasium so that the total of two gyms replace the Mickey McDougall and Memorial gyms	8,000	A full sized gym , which could serve, in part, to provide some indoor tournaments, as Capilano University doesn't appear to be moving forward with a sport tournament facility anytime soon.
A scaled down replacement for Silver Harbour Centre	8000	Somewhat reduced space but still a significant amount of dedicated spaces primarily available to seniors, supplemented with all the multipurpose spaces
Added Multipurpose Space	2000	To make up for the downsizing of the dedicated space for Silver Harbour
Added Ice Surface	25,000	A regulation sized ice surface with about 500 spectator seats
Added Gymnastics Gym	12,000	A 10,000 sq. ft. dedicated gym, some multipurpose training space, dressing rooms and administration space, possibly on the Harry Jerome site
Total net usable	114,000	

It is important to note that “total gross” space is always significantly larger than “net usable space”. The substantial difference can include dressing rooms, public washrooms, circulation and control space, mechanical and electrical space, administration offices, storage areas, janitorial closets and wall thicknesses. While gross space is typically 15-30% higher than net usable space, that difference is substantially higher for indoor pools and for ice arenas.

### **The 50 Meter Pool Question**

During the 2007 indoor facility planning process, and thereafter, the issue of what size of pool to develop at the Harry Jerome site has been debated. In 2007, the consultants worked on the basis of analyzing eight different categories of aquatic service needs and attempted to determine an overall aquatic strategy that would meet all eight types of aquatic service, adding significantly to the existing aquatic capacity in North Vancouver, but in one less pool facility, so

that almost all residents were within four kilometers of an indoor pool. The consultants recommended the largest of the resultant pools at Harry Jerome with two tanks; one ten lane 25 Meter tank which would primarily be used for swim instruction, fitness swimming, rental to aquatics clubs for sport training, special events including competitions and leadership training. The second would be a large leisure tank primarily used for recreational swimming, some shallow water fitness classes, rehabilitation and therapy and water orientation for toddlers.

At the time, many of the organized aquatic sport clubs expressed a preference for the 25 Meter tank to be expanded to a 50 Meter tank. They have continued to press for a longer tank and have formed the North Vancouver Aquatic User Association to focus that effort.

The consultants have reviewed that situation as part of this “refresh” and have reviewed some updated information that the North Vancouver Aquatics user Association has provided. However, the consultants come to the same conclusion as they did in 2007; that a 50m tank is more than is required and more than would be prudent or cost effective. The details of that analysis are included in **Addendum B**. The summary is that adding 3350 sq. ft. of water surface area to the Harry Jerome project at a cost of roughly \$10,000,000 and a substantial addition to the net operating deficit would not be prudent for the following reasons.

- Pools need to operate as close to full capacity as possible in order to be economically feasible. Operating at much less than full capacity is very expensive.
- Adding more water surface area than needed (as with a 50M tank) does not, in the short term, increase the amount of use. Excess capacity simply sits unused and increases the operating deficit overall and the net deficit per swim;
- The increased operating deficit while waiting for a population to rise and thus for the swims to increase to fill unused capacity, is more expensive than building new capacity only when absolutely needed.
- Adding more capacity than needed at Harry Jerome will also likely have the effect of reducing a future pool (likely the Ron Andrews pool) thereby increasing the net travel time and distance to the nearest pool in the sub-region, increasing pollution and working against the District’s and City’s OCP objectives of providing services as close as possible to all residents.

More on the 50 meter pool question is included in **Addendum B**.

It is also worth noting that the large leisure pool recommended as part of the Harry Jerome redevelopment is a very important part of the overall provision of aquatic services in North Vancouver. High quality leisure pools serve the largest segments of the swimming market and serve the segments most likely to grow in the future. For example, in almost all aquatic facilities in BC which have a rectangular tank and a leisure tank, the leisure tank experiences far more visits than the rectangular tank and costs less per swim to provide the service than a rectangular tank.



## Addendum A – Excerpt From 2007 NVRC Indoor Recreation Facility Strategy

Because so many of its facilities were approaching the end of their functional lifespan, the North Vancouver Recreation Commission, on behalf of the City and District of North Vancouver, retained Professional Environmental Recreation Consultants Ltd. (PERC) to undertake a Recreation Needs Assessment and Indoor Facility Plan to chart a path forward in terms of facility renewal.

