

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

Coopers Green Hall Replacement Design Task Force
Wednesday November 22, 2017
Coopers Green Hall, 5500 Fisherman Road, Halfmoon Bay

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT	SCRD Parks Planning Coordinator SCRD GM Planning & Community Development SCRD Administrative Assistant Principle Architecture Task Force Member / shishalh Nation Councillor Task Force Member Task Force Member Task Force Member	Trevor Fawcett (Chair) Ian Hall (Co-Chair) Autumn Ruinat Craig Burns Keith Julius Marie Knight Terry Karleen Brian Smith
ALSO PRESENT	Public	3
REGRETS	Task Force Member Task Force Member	Don Cunliffe Mike Carson

CALL TO ORDER 11:32 a.m.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND WELCOME

It was acknowledged that the Coopers Green Hall Replacement Design Task Force meeting was held within the territory of the shíshálh Nation.

INTRODUCTIONS

Roundtable introductions of Task Force Members, SCR D Staff and Principle Architecture Staff.

AGENDA

The agenda was accepted by the Task Force Members as presented.

MEETING NOTES

The meeting notes of October 25, 2017 were accepted as presented.

UPDATE FROM SCR D

SCR D Staff provided an update on items from the previous meeting as follows:

- It was noted that the SCRD Board accepted Walter Powell's resignation from the Task Force and recommended that the Task Force continue with the remaining members.
- It was noted that a building permit has not been applied for on the adjacent lot.
- In Situ Archaeology consultants have advised that further screening is required by the Province and reconnaissance work is pending.
- SCRD staff have elected to delay the project communications update until after this meeting.

A handout was distributed and received by the Task Force with more information regarding the Coopers Green Hall event analysis/hall size statistics. The following observations were made:

- Discussion regarding the event types
- Are past bookings a predictor of future demand?
- Large events are very diverse in type
- There are more celebration of life events than weddings
- There are smaller sized weddings
- There are other large events have included an outdoor component, utilizing both the hall and park space.
- The number of people in the community hall during an indoor/outdoor event may not be 82 capacity. There may be hundreds of people through the building throughout the day.
- Examples of indoor/outdoor events are: HMB Apple Festival, HMB Country Fair, RCMSAR fundraiser.

The Task Force requested staff provide a recommendation regarding the community hall size, considering the analysis of event type bookings.

Staff recommended that the proposed 120 person occupancy would be appropriate based on community input through the Coopers Green Park Management Plan and most recent public engagement for the community hall redesign project.

The Task Force provided feedback on the staff recommendation as such:

- The community hall should be built for the future
- Supports the proposed 120 person occupancy
- Incorporate design elements that allow for small meeting spaces within the larger space
- Based on the distribution of event sizes, consider how a large room could be utilized for smaller group sizes of 20-40 person range.

Staff provided an update regarding the Flood Construction Level (FCL) and geotechnical assessment report recommendation for 2.4 metres higher than the current grade (additional detail on issues raised at earlier Task Force meetings). The geotechnical engineers have confirmed that the final elevation is 5.4 metres. Principle Architecture had based the design on accommodating for an increase in grade and FCL, but the final elevation is higher than was initially estimated.

Given the final Flood Construction Level (FCL) calculation, the implications for siting, location and archeology will be the focus of the meeting. The archeologist is set to do a comprehensive assessment of the whole site and is awaiting the confirmation of building site.

UPDATE BY PRINCIPLE ARCHITECTURE

Craig Burns provided an update on the community hall design work that was presented at the last meeting as follows:

- It was noted that the design work up to date has been done prior to the final FCL calculation and the results from the geotechnical assessment report will have an impact on the feasibility of the current site.
- A site section drawing of the park was presented to demonstrate building elevation as currently designed and as would be required by the FCL, which is a 2.4 m difference in the current floor elevation of the building.
- Discussion regarding the impacts on the experience of the building, access to the park and cost of constructing the building based on final FCL.
- Given these factors it is worth considering the viability of the current proposed site.
- The Coopers Green Park Management Plan identified other site options early in the process.
- Opportunity to re-visited the site discussion or consider alternative locations.

A document summarizing the Pros and Cons for each of the Site Options was provided to the Task Force and presented at the meeting. The presentation slides are attached to the meeting notes as Attachment A.

A general summary of the Site Options presented is as follows:

- Site Option 1 – Same site plan as presented at last meeting. Elevating the building up, there would be stairs and ramps, the building would have a much larger footprint and may not fit between the waterfront and the trees.
- Site Option 2 – Would be located closer to the back property line near, corner area near the road and rock wall. Would be encroaching on the set back, variance required. May be a darker location in terms of natural light.
- Site Option 3 – Would be located in the upper parking area, currently used for boat trailers. At higher ground so would not have issue with FCL. It is more disconnected from the park, would need a path way to connect the other park. Facility is off on its own and allows more usable park area. Viewpoints could be beneficial. Hydro lines running near. Concern for vehicle and boat trailer parking. Would need to re-open discussion with MOTI.
- Site Option 4 – SCR D owned parcel on the other side the road. Steep slope, out of FCL zone. Opens up the park to more park space rather than building space.
- Site Option 5 – Would be located near volleyball court, may be easier to manage the higher floor elevation because the area around the building is unobstructed. Opportunity to knit together the upper parking area to the building with a pathway.

Three Alternative Options were discussed as follows:

- Alternative 1 – Keep the building site as is. Preparing the construction and plan for the potential to raise the building in the future. Allows the project to continue but considers the future.
- Alternative 2 – Renovate the existing building, represents the least cost option, minimal impact. Still an option to consider if it is not feasible to carry on with other sites.
- Alternative 3 – Reconsider another site within Coopers Green Park or Halfmoon Bay.

