

## VanSplash Advisory Group Meeting #5

April 3, 2019, 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Vancouver City Hall

**Members in attendance:** Anthony Abrahams, Jean Campbell, Kaye Chapman, Cliff Cheng, Michael DiPietro, Dale Edwards, Abby Ferris, Samantha Garrett, Igor Kopecky, Carol Martin, Bronwen Mears, Anthony Mehnert, Barry Morris, Stevie Nguyen, Charles Tai, Arthur Tsai, Jarrett Vaughan, Marianne Wieland de Alvarez

**Regrets:** Peter Wong

**Park Board staff presenters:** Leila Todd, VanSplash Project Manager, Sean Healy, Supervisor of Aquatic Services

**Third-party facilitator and notetaker:** Jennifer Miller, Abbey-Jane McGrath

### Summary of Meeting

#### Welcome, agenda review and housekeeping:

- Facilitator:
  - Recognizes First Nations Territory, housekeeping, emergency procedures.
  - Introduces Feedback Frames tool – will do an activity later to determine group’s level of agreement on recommendations and help identify those that we need to hone-in on for detailed discussion.
  - Purpose of today’s meeting: Review indoor and outdoor pools recommendations in DRAFT VanSplash strategy and prioritize those that have least support from the group. Will discuss up to four indoor pools recommendations that have the least support from the group, as identified by the Feedback Frames results.
  - Refers to where we are at in the Process Framework and recommendation that we adjust and start with indoor and outdoor pools and then move on to other recommendations, instead of only reviewing and prioritizing all 38 recommendations in one meeting, without any discussion.
  - Also, we will talk tonight about adding another meeting / adding more time in other ways: will update the process framework once we have decided whether we will have another meeting
  - Agenda reviewed

#### Questions:

- Clarification that we will prioritize both indoor and outdoor pools recommendations today. Yes.
- Advisory Group Member wants to know if Feedback Frames will indicate final decision on recommendations
- Facilitator clarifies that we can come back to other issues, but trying to narrow down for discussion those that have the least support from the group
- Advisory Group Member raises concern that there are some outdoor pools inaccurately characterized as “pools” that are not – more wading pools
- Facilitator invites these questions for clarification when we get to outdoor pools agenda item. Clarifies that process framework also outlines that we will discuss community concerns that were brought forward to the Board when the draft came forward for adoption – there will be more opportunities to discuss concerns that have been raised from residents

- Facilitator introduces idea of a “Greenhouse” – a poster where we will put ideas that we cannot immediately address but that we will address at future meetings.
- Advisory Group Member raises the new plan for the Jericho site - has a pool on it, if that pool disappears where will all those children go for lessons? 90 hectare site that will be developing – perfect item for the greenhouse
- Facilitator reminds group of code of conduct

#### Correspondence summary:

- Facilitator shared that several emails have been received either addressed to advisory group or about advisory group
- 2 emails received re: support for community pools
- 1 email re: support for outdoor pool at Mount Pleasant
- 1 email re: support to retain and/or add more 50 metre lane swimming capacity in the aquatics system
- 1 email from an advisory group member to Park Board Commissioners re: concerns about the advisory group process: lack of time for discussion, lot of presentations, some voices missing from discussion, such as First Nations and homeless.
- Advisory Group Members confirmed they would like to receive full emails: we will distribute these by email to the group
- Suggestion from a community member by phone that for Meeting 4 notes we change the +/- to “likes” and “dislikes”. Advisory Group Members agree.
- Facilitator addressed some feedback from last meeting:
  - Time constraints and lack of time: we heard you and also feel that we haven’t had as much discussion as we would like. Need to recognize some of the realities: we have five months for this process and time is limited. We have heard that you want more time for discussion and less time for presentations and are working to address this
  - We have a survey for you tonight re: options for growing our time (three-hour meetings instead of two hours, one additional meeting in late May or early June, homework, or combination of these options)
  - Advisory Group Members were asked to complete the survey