In Phase One of this study, the Recreation Needs Assessment Phase which is bound in a separate document, a total of thirty four recreation demands were identified. After much analysis, thirteen of those were identified as indoor recreation needs that had a facility dimension. These were prioritized and referred to Phase Two of the study; the Facility Planning phase of the work. The needs are summarized in **Figure A-1**. They are further described in the Phase One report which is bound separately.

**Figure A-1  
Summary of Indoor Recreation Needs and Priorities**

Recreation Need	Priority
1. More fitness services of all kinds	High
2. More indoor aquatics activities	High
3. More gymnasium activities	High
4. More and better performing arts and rehearsal experiences	High
5. More dry floor arena activities	High
6. Enhanced indoor sport tournaments	Medium
7. More indoor ice sports	Medium
8. More indoor tennis opportunities	Medium
9. More unstructured recreation experiences for youth	Medium
10. More gymnastics training	Low
11. New indoor lawn bowling experience	Low
12. More arts and crafts experiences	Low
13. More services east and west of Lower Lonsdale	Not prioritized

In Phase Two of the project, the consultants developed facility recommendations for how best to respond to the thirteen needs. The consultants reviewed background studies, facility condition audits, facility usage reports, operating costs and revenues, “best practices” from other communities and growth projections for the City and District of North Vancouver. They also inventoried all existing facilities that serve North Vancouver residents.

This report is a culmination of Phase Two of the process. It represents an effort to respond to outstanding indoor recreation needs, and to outline a set of facility recommendations to respond to those needs, correcting problems in existing facilities and replacing facilities which are at the end of their functional lifespan.

## A Vision for Indoor Recreation Facilities in North Vancouver

If the City and District of North Vancouver had no public recreation facilities and wished to build indoor recreation facilities from scratch, it would want to provide a system of facilities at three levels of supply (i.e. specialty facilities at a sub-regional level, the bulk of facilities at a community level and a small number at the neighbourhood level) to meet all the community's needs as follows:

- Most residents would be within 2 km of a local Community Recreation Centre (CRC) which would act as a social focal point and community hub of activity. It would be accessible without having to get into a private vehicle. It would be located adjacent to other elements of community life, possibly including a high school, a large park, commercial shopping and other public amenities (e.g. library, community policing station, day care, health centre etc.).

Each CRC would include a large gym, one or more large fitness centres, a dance/martial arts/fitness studio, several multipurpose spaces, a small youth space, seniors space, a preschool program centre and arts and crafts studios.

Each CRC would have a large and welcoming entry foyer which entices people to come in even if they don't have an intended use, and doubles as a community and family gathering place, possibly with some access to food and beverages.

It would also be a base for use of local park areas and trails providing public washrooms and possibly change rooms.

- Also provided in North Vancouver there would be larger, more specialized recreation facilities to which people are willing to travel further, and which require a larger market within which to operate. For example, there should be:
  - A single premier public theatre complex serving all North Vancouver residents,
  - One large gymnastics centre, one sport tournament centre and one indoor tennis centre; each serving the entire North Vancouver community,
  - Six sheets of arena ice in one or more multiple sheet complexes with public dry floor use of most of them all summer,
  - Three large multi-tank indoor pools, each delivering a wide range of aquatic services distributed so that one is within 4 km of almost all residents.
- There would also be a great deal of public access to other facilities which might be located even closer than the nearest Community Recreation Centre and might have dual purposes. For example, school gyms would be used during weekday evenings and weekends for community recreation purposes and community and church halls would be used for various programs and social gatherings.

All these spaces would be energy efficient, of the highest quality, and user friendly.

The vast majority of all residents would use one or more of these facilities, and derive some direct benefit from them. But even if they didn't, they would understand that the facilities contribute to healthy citizens, healthy families and a healthy community, thereby making North Vancouver a much better place to live for all citizens regardless of whether they use them. The facilities would be focused on nine public goods called Outcomes that the Commission uses to measure its success.