The Task Force provided feedback regarding the Options and Alternatives presented by Principle Architecture as follows:

- Concerned with challenges in order to meet the FCL requirements. Feels like we are going back to square one. Could increase the budget depending on what option we choose.
- The concern is valid. Principle Architecture has lead the Task Force through a functional program which we didn't have before. In the list of options there are a range of cost influences depending on what we do next. Discussed the challenges around being fixed on the 1 million figure. The sites that were considered at the time that dollar figure was generated did not consider the FCL. Site Options 1, 2, 5 are all influenced by the FCL confirmation.
- Concern for the substantial increase in cost and time delay. Considering the further archeological screening and site preparation, how far does it push us back the timeline?
- Proposed timeline outlined a late-2018 estimate for construction start. The FCL information does not necessarily delay the timeline, some site options could allow the timeline to continue, other factors that impact construction start is the fundraising strategy and annual grant funding opportunities.
- An example of another community hall project saw approx. 6 months required in order to confirm the funding strategy and access funding opportunities.

The Task Force provided first observations regarding the Site Option locations as follows:

- Site Options 3 and 5 would not be far off from what the project already has prepared for.
- Site Option 1 – has there been any further cost analysis about raising the floor elevation?
- Principle Architecture suggests that Site Option 1 (raising the floor elevation) cuts the park off from the waterfront and would be more difficult to build in this location.
- Site 5 is architecturally a more feasible option to raise the floor elevation. A bridge and pathway could be developed to lead to parking.
- Overall, it seems like we are trying to fit a large building in too small of a space. Raises the question as to if this the right site for the building? Could Connor Park or other SCRD properties be considered for the hall?
- Site Option 5 is most viable as a first observation. The current hall could remain and no interruption in the service during the construction phase.
- In terms of cost, which top two site options would be the least expensive?
- Principle Architecture suggested that Site Options 3 and 5 would be the least expensive. Site Option 3 - provided that the boat trailer parking would be solved with an alternative location. Site Option 5 - would be better suited architecturally and so that the most parking spaces are preserved.
- There would be major concerns from the boating community if the hall was located on Site Option 3.
- A member of the public asked for clarification regarding Site Option 2 and setback from property line and road allowance.
- Site Option 2 has challenges as it would be disconnected from the use of the park and parking.
- A member of the public asked about extending Fisherman Road. It was noted that there is no road allowance for extending Fisherman Road through the park to access Site Option 2.
- Site Option 4 could be potentially used for boat trailer parking.
- Site Option 3 would cost the least, would be easier for accessibility and would not require raising the building.

- None of the Site Options stand out as the best. Site Option 1 was favored by the community, if we are going away from it, we should look at the cost of this first before exploring other options.
- Principle Architecture does not recommend Site Option 1 or 5. The FCL states that nothing should be built within this area (under 5.4m elevation).
- Concerns with investing money in a site that should not really be built on in the long term. Is there another location to investigate? Best to plan for the long range future for the community hall.
- Site Option 3 seems to be the most reasonable option. Although it takes parking away, we could do more work to investigate alternative parking. Doesn't like that it is separated from the park but could be connected with a bridge. Would like to explore Site Option 3 and alternative locations for a community hall. Perhaps there are other SCRD owned park sites that could be seeded to provide a more appropriate location.
- Connor Park site was historically looked at for an alternative site to investigate.
- Preference is still Site Option 1. Potential benefits for view and elevation from Site Option 3. Concern that in a scenario of storm surge and sea level rise, then the parking area would be flooded.
- Principle Architecture clarified that parking areas are not limited by the FCL because it is temporary, only permanent structures cannot be put in this zone.
- Concern that Site Option 3 is disconnected from the park and may be noisy due to proximity to the road.
- Principle Architecture noted that the septic system consultant would need to be informed of the FCL.
- Staff noted that the septic system is not considered with the FCL. You can have a septic system within the flood plain.

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Staff provided a summary of the feedback received from the Task Force regarding Site Options and Alternatives.

1. Site Option 1 – Preferred location, however FCL raises questions on how the things people like about this site would be affected by floor height being raised. Principle Architecture suggests that this site is no longer feasible. More information is needed regarding cost analysis and design impacts in order to meet the flood plain requirement if building on this site as planned.
2. Site Option 3 – Support for this location, subject to suitable boat trailer parking solution. More information needed to address proximity to road, road noise and access to the park via connected pathway.
3. Investigate alternative site options owned by the SCRD within the Halfmoon Bay community.
4. Consider the possibility of renovating or redesigning the current building on its current site location. It was noted that renovations must be within the existing footprint and cannot increase the footprint. The current hall is non-conforming.
 - Principle Architecture suggests potential to leave the hall as is and investigate other location option.
 - Renovating the hall would not meet the objectives of increasing the size of the building for the community.

- Could 1 million dollars be invested in this building and meet needs of the community? General sense that without enlarging the building, one of the core challenges with the facility (size) cannot be resolved.
- Decks do not increase the building foot print.
- Why would money be spent on a building that does not address the future potential for flood?

NEXT STEPS

The Task Force recommended to delay providing design direction to Principle Architecture until further information on the Site Options and Alternatives is provided by the SCRD at a future meeting date.

SCRD staff shall prepare the following for the next Task Force meeting:

- Provide the Geotechnical report on the next agenda
- Investigate septic system and relation to FCL
- Provide scale drawings of Site Options and how the parking could be reconfigured
- Pros and Cons Document of each site to be circulated
- More information on potential alternative sites and historical research for Connor Park.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting date, time and location will be confirmed by email. Potential date discussed is December 15th at SCRD office to accommodate teleconference and audio visual needs.

ADJOURNMENT

1:08 p.m.