#### Additional Time Survey Results:

- 1 Extend all remaining meetings to three-hours each, instead of current two-hour meetings
- 0 Add one additional meeting to existing schedule (to be held in May or early June)
- 3 Assign tasks for AG members to complete independently on their own time before each remaining meeting (i.e. homework)
- 3 Three-hour meetings AND add one additional meeting
- 3 Three-hour meetings AND homework
- 3 Add one additional meeting AND homework
- 4 All of the above: three-hour meetings, one additional meeting AND homework
- 1 None of the above

## Response Re: Reconciliation at the Park Board – Leila Todd

We have a team of staff with expertise in First Nations reconciliation at the Parks Board – this team was told about some concerns raised by an Advisory Group member regarding First Nations and reconciliation. This team does consultation with First Nations because they have the expertise to do this work – it is great to hear your feedback but please know that those concerns will be addressed through them and not through the VanSplash Advisory Group process.

- 
- Facilitator addressed some other feedback from last meeting re: consensus and lack of clarity on mandate of the group:
  - Our job, what we've been tasked to do from the Park Board, is to review and comment on the Draft VanSplash strategy. Some of you may want to get rid of it and start over, but that is not what we have been asked to do. The sooner we do this work, comment on the strategy and complete our mandate that is included our terms of reference, the sooner that we can move on to talk about other things. We need to focus on the task that we have been assigned; we recognize it's not an easy task.
  - In terms of consensus there was a comment in the evaluations that said that consensus is impossible, and I thought that we had reached a decision on consensus; ask you to reflect on the conversation from last time and perhaps we'll come back to it; need to move on with our meeting agenda now.
  - Advisory Group Member: point of clarity – do we have an unlimited budget to implement the recommendations in the strategy?
  - Facilitator: (confirming with staff) No. A draft was made, the draft was not accepted; the opportunity is for you to provide your lived experience and expertise and identify the areas that are problematic in the strategy and how might we address these. If we can try to get to the place of suggestions for improvement, the group can help support the revised strategy getting approved the next time it comes forward

## Leila Todd - Presentation: Orientation on Recommendations and Context of Indoor Pool Recommendations

- I am a staff member, but I'm also a resident as well somewhere; I've been a member of groups like this and want to thank you for your time and effort
- Last session talked about the big picture, high level vision, principles and goals
- This session talking about recommendations: a set of actions intended to fulfil the stated goals
- Common practice for municipalities to have ideas, get capital funding approval, and then get there and figure out unknowns that they didn't anticipate (shared previous experience with trail and wetland example)
- The Draft Strategy includes a 10-year implementation plan because the City's capital plan is 10 years.
- References 2017 timeline that has now shifted because there was not approval of the strategy
- The aquatics system is a network – a system that is supposed to be connecting City of Vancouver
- **Indoor Pools:** recommendations speak to continuing service and improving it. Proposes 4 new indoor pools.
- Definitions:

- “Neighbourhood, Community, City-Wide (Destination)” - really means small, medium and large. Opportunities for programming and design, etc. increase with size.
- “Destination”: through VanSplash feedback this word has received negative connotations. One definition referenced reads: to be successful cities need destinations – could be downtown, mainstreet, waterfront park, museum, park
- Quality of Place and Experience: story about daughter referencing pool as a neighbourhood pool even though it is a community-plus pool; concept of a quality of place is:
  - Personal
  - Subjective
  - Evolves
  - Adaptable
  - A civic space has a place for all of us.