They are:

- 1 Physical Fitness and Rehabilitation**  
Physical activity contributes to one's physical, mental and emotional health. North Vancouver residents will have access to fitness services that will help them to gain or regain high levels of fitness.
- 2 State of Wellbeing**  
Through recreation and cultural experiences, individuals will develop confidence, positive self-image and self-esteem, reduce stress, express themselves creatively, discover personal strengths and maximize their life satisfaction.
- 3 Social Interaction and Socialization Skills**  
It is important that citizens feel welcome and involved in their communities of interest. Through recreation, North Vancouver residents learn social skills, increase feelings of belonging and inclusion and reduce feelings of isolation and alienation.
- 4 Basic Skill Development in Leisure Pursuits**  
Skills in a variety of leisure pursuits help citizens with lifelong participation in sports, arts and hobbies, contribute to gross and fine motor development, explore creative potential, be safe in the water and participate in healthy play activity. North Vancouver citizens will have the opportunity for skill development in order to develop basic proficiency in a wide variety of leisure pursuits.
- 5 Higher Level Skills in Leisure Pursuits**  
Developing skills beyond basic proficiency levels furthers one's lifelong participation in sports, arts and hobbies, and contributes to enhanced health and fitness. North Vancouver residents will have access to some skill development opportunities to advance beyond the basic level.
- 6 Volunteer Leadership Development**  
Volunteering is one of the highest forms of recreation. It helps the volunteer to grow and become a more responsible citizen and strengthens the community in which the volunteer serves. North Vancouver residents will have opportunities to volunteer in recreation settings in ways that maximize the benefits to both the volunteer and the community.
- 7 Lifelong Learning about the Wise Use of Leisure Time**  
Individuals make healthy life-long choices if they understand the personal and public value of recreation and are aware of how best to use their leisure time. North Vancouver residents will have opportunities to learn about the wise use of leisure time.
- 8 Strong Families**  
Recreation can enhance the quality of time that citizens spend together as a family. North Vancouver residents will have opportunities for families to recreate as a unit in ways that best support and nurture those families.
- 9 Strong Neighbourhoods and Communities**  
Recreation activity contributes to a strong sense of community. Neighbourhoods and communities within North Vancouver will have access to recreation services that will enhance and strengthen them, connecting people to their communities, ensuring they feel positively about those communities and developing community leadership.

## **A Conceptual Plan for Recreation Facility Provision in North Vancouver**

North Vancouver is not starting from scratch. It already has many existing indoor public recreation facilities that enjoy approximately 3.8 million visits each year. However, many of these facilities are approaching the end of their functional lifespan. A technical assessment in 2002 showed that some will not last past 2010 without significant retrofit and others will need to be replaced. The challenge is to proceed from where the community is now to a place as close to the above vision as is reasonably possible, all the while looking for investment partners with a shared vision, and trying to make best use of limited available public resources. This concept plan overlays the above vision with the current reality and attempts to chart the most appropriate course forward for the next ten to twenty years. It has the following elements:

1. Each community of 25,000 to 30,000 residents in North Vancouver would have a Community Recreation Centre (CRC) which would welcome the broadest cross section of residents and serve their diverse recreation needs in a way that optimizes the Commission's nine Outcomes. Each CRC would have approximately 31,000 square feet of net usable space (more space once all support areas are included) including a gymnasium, a smaller dance/martial arts studio, a large fitness area, a series of multipurpose spaces, a preschool program centre, a youth space, a seniors space and arts and crafts studios.
2. Initially there would be five CRCs, including John Braithwaite, Parkgate, a redeveloped Harry Jerome, Karen Magnussen (not quite all spaces listed above) and a new CRC in the northwest Upper Capilano area to replace Delbrook and William Griffin. If and when the Maplewood/Moodyville area develops and surpasses 15,000 residents, and is clearly on its way toward 25,000 residents, a sixth CRC would be created in a way that also replaces the Ron Andrews recCentre. If that doesn't happen, Ron Andrews would have to be replaced on its own.
3. In the longer term future, if the densification of the Marine Drive area is achieved, there may be sufficient population in the lower Norgate area to justify a seventh CRC. However, in the short term future, the upper Capilano CRC should be positioned to attract and serve Norgate residents. They may also be served in part by the John Braithwaite CRC and/or a smaller facility developed in conjunction with an elementary school in the area through a partnership with School District No. 44.
4. Specialty facilities would be added to three of the CRC's. Harry Jerome, Karen Magnussen and the new Maplewood CRC (or the replacement for Ron Andrews) would have an additional large indoor pool with a rectangular tank and a leisure pool together with a variety of amenities and support spaces. One of the three CRCs (Harry Jerome) would also have additional elements including the community's premier theatre (Centennial Theatre), a new studio theater, an enhanced fitness centre, a second large gym and additional seniors' spaces provided in a partnership with Silver Harbour. Also, the seniors' spaces could be developed in conjunction with some residential units, including units for seniors.
5. Other specialty facilities would not be located on CRC sites. There would be two arena centres with a total of six sheets of winter ice and summer dry floor activity. Both could be public private partnerships; one would be in the west and one in the east of the market area. There would also be one indoor sport tournament centre (at Capilano College), one indoor tennis centre (with six indoor courts and two indoor/outdoor

facilities) and one gymnastics training centre (in the Karen Magnussen facility where the arena used to be).

6. To augment the six NVRC operated gyms in the five CRCs and the gym complex at Capilano College, there would be increased access to all school gyms.

All other facilities would eventually be declared surplus to indoor recreation needs. That includes Delbrook **recCentre**, William Griffin **recCentre**, Lynn Valley **recCentre**, Seylynn **recCentre** and Ron Andrews **recCentre**. Also, some space around Harry Jerome **recCentre** would be declared surplus to indoor recreation needs. Of course, new much better replacement facilities would be provided before any existing facilities are phased out. Some of these surplus sites could be re-used for other public purposes or liquidated for private uses, and that might help to finance some of the required capital. Partnerships can also be used to assist with the required capital.

Once the above recommendations are implemented, the net result would be a set of indoor recreation facilities that would:

- Offer higher quality recreation experiences than are available now,
- Be more cost effective to operate (provide more service at less cost to the public per unit of service),
- Be more equitably distributed across North Vancouver (with even more residents closer to a CRC and fewer residents double served by two of them),
- Require as little travel time and cost as necessary to access appropriate facilities,
- Make better use of available land for recreation facilities,
- Include 40% more fitness space better configured to provide about 45% more service,
- Add one additional ice sheet for local use (20% increase in capacity),
- Provide more opportunities for dry floor arena sports (20% more capacity),
- Increase the number of lanes of swimming from 18 to 24 for training and fitness swimming (33% more capacity for swim clubs and fitness swimming),
- Increase the number of appropriate spaces for deep water sports such as diving, synchronized swimming and water polo,
- Add significantly to the amount of leisure aquatics capacity for recreational swimming, therapy and rehabilitation, and water orientation for those that can't swim,
- Enhance local capability to host indoor sport tournaments and short course swim meets,
- Increase substantially the amount of gymnasium capacity that will be available to local sports groups for basketball, volleyball and badminton,
- Increase the amount of dedicated gymnastics training space by about 30%,
- Increase winter indoor tennis capacity by 33%,
- Increase the capacity for arts and crafts activity in the community by 10%,
- Render youth centres more efficient and equitable for all youth in the community,
- Add rehearsal space and leverage the use of performance spaces for recreational uses,
- Create more partnerships with other community private, non-profit and public agencies.

In all of the above, all segments of the community will be better served and three segments would have facilities which focus on their needs. Seniors will have space at each of the five Community Recreation Centres as well as specialized spaces at the Harry Jerome facility and higher quality fitness, arts and crafts, aquatics and multipurpose spaces closer to their residences. Youth will have some dedicated space in each Community Recreation Centre as well as better access to more spaces on an “as required” basis in each centre. The same will be true of pre-school aged members of the community.

## Recommendations for Indoor Recreation Facility Projects

The consultants have synthesized the Concept Plan into ten projects. They are outlined in **Figure A-2**. While the third and fourth project in the list are the highest short term priorities, the first two items on the list have to be done before the third and fourth projects can be implemented.

**Figure A-2**  
**Summary of Facility Recommendations**

Project	Spaces
1. New three sheet ice arena	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three sheets of ice and all the support spaces that are required (approximately 80,000 square feet of space) on west side of North Vancouver developed as a public/private partnership. Two of the three will replace single sheet arenas at Harry Jerome and Karen Magnussen <b>recCentres</b>. An alternative to this project would be to develop only two new sheets on the west side and add one new sheet to the existing three sheet facility on the east side.</li> </ul>
2. Larger gymnastics gym	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retrofit 17,000 square foot arena and support spaces at Karen Magnussen <b>recCentre</b> into a gymnastics centre</li> </ul>
3. New Harry Jerome Community Recreation Centre (CRC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>33,000 net usable square foot CRC (including 8000 sq. ft. of fitness, one 8000 sq. ft. gym, two arts and crafts studios totaling 2500 sq. ft., multipurpose spaces totaling 8,000 sq. ft., a 1000 sq. ft. youth centre and a 1000 sq. ft. seniors centre, a 2000 sq. ft. dance/martial arts floor, 2000 sq. ft. pre-school program centre and all support spaces)</li> <li>Second 8000 sq. ft. gym</li> <li>A new 10,000 sq. ft. studio theatre associated with Centennial Theatre</li> <li>A multi-tank pool with 9000 sq. ft. of water surface area (i.e. a ten lane 25 M. tank and a leisure tank) totaling almost 33,000 sq. ft. of space</li> <li>Additional 10,000 sq. ft. of seniors spaces to incorporate the Silver Harbour operation</li> </ul>
4. New Capilano CRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 31,000 net usable square foot CRC with an average size (6000 sq. ft.) fitness area but otherwise similar to the one at Harry Jerome to replace the Delbrook <b>recCentre</b> and the fitness spaces at the William Griffin <b>recCentre</b></li> </ul>
5. Tennis courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two new indoor/outdoor tennis courts and support spaces as close as possible to the Grant Connell Tennis Centre</li> </ul>
6. New sport tournament centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New gym and support spaces at Capilano College as a partnership between the municipalities, the College and the Province of BC</li> </ul>
7. Karen Magnussen expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New 6 lane 25 meter tank with support spaces (14,000 square feet)</li> <li>Added fitness spaces (about 2500 sq. ft.)</li> <li>Added multipurpose spaces (about 9000 sq. ft.)</li> </ul> <p>(Note: The site would have to be expanded to accommodate these spaces)</p>

Project	Spaces
8. New CRC in Maplewood area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 31,000 net usable square foot CRC</li> <li>• A new 30,000 sq. ft. multi-tank pool with 8 lanes to replace Ron Andrews <b>recCentre</b></li> </ul>
9. Free up land for other uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Around Harry Jerome <b>recCentre</b> as new footprint will be reduced from that which was suggested in earlier studies</li> </ul>
10. Free up land for other uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Former site of Ron Andrews <b>recCentre</b>, Lynn Valley <b>recCentre</b>, Seylynn <b>recCentre</b>, William Griffin <b>recCentre</b> and Delbrook <b>recCentre</b></li> </ul>

## Implementation of the Facilities Recommendations

Recreation facility renewal in North Vancouver will come at a significant capital cost. But the recommendations above will result in several operating efficiencies. The net operating public subsidy per use should decrease in constant dollars. But capital costs will increase with inflation. **Figure A-3** is the best current estimate of capital costs in 2007 but does not include any land costs. The best estimate is that construction costs will continue to escalate at a rate of about 10% per year for the foreseeable future. The capital estimates include an allowance for a so called “green” standard of construction.

**Figure A-3  
Project Capital Costs in Current Dollars**

Project	Current Estimate of Capital Cost
1. New Three sheet ice arena	\$28.8 million
2. New gymnastics gym	\$1.4 million
3. New Capilano CRC	\$15.1 million
4. Tennis courts	\$1.9 million
5. Indoor sport tournament centre	\$8.9 million
6. New Harry Jerome CRC	\$54.1 million
7. Karen Magnussen expansion	\$14.4 million
8. New Maplewood CRC	\$37.0 million
<b>Total net of land costs</b>	<b>\$161.6 million</b>

In order to reduce the net public investment required by local taxpayers, the City and District will have to look for creative ways of financing these capital costs. Partnerships and land re-use will be important options to consider. There is some potential for capital costs to be shared with private investors and developers of property that will benefit from these investments. There is also some potential for capital costs to be shared with other agencies (e.g. grants from senior levels of government, and Capilano College), and with non-profit societies (possibly the North Vancouver Tennis Society, the Flicka Gymnastics Club and Silver Harbour). Land re-use may be possible with land gained at such sites as the existing Harry Jerome **recCentre**, Delbrook **recCentre**, William Griffin **recCentre**, Ron Andrews **recCentre**, Seylynn **recCentre** and Lynn Valley **recCentre**. In these areas land no longer required for recreation facilities could be used for other public or private uses, and could be used to help finance new recreation facility construction.

