



Town of Sidney Potential New Community Safety Building Background & Rationale



Introduction

- Why was this process initiated?
- Town evaluates facilities, capital assets needs & potential risks
- 08' OCP & LAP recognized need to relocate fire hall outside of downtown
- Council Strategic Plan identified need for new fire hall
 - Based on inadequate size & no training space
 - Seismic & structural deficiencies
 - Demographic & built form changes in Town

Presentation Overview

- Background on existing fire hall
- Summary of why a new fire hall is necessary
- Challenges associated with renovating or retrofitting existing building (including expanding on adjoining property)
- Summary of alternative sites evaluated
- Why the SD63 site
- Potential Next Steps

Background on Existing Fire Hall

- Fire Hall completed in 1989
- Constructed to 1985 BC Building Code
- 1989 Sidney Fire Dept. entirely volunteers
- Fire inspection performed by Building Official
- Firefighting focused on fires in single family
- Town-demographics & built form
- Fire service & risks have changed dramatically since 1989

Consideration of New Community Safety Building – Why?



Why Not Renovate Existing Building?

- 2009 Seismic upgrade to Level-6; sprinklers, 240m² (787sq ft.); \$2.2 mil. Renovation cost today: Unkown
- Other deficiencies still not addressed
- Current building & property too small
- On-site training/drill, turn out gear storage, larger alarm room, decontamination, & expand shower/locker rooms
- Cannot expand covered apparatus bay
- Population increase = overnight crew or live in firefighters; no dorm facilities
- Plan emergency services 75 yrs in future
- Service disruption; temporary site; heightened risk

Issues & Challenges of Expanding on Adjacent Town-Owned Lot

- Site is still too small for training purposes
- Access & Egress result of location
- Close proximity of surrounding built form
- Not consistent with OCP & LAP Vision
- Functionality & feasibility needs may dictate requirement for new construction
- Potential that building cannot be renovated to current BCBC
- Cost of new construction

Reasons for Considering a New Public Safety Building

- 1. Seismic, Safety & Resiliency Needs
- 2. Changing Demographics & Increased Service Needs
- 3. Training Needs

Seismic, Safety & Resiliency Needs

- Seismic Rating: Level 2 – Minimal Life Safety.
- 2008 Report “structure below minimum building code standards”
- Seismic event “significant structural & non-structural damage expected... possibility of partial collapse in a significant earthquake”
- All fire apparatus, EOC communications equipment, emergency supplies
 - Peninsula Emergency Measures Organization (PEMO)
- Ability to Respond & Recover severely constrained

Changing Demographics & Increased Service Needs

- Facilitate volunteer success
- Week day emergency response
- Training to 1001/1002 standard
- Fire inspections: 800+ annual
- Fire education: 50 + annual
- Fire Dept. & PEMO administration
- Pre-fire planning

Training Needs

- *Mitchell Report*: Strength - proactive training
 - Deficit - no appropriate training area at or near fire hall
- Currently hold drills in public buildings; risks; not certified for training
- Training: Mimic & Prepare
- Not primarily SF; 3-6 storey
- Firefighter drill ground
- 4 story training tower
- Serious safety concerns
- Must prepare for environment & risks



Alternative Sites Considered

1. Current downtown site (+ parking lot)
2. Proposed VAA Site
3. 2114 Beacon Avenue West
4. 2180 Beacon Avenue West
5. Iroquois Park
6. South Memorial Park Society Lands + Skateboard Park
7. Ministry of Transportation Lands (South of Public Works Yard)

Alternative Sites & Findings

- **Sites: ‘poor’ or ‘fair’ rating in several categories**
- **Deficiencies or challenges included:**
 - **Access to/from site**
 - **Potential to buy fee simple; long-term lease**
 - **Cost & Property size**
 - **VAA Lands (south of MWC) least challenges: Federal government owned; leased to VAA; sub-leased to Memorial Park Society**



ROTHESAY AVE.

HENRY AVE.

MT. BAKER AVE.

GALARAN RD.

PAT BAY HIGHWAY

SIDDALL RD.

SIMKIN PL.

SEVENTH ST.

RESTHAVEN DR.

FIFTH ST.

FOURTH ST.

THIRD ST.

SKYLARK LANE.

JAHN PL.

BEACON AVE. WEST

BEACON AVE.

BEVAN AVE.

SECOND ST.

FIRST ST.

OAKVILLE AVE.

6

2

5

7

OCEAN AVE. WEST

ORCHARD AVE.

OCEAN AVE.

EPCO DR.

LAPWING PL.

WEILER AVE. WEST

WEILER AVE.

LANNON WAY

Challenges with any West Side Location

- East vs West 2014 Sidney Call Volume
 - East Sidney Calls: $411/500 = 82\%$
 - West Sidney Calls: $77/500 = 16\%$
 - Mutual Aid (Out of District) Calls: $11/500 = 2\%$
- 74% of firefighters live east of Highway 17; 16% live on west side; 10% live in North Saanich
- Requiring 74% of firefighters to cross Highway 17 to west side, then respond in emergency vehicles back across Highway 17 to east side in 82% of call outs cannot be justified
- Resulting increase in response time due to transiting back & forth across Highway 17 may affect building spatial separation distance & insurance premiums.

Why School District 63 Site?

- No preferred alternative
- Staff initiated discuss with SD63 regarding Elementary School site after further assessments of other sites based upon ideal needs
- Centrally located
- Well connected street network
- Appropriate size & accommodate future growth (meets current & future training size requirements)
- Access/egress for volunteers
- Proximity to majority of emergency response calls
- No traffic issues per Traffic Study
- Appropriate zoning

Potential Next Steps

- Further meetings & discussions with SD63
- Develop a Public Consultation Approach Report for Council consideration
- Based on results of community feedback engage SD63 RE: land acquisition

Questions?