## Questions

- **Q: What does Community-Plus mean?**
  - Staff: A facility in between Community and City-wide and refers to number and kind of amenities that can be provided
- **Q: What is a whirlpool?**
  - Staff: a hot-tub
- **Q: Any existing pools that do not have hot-tub?**
  - Staff: Kerrisdale is the only indoor pool that does not have a hot-tub (whirlpool)
- **Q: Clarification on Britannia: are they at the process where they have to do land use rezoning? How far along is the draft?**
  - Staff: this was an ongoing work that got merged into VanSplash. Asked for an update from facilities staff, which I can share: MasterPlan was completed in 2018 for the big picture idea for public engagement; after rezoning for first phase will be doing additional engagement for programming, detailed functional programming of building one (the pool)
  - VanSplash talks about the big picture, once we get to the implementation there is another engagement period for each pool project
- **Advisory Group Member Comment: Went to Britannia because lots of First Nations people there - important part of the process was not happening: they did not want a big destination pool there.**
  - Staff: That is a separate consultation process
- **Advisory Group Member Comment: Whatever happens at Britannia will have a significant impact on Templeton**
  - Staff: there have been ongoing meetings. The die has not been cast as to what will be built at Britannia yet.
- **Q: Slides contradict what is being said for Connaught - Recommendation 6: Intention on slide is to continue service, replace and improve the current sport-training provided at VAC, but then the report seems to lessen this, loses sight of improvement aspect potentially when it says this will be dependent on site**
  - Staff: Recommendations 6, 7, and 8 are connected. We are not going to have a gap in service. The idea is to make sure that group (sport/competitive) has a place to do what they need to do.

Two facilities would be replacing VAC, a new facility in addition to the new VAC possibly on the same land parcel.

- Example of how site/footprint could impact: in FINA requirements, to hold an international swim meet need to have warm-up pool of certain dimensions – the footprint might be fine to meet National competition requirements, but maybe not international. Design has not been determined

- **Q: Recommendation talking about partnerships – what other types of agencies are we talking about?**

- Staff: YMCA comes to mind, report doesn't detail, refers to openness to collaborate, or if there is overlap of programming
- Could include colleges, for example, Langara
- Advisory Group Member suggests perhaps: GF Strong, health care partnerships
- Advisory Group Member shares: in the UK, British Gas sponsored modular swimming pools for schools from 2010 to 2015, they built them and the schools taught the 10,000 children to swim during that time
- Advisory Group Member: are some of the major developments in the city, for example in Oakridge going to build a pool?
- Staff: haven't heard about that at Oakridge; we are open to partnerships

#### **Prioritization: Indoor Pool Recommendations**

- Facilitator provides instructions for Feedback Frames exercise
- Advisory Group Members indicate their level of support for each recommendation through a token system

#### **Prioritization Results: Indoor Pools**

**Recommendation 1:** *Move away from a predominantly neighbourhood scale pool system and deliver a greater diversity of swimming experiences at larger, community and destination scale facilities*

Strong Agreement:	4
Agreement	5
Neutral:	1
Disagreement:	0
Strong Disagreement:	8
Not Sure:	0

**Recommendation 2:** *Where feasible, co-locate outdoor pools with indoor pools to offer a greater range of aquatic experiences at each facility and to maximize operational efficiencies*

Strong Agreement:	7
Agreement	5
Neutral:	4
Disagreement:	2
Strong Disagreement:	0
Not Sure:	0

**Recommendation 3:** *Decommission existing stand-alone whirlpools in community centres which have safety and operational challenges*

Strong Agreement:	12
Agreement	3
Neutral:	3
Disagreement:	0
Strong Disagreement:	1
Not Sure:	1

**Recommendation 4:** *Replace Britannia neighbourhood pool with a new Community-plus scale pool on the Britannia site*

Strong Agreement:	4
Agreement	6
Neutral:	2
Disagreement:	6
Strong Disagreement:	0
Not Sure:	0

**Recommendation 5:** *Once the Britannia Community-plus pool is fully operational, engage with pool users, community members, key stakeholders to determine the impact of the new Britannia pool on the Templeton*

Strong Agreement:	4
Agreement	6
Neutral:	2
Disagreement:	1
Strong Disagreement:	5
Not Sure:	0

**Recommendation 6:** *Provide a new City-wide destination pool with sport-training focus, at Connaught Park as part of a future arena and/or community centre renewal*

Strong Agreement:	7
Agreement	4
Neutral:	0
Disagreement:	1
Strong Disagreement:	6
Not Sure:	1

**Recommendation 7:** *Once the Connaught pool is fully operational, engage with pool users, community members, and key stakeholders to determine the impacts of the new Connaught Pool on Lord Byng Pool*