It should be clear that the status quo is not an option. The facility assessments have shown clearly that while a few of the Commission's newer facilities are in good shape, many existing facilities are approaching the end of their functional lifespan. Minor retrofits will not suffice to keep them cost effective. If they are to be replaced, it is important to replace them with facilities that meet future needs, not simply replicate what has been done in the past. This plan represents the best approach for meeting future needs in the most cost effective manner possible.



## Addendum B - The 50 Meter Pool Question

### Background

- Until the end of 2013, the NVRC operated four pools with a total of 19,100 sq. ft. of water surface area.
- Those pools have capacity for about 1.1 million swims per year. In addition, there was public access to about 136 lane hours per week of indoor pool time at the Pinnacle Hotel in Lower Lonsdale. That is used primarily for lane fitness swimming and for rental to swim clubs.
- In the most recent full year for which statistics are available, 2013, the NVRC recorded about 540,000 swims per year (about 50% of capacity is used, although that is virtually 100% of capacity in peak periods and less in some off peak periods)

### 2007 Recommendations

Due to trends, demographic projects and analysis of existing use, the 2007 recommendations called for more aquatics capacity in the long term future as follows:

- Reducing the number of public pools from four to three, but a public pool would still be within about 4km of the vast majority of residents, which is a reasonable service radius and much better access on average than many of BC's mid-sized communities such as Nanaimo, Kelowna, Prince George, Saanich, Maple Ridge, West Vancouver, Richmond and the Township of Langley;
- Increasing the actual amount of water surface (and therefore capacity for swimming) by about 35% by developing larger, multi-tank pools;
- Three new or expanded pools would each have an 8 lane 25 meter tank and a large leisure tank with a total of 8000 square feet of water surface area or more;
- Resultant capacity would be better configured to meet all seven categories of aquatics service; namely, in descending order of popularity, swimming for fun, learn to swim programs, fitness swimming, swim club training, rehab/therapy swimming, special events and leadership training;
- The net deficit in "real" terms will remain constant as usage increases over time, so the net public subsidy per swim will decrease substantially.

### The Current Reality in 2014

Overall swims are in decline as the most popular category of swimming, which is recreational swimming, or swimming for fun, go outside of North Vancouver to pools that accommodate this category much better than any in North Vancouver. However, while recreational swimming is on the decline, swim lessons are stable or growing slightly, fitness swimming is growing, and swim club training is growing along with rehab/therapy swimming. There is still need for more capacity in North Vancouver.

However, the William Griffin pool, when it reopens, will provide more water surface area than was originally in the 2007 recommendations. That means that less has to be provided at other locations. One option would be to delay adding a six lane 25 meter tank at Karen Magnussen. That would mean that the William Griffin pool simply replaces the tank at Karen Magnussen. However, William Griffin also has a modest leisure pool. That still leaves the need for a 25 meter ten lane pool at Harry Jerome supplemented with a large leisure pool. Once it is open, plans can be confirmed for replacement of the

Ron Andrews Pool with a multi-tank 25 meter tank and a leisure tank. When all that is in place, there will be four significant pools in North Vancouver which will be capable of serving a population of some 160,000 to 200,000 residents; each within about 4km of an indoor pool, and all collectively having 35% more capacity than was originally provided pre 2007.

It is worth noting that the relatively minor amount of capacity for public swimming that has been added at the Pinnacle Hotel in lower Lonsdale has added to the supply of public swimming but only very marginally. Any assumption that the opening of this facility since 2007 has changed the picture significantly in terms of pool availability in North Vancouver is false.

### **A 50 Meter Pool Option**

If the recommended 25 meter tank at HJRC were increased to a 50 meter tank the benefits would include:

- The ability to host one or two long course swim meets on the north shore that cannot be hosted now;
- The ability to have long course training and fitness swimming on the north shore that is not available now;
- More capacity than has been recommended (adding six additional 25 meter lane equivalents, or about the capacity of a standard six lane 25 meter facility).

The corresponding “downside” includes:

- A 52m by 18m eight lane tank would have about 10,075 sq. ft. of water surface area, while a 25M square tank would have about 6,728 sq. ft. So, the long course tank would have about 50% more water surface area and would cost approximately 50% more to construct. The one time capital cost difference for this specific segment of the pool would be a minimum of \$10 million more for the larger tank. Ten million dollars is a huge amount to add to an overall HJCC project.
- Just because one builds more pool capacity doesn’t mean it will be used. The consultants believe that all demand and need for indoor swimming can be accommodated within the pools recommended in the refresh of the facility strategy. Therefore, building more space simply adds operating costs and little or no revenue. Ongoing annual operating subsidy increase of the larger tank would be quite substantial. Providing a detailed operating projection is beyond the scope of this refresh, but the consultants are convinced the larger tank would add hundreds of thousands of dollars per year to the net operating deficit.
- Possible centralization of aquatic services, making them farther away from some residents - if an additional 25 meters of pool at HJRC is offset by not adding a 25 meter tank at one of the other two locations, the net effect will cause more travel time, pollution and expense and result in some aquatic services not being as close to residents as is desirable.

### **Other considerations**

- There are currently about fourteen 50 meter tanks in municipal indoor pools in BC. That means that, on average, there is one 50 meter public pool in BC for every 330,000 residents. North Vancouver is currently at less than half that threshold and won’t approach it in the foreseeable future.

- More than 90% of all indoor swim meets in BC are short course and can be accommodated within a short course 25 meter tank. There are fewer than 10 long course meets held in BC each year including all long course regional, provincial, national and international competitions. That means that there is an average of less than one long course meet per 50 meter tank per year. Therefore, building a long course tank in order to compete with other communities to host long course meets is not prudent or cost effective. As noted in **Figure B-1**, Surrey is currently building two additional 50 meter tanks.
- Those long course tanks which have the capability of operating at either long course or short course (i.e. have a movable bulkhead) typically spend more than half their time in short course configuration, because that is where the majority of demand is.
- Because roughly 70% of the operating costs of indoor pools are fixed (i.e. it costs the same per hour whether there is one person swimming or 40 people swimming) but all revenues are 100% marginal (i.e. each new swim attracts roughly the same revenue as the previous swim), each additional swim that can be attracted to an indoor pool brings with it more revenue than cost. Therefore, indoor pools operate most cost effectively at a high proportion of capacity. In fact, if an indoor pool operates at a low proportion of its capacity for use, the net public subsidy per swim increases dramatically. For these basic economic reasons, building excess capacity for future use can be very uneconomic. While a community is operating excess capacity, waiting for it to fill up, it must subsidize all swims to such a high degree that it is invariably cheaper to wait and build capacity after it is needed rather than in anticipation of its need. Operating with unused capacity in the aquatic system is very expensive.

**Figure B -1**  
**Summary of 50M Public Indoor Pools in BC**

Municipality	Population 2012*	# of Indoor Public Pools	# of 50M Tanks
Abbotsford	140,235	2	0
Langley Twntship	107,505	2	1
Langley City	26,261	0	0
Surrey **	482,725	4	1
White Rock	19,211	0	0
Delta	100,337	3	0
Richmond	199,949	2	1
Vancouver	666,517	6	2
Burnaby	231,811	4	0
Coquitlam	129,716	2	1
Port Coquitlam	58,517	1	0
Port Moody	34,567	0	0
Maple Ridge	78,124	1	0
Pitt Meadows	18,604	0	0
New Westminster	68,534	1	1
West Vancouver	44,284	1	0

Municipality	Population 2012*	# of Indoor Public Pools	# of 50M Tanks
North Vancouver City	51,870	1	0
North Vancouver District	89,437	3	0
Belcarra	689	0	0
Anmore	2,337	0	0
Bowen Island	3,777	0	0
Lions Bay	1,406	0	0
Unincorporated Areas (including UBC)	27,566	1	1
Lower Mainland	2,583,979	34	8
Remainder of Province***	2,038,594	NA	6
Total Province of BC	4,622,573	NA	14
Number of 50 Meter pools per capita in BC			330,184
Number of 50 Meter pools per capita in Lower Mainland			322,997

\* according to

[www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca](http://www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca)

\*\* Surrey has two additional 50M tanks under construction

\*\*\* one 50M tank each in Prince George, Kamloops, Kelowna, Nanaimo, and two in Saanich