

Executive Summary

The North Vancouver Recreation Commission selected six (6) of its recreation facilities, located within the District of North Vancouver, for detailed building condition assessment. The two main objectives of the assessment were to: 1. Determine the timing and cost for either building replacement or renewal, and 2. Identify any significant issues to be addressed within a 10-year capital plan.

A specific goal of this study was to assess the condition of the selected recreation centers, including their site, and determine compliance with current governing codes and regulations. The study did not include a review to address and recommend current technological updating of mechanical HVAC, plumbing, and electrical systems.

The site review included an assessment of the facility site, parking lots and playground equipment, and order of magnitude costs to bring these areas into satisfactory condition.

In a similar manner the condition review of the selected facilities included a rigorous condition audit of the building envelope (excluding roofs), the building interior finishes, plumbing and electrical fixtures, and mechanical HVAC and electrical systems. A building code review was undertaken for each facility, and a facilities hazardous materials review for each of the selected buildings was completed.

A numerical rating from 1 to 5 describing the condition of the facility, as outlined below, was determined for each building.

Rating “5” The facility is in “excellent” condition with everything in a well-maintained order. Irrespective of the age of the facility, Preventive Maintenance is being done, replacing fixtures and systems when needed, and the maintenance system is responding to all corrective maintenance. “As – built” or better condition is being achieved. All mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems are current technology and are functioning in a good manner.

Rating “4” The facility can be described as “good” with most elements maintained well. Deterioration has commenced but a few key maintenance projects could return the facility to a “5” rating. Conversely, if the projects were deferred, the rating could slip to a “3” rating. Mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems are well maintained and have a number of years remaining before reaching their service life.

Rating “3” The facility is only “satisfactory”. It is no longer being maintained to as-built standard and patch and repair maintenance is being performed as opposed to replacement. Although the maintenance system is reacting to trouble calls, many routine maintenance needs are being deferred. This condition may have resulted from a lack of funding, or simply because minimum standards are being met knowing that the facility will be replaced in the near future. Mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems are

nearing or have exceeded their service life, and current technological updates could be initiated for efficiency and economy.

Rating “2” Condition is “not satisfactory”. The facility is being neglected to the extent that failure to correct one deficiency often leads to another more serious problem. The facility is still functional, but its remaining useful life is limited, as it is approaching concerns for health or personnel safety. The mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems have exceeded their service life and obsolescence has occurred in terms of efficiency and economy.

Rating “1” Condition is “poor”. The facility and systems have deteriorated to the extent that it can no longer be used. The only maintenance being done is that which is essential to protect life and property.

The costs associated with each part of the review are summarized in this study. They indicate the order-of-magnitude costs required to bring the selected facilities, as directed by the Manager, Maintenance and Engineering Services, to acceptable accommodation with respect to operations, health and cleanliness, compliance with current codes and standards, and appearance.

There is a tendency to maintain buildings and service elements that are becoming obsolete, to the point where their good condition does not warrant replacement. However these buildings are dated and their economic life is reaching the period of time after which it becomes more economical to replace or renew rather than continue to maintain them. Below is a summary of these facilities, and our recommendation for their disposition in terms of replacement and/or renewal, based on the building rating.

Facility	Rating	Recommended Disposition	Year	Replacement/ Renewal Costs
William Griffin	3.07	Replace	2006 - 2007	\$6,100,000
Delbrook	2.96	Replace	2005 – 2006	\$7,100,000
Karen Magnussen Arena	3.11	Replace	2008 – 2009	\$5,500,000
Karen Magnussen Pool	3.11	Renew	2005 - 2006	\$2,500,000
Ron Andrews	3.18	Replace	2007 – 2008	\$6,100,000
Seylynn	2.27	Replace	2004 – 2005	\$1,500,000
Lynn Valley	3.30	Renew	2012	\$500,000