Strong Agreement:	4
Agreement	6
Neutral:	0
Disagreement:	2

Strong Disagreement: 6  
Not Sure: 0

**Recommendation 8:** *Replace the Vancouver Aquatic Centre with a new City-wide destination pool with a health and wellness focus, with co-located outdoor aquatic amenities*

Strong Agreement: 6  
Agreement: 6  
Neutral: 2  
Disagreement: 3  
Strong Disagreement: 1  
Not Sure: 0

**Recommendation 9:** *Replace Kerrisdale Pool with a new Community scale pool, as part of a future Community Centre and/or arena renewal to take advantage of co-location synergies including energy savings, operational efficiencies, and the community interest in larger facilities offering a diverse range of amenities and services in one location*

Strong Agreement: 9  
Agreement: 6  
Neutral: 1  
Disagreement: 2  
Strong Disagreement: 0  
Not Sure: 0

**Recommendation 10:** *Renovate Kensington Pool to enhance accessibility and increase opportunities for adaptive and therapeutic swimming*

Strong Agreement: 6  
Agreement: 8  
Neutral: 2  
Disagreement: 1  
Strong Disagreement: 1  
Not Sure: 0

**Recommendation 11:** *Continue to consider building partnerships with other agencies to gain opportunities for public use of non-park board aquatic facilities*

Strong Agreement: 10  
Agreement: 7  
Neutral: 1  
Disagreement: 0  
Strong Disagreement: 0  
Not Sure: 0

## Leila Todd: Overview of Outdoor Pool Recommendations

- Definitions of pools, both “indoor” and “outdoor” come from the Health Act
- The focus in VanSplash is for pools to have unique experiences – one may be more family oriented and one may be more adult oriented – i.e.: Second Beach has sloped entry and only 5 feet at deepest depth, so many people bathe there. Kitsilano has a bona fide deeper 12’ and longer pool so it is more popular with fitness swimmers
- City as part of energy utilization and becoming a green city, proposes co-locating indoor pools with an ice rink – one warms the other – energy saving and operational savings. The analogy used for outdoor pools is heating a pot of water on the stove. So focus opportunity to swim outdoors is more heavy on the Northern part of the city. South side needs an outdoor pool – historically less recreational opportunities
- Idea of swimming outdoors can also be accommodated through other opportunities, will come up in beaches and innovation recommendations
- Advisory Group Member: if you are telling people that you can swim in an outdoor pool, that is misleading, looks like five pools but is actually only three.
  - Staff: the idea is the experience of being outside
  - Advisory Group Member: but swimmers want to swim outdoors
  - Staff: Will come down to best “bang for buck”
- Advisory Group Member: There is capacity with outdoor pools that is not being utilized. Some pools in London are open 12 months a year and are unheated.
- Advisory Group Member: If you make the outdoor pool swimmable under most of the conditions, then you can assess if there is underusage. Right now, they are not swimmable. People have to travel a long way in the city or out of it to use the pool.
- Advisory Group Member: Can see the purpose of getting info on whether we support existing recommendations. But what is the process for adding a recommendation; additional ones? Agreement from several other Advisory Group Members.
  - Staff: yes, if you feel that something is missing, please do provide that feedback keeping in mind that we will need to look at this from a technical, sustainable and financial perspective
  - Advisory Group Member: How do we officially talk about additional recommendations?
  - Facilitator: once we get through the draft and the content that is there, then we can have a “what else” discussion.
  - Ideas can go in the greenhouse for now. Our process framework identifies discussing “additional considerations” in the last meeting.

## Prioritization: Outdoor Pools Recommendations

- Advisory Group Members prioritized outdoor pool recommendations using Feedback Frames

## Prioritization Results: Outdoor Pools

**Recommendation 1:** *Continue to invest in the existing outdoor pools to keep them as unique citywide (destination) facilities within Vancouver*

Strong Agreement:	7
Agreement	10
Neutral:	0
Disagreement:	0
Strong Disagreement:	1
Not Sure:	0

**Recommendation 2:** *Prioritize locating new outdoor pools to fill current service area gaps in southcentral and southeast Vancouver*

Strong Agreement:	7
Agreement	6
Neutral:	3
Disagreement:	0
Strong Disagreement:	2
Not Sure:	0

**Recommendation 3:** *Provide a balance of recreation, fun, socializing and fitness, through a range of outdoor pool facilities and experiences*

Strong Agreement:	3
Agreement	9
Neutral:	5
Disagreement:	0
Strong Disagreement:	0
Not Sure:	1

**Recommendation 4:** *Consider an outdoor pool or spray feature with every new indoor pool or spray feature with every new indoor pool facility where possible with site constraints and site planning objectives*

Strong Agreement:	7
Agreement	3
Neutral:	2
Disagreement:	1
Strong Disagreement:	2
Not Sure:	2

**Recommendation 5:** *Revitalize existing outdoor pools: Improve or replace changing facilities, improve food and beverage service offerings, improve or replace mechanical equipment, improve new spray features and improve deck areas to enhance quality of experience*

Strong Agreement:	9
Agreement	9
Neutral:	0
Disagreement:	0
Strong Disagreement:	0
Not Sure:	0

**Recommendation 6:** *Provide a new co-located outdoor pool in South Vancouver considering Killarney or Marpole Community Centres as possible locations*

Strong Agreement:	8
Agreement	7
Neutral:	2
Disagreement:	1
Strong Disagreement:	0
Not Sure:	0

**Recommendation 7:** *Provide a new City-wide naturally filtered destination outdoor pool in South Vancouver, i.e. non-chlorinated*

Strong Agreement:	7
Agreement	4
Neutral:	5
Disagreement:	0
Strong Disagreement:	2
Not Sure:	0

### **Small-Group Discussions: Least-Supported Indoor Pools Recommendations**

Indoor Pool Recommendations with least support based on feedback frames were (in priority order from least-supported): Recommendations 1, 7, 6, 5

### **Flip Chart Input from Small-Group Discussions**

**Flip Chart Re: Recommendation 1:** *Move away from a predominantly neighbourhood scale pool system and deliver a greater diversity of swimming experiences at larger, community and destination scale facilities*

- Re: “predominantly” Instead: a diverse mix of pool size relevant to neighbourhoods alongside destination pools
- Neighbourhood pools could be more efficient and accessible (i.e. transportation) (thinking of climate change and increased temperatures)
- Neighbourhood pools have major social values (re: reorganizing and creating community.)
- Neighbourhood more accessible to marginal communities
- Climate impact, people walk/bike to neighbourhood pools. People drive to destination pool. Latter not even accessible to certain groups, such as seniors/people don’t drive (they only stay in neighbourhoods)
- Budget wise, if all neighbourhoods are universally serviced, it is a good idea to have a destination pool
- The value and scale of “neighbourhood” (people accessible by walking/cycling) needs to be retained/preserved in any “community” scale proposals
- Rewrite of Indoor Pool Recommendation 1:
  - *Continue with development of neighbourhood pools and destination pools alongside rapid transit lines and bike routes... deliver etc. – Yes!!*

- Neighbourhood pools offer a unique and worthwhile experience for a large section of users (recreation, therapy, fitness, skill development)
- You shouldn't aim to reduce them

**Flip Chart Re: Recommendation 7:** *Once the Connaught pool is fully operational, engage with pool users, community members, and key stakeholders to determine the impacts of the new Connaught Pool on Lord Byng Pool*

- Lord Byng serves the Jericho lands – need to plan for the increased population there
- They have diverse needs
- As per point 1 – a mix of pool sizes is vital
- Area already serviced by UBC

**Flip Chart Re: Recommendation 6:** *Provide a new City-wide destination pool with sport-training focus, at Connaught Park as part of a future arena and/or community centre renewal*

- Consult community.
- Consider alternative site if the community is opposed
- Group is not opposed to destination pool for training/sport
- Include other sports diving, water polo, synchro swim etc.
- Consider Templeton site!

**Flip Chart Re: Recommendation 5:** *Once the Britannia Community-plus pool is fully operational, engage with pool users, community members, key stakeholders to determine the impact of the new Britannia pool on the Templeton*

- Unique environment provides
- Both needed for capacity
- Supports underrepresented communities
- As per point 1 – recognize the value that neighbourhood pools provide. You cannot replace a neighbourhood pool experience with a community/destination location

### **Whole-Group Discussion on Least-Supported Indoor Pool Recommendations**

- Facilitator invited Advisory Group Members to report-back on small-group discussions
- Advisory Group Member: the top three things I think came forward across all the group discussions were:
  1. Neighbourhood pools are important
  2. Consult the local community
  3. No one is opposed to a destination pool, but where it is located is important
- No one disagrees with the above three points; this is consensus input
- Staff: Connaught was selected for a destination pool based on selection criteria. If the group would like to recommend a location, it needs to be based on selection criteria. We need direction on location for destination facilities – location selection criteria.

- Facilitator: I suggest we come back to that another time; for now I'd like to hear from the group a bit more about the small-group discussions
- Advisory Group Member: Underappreciation of the meaning of neighbourhood – the value of neighbourhoods; continue with the development of destination pools... alongside neighbourhood pools
- Advisory Group Member: can have a neighbourhood feeling in a larger facility that can be addressed through design
- Staff: library analogy – in both programming and design need to consider all uses. We cannot accommodate new requirements in small footprint anymore. Land considerations: in order to build neighbourhood pools, we have to select our favourite neighbourhoods and put in pools. Financially – it is a better investment to have larger facility
- Facilitator: what do we mean by neighbourhood pool?
- Advisory Group Member: For people of a certain age or disabilities, big facilities aren't a good fit: psychological space as well. For some people, busy feeling will not meet their needs
- Advisory Group Member: Neighbourhood: means smaller and less busy
- Advisory Group Member: You cannot close the whole pool for a specific group at a larger, destination facility (i.e. Teen night and Trans Swim)
- Advisory Group Member: Neighbourhood pool is more than about the money and having a pool that is going to be a certain dollar amount, 60% of the pools are being used by people using for recreation and for fitness<sup>1</sup>, older demographic using pools, need to feel like you are not in big massive place
- Advisory Group Member: Neighbourhood pool: people in a certain area can travel to a certain location environmentally: don't drive; you can bike or walk. People who do not have a car. Environmental impact on the city. Do not like the idea that neighbourhood pools and destination pools are against one another. Accessible to seniors and people who cannot afford drive.
- Advisory Group Member: I think these are design issues. There are examples of great pools around the world that have shared infrastructure; there are some tremendous designs in terms of how these are brought together to welcome different members of the community. For example, one larger facility with multiple tanks for different purposes and needs
- Advisory Group Member: One of the hardest things in Vancouver to envision are destination facilities that are not being overused. Killarney is overutilized. 150% overcapacity. Not designed to be a destination, designed to replace Riley Park. First five years, had 10 years of use. None of us see these pools in use at their appropriate capacity: the 10-year plan. To realize at end of 10-year period, want to see these pools used at their proper capacity. In other cities have seen destination pools that feel like neighbourhood pools where they are not so overused. Next one might not be as busy as Killarney or Hillcrest. Hopefully, at end of plan that is not the way that they are going to be.

#### **Facilitator's Flip Chart re: Neighbourhood Definition**

- Smaller size, less busy, calm
- Allows for dedicated group use (i.e. team swim, trans)
- Feeling

---

<sup>1</sup> The VanSplash Public Engagement report (Page 28) says that “the two most popular uses of indoor pool facilities is for casual recreation, including fun, relaxation and socialization (68% of survey respondents), and fitness (such as lengths and free swims, and aerobics classes offered in water) (58% of survey respondents).”

- People can walk, cycle, transit (not drive)
- Accessible to seniors

### **Evaluation, Next Steps and Wrap Up**

- Facilitator: Results of time survey is that you want to spend more time together; winner was “all of the above”; many close seconds.
- Will work toward some homework, three-hour meetings and an additional meeting; if these do not work for you, please contact facilitator, we will find a way to make it work
- Advisory Group Member: What time will the longer meetings be?
- Facilitator: Does 6-9 p.m. sound reasonable? (Signs of agreement)