

City of Kelowna

Regular Council Meeting

AGENDA



Monday, August 10, 2015

8:30 am

Knox Mountain Meeting Room (#4A)

City Hall, 1435 Water Street

Pages

1. Call to Order

2. Confirmation of Minutes

3 - 8

Regular AM Meeting - July 27, 2015

Chauffeur Permit Appeal Hearing - July 28, 2015

3. Reports

3.1 Southern Interior Municipal Employers Association
Appointment - Draft Resolution

5 m

9 - 9

To appoint City of Kelowna representatives, and alternates, to the Southern Interior Municipal Employers Association.

3.2 Heritage Review Update - Phase 1

45 m

10 - 29

To provide Council with an update on Phase 1 of the Heritage Review and to receive Council direction to proceed with Phase 2 of the Heritage Review.

3.3 Parkinson Recreation Centre - Planning Overview

120 m

30 - 182

To provide Council with an overview of the 2013 Sport and Recreation Needs Assessment in relationship to the more specific planning on the future of the Parkinson Recreation Centre.

4. Resolution Closing the Meeting to the Public

THAT this meeting be closed to the public pursuant to Section 90(1) (a) and (e) of the *Community Charter* for Council to deal with matters relating to the following:

- Position Appointment; and
- Acquisition, Disposition, or Expropriation, of Land or Improvements.

5. Adjourn to Closed Session

6. Reconvene to Open Session
7. Issues Arising from Correspondence & Community Concerns
 - 7.1 Deputy Mayor Stack, re: Issues Arising from Correspondence 30 m
8. Termination



City of Kelowna Regular Council Meeting Minutes

Date: Monday, July 27, 2015
Location: Knox Mountain Meeting Room (#4A)
City Hall, 1435 Water Street

Council Members Present: Mayor Colin Basran and Councillors Maxine DeHart, Ryan Donn, Gail Given, Tracy Gray, Charlie Hodge, Brad Sieben, Mohini Singh and Luke Stack

Staff Present: Acting City Manager, Joe Creron; City Clerk, Stephen Fleming; Deputy City Manager, Paul Macklem*; Corporate & Protective Services Divisional Director, Rob Mayne*; Financial Services Director, Genelle Davidson*; Cultural Services Manager, Sandra Kochan*; and Legislative Systems Coordinator, Sandi Horning

(*denotes partial attendance)

1. Call to Order

Mayor Basran called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m.

2. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved By Councillor Hodge/Seconded By Councillor Donn

R558/15/07/27 THAT the Minutes of the Regular AM Meeting of July 13, 2015 be confirmed as circulated.

Carried

3. Resolution Closing the Meeting to the Public

Moved By Councillor Singh/Seconded By Councillor DeHart

R559/15/07/27 THAT this meeting be closed to the public pursuant to Section 90(1) (f) of the *Community Charter* for Council to deal with matters relating to the following:

- Law Enforcement.

Carried

4. Adjourn to Closed Session

The meeting adjourned to a closed session at 8:33 a.m.

5. Reconvene to Open Session

The meeting reconvened to an open session at 9:17 a.m.

6. Reports

6.1 Principles and Strategies for Financial Strength & Stability

Staff:

- Displayed a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the strategy framework and responded to questions from Council.
- Reviewed the draft Principles & Strategies for Financial Strength & Stability document page-by-page and provided further details and clarification.
- Confirmed that specific policies will be drafted based on these over-arching principles.

Acting City Manager:

- Responded to questions from Council.
- Clarified the process when the City applies for a grant, but doesn't obtain the grant.

Deputy City Manager:

- Provided clarification regarding the definition and reserves for 'catastrophic events'.
- Responded to questions regarding Provincial funding for wild fires.

Corporate & Protective Services Divisional Director:

- Made comment on how the City deals with the Province as part of the aftermath of emergencies.

Moved By Councillor Stack/Seconded By Councillor Given

R560/15/07/27 THAT Council endorses the Principles and Strategies for Financial Strength & Stability document as outlined in the Report from the Financial Services Director dated July 27, 2015;

AND THAT Council directs staff to report back with the finalized Principles and Strategies detailed document and summary sheet.

Carried

The meeting recessed at 10:04 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 10:14 a.m.

10. Issues Arising from Correspondence & Community Concerns

10.1 2015 Creative City Summit - Grant in Aid Request

Staff:

- Provided background information regarding the Grant-in-Aid request.
- Confirmed the request is within the scope of Council Policy No. 058.
- Confirmed that the key note speaker session will be open to the public for a fee.
- Circulated a copy of the 'schedule at a glance'.

Moved By Councillor Sieben/Seconded By Councillor Stack

R561/15/07/27 THAT Council receives, for information, the letter from the General Manager, Creative City Network of Canada and the City of Kelowna's Cultural Services Manager dated July 8, 2015 with respect to Sponsorship for the 2015 Creative City Summit;

AND THAT Council authorizes the amount of up to \$3,500.00 as per Council Policy No. 58, Grant-in-Aid Request, for a sponsorship contribution in support of the Charles Montgomery workshop and keynote address at the 2015 Creative City Summit to be held in Kelowna on October 27-29, 2015.

Carried

6. Reports

6.2 Chauffeur Permit Appeal Hearing Process - Refresher

City Clerk:

- Provided an overview of the Chauffeur Permit Appeal Hearing process and responded to questions from Council.
- Advised that staff will be bringing forward amendment options to the City's current Chauffeur Permit Bylaw sometime this fall for Council's consideration.

7. Resolution Closing the Meeting to the Public

Moved By Councillor Singh/Seconded By Councillor DeHart

R562/15/07/27 THAT this meeting be closed to the public pursuant to Section 90(1) (e) and 90(2) (b) of the *Community Charter* for Council to deal with matters relating to the following:

- Acquisition, Disposition, or Expropriation, of Land or Improvements;
- Negotiations with another level of government (Federal Government).

Carried

8. Adjourn to Closed Session

The meeting adjourned to a closed session at 10:29 a.m.

9. Reconvene to Open Session

The meeting reconvened to an open session at 12:03 p.m.

10. Issues Arising from Correspondence & Community Concerns

10.2 Mayor Basran, re: Water Conservation

Acting City Manager:

- Made comment on the City water utility's efforts to conserve water both this year and in previous years.
- Responded to questions from Council.

Council:

- Agreed that the messaging needs to be better.

10.3 Mayor Basran, re: Rainbow Crosswalks

Mayor Basran:

- Commented that other communities have created rainbow crosswalks in the spirit of diversity and that there is an opportunity to create one in the downtown.

Moved By Councillor DeHart/Seconded By Councillor Hodge

R563/15/07/27 THAT Council directs staff to paint the crosswalk at Pandosy Street and Lawrence Avenue as a "rainbow crosswalk".

Carried

10.4 Councillor Hodge, re: Accessible Parking

Councillor Hodge:

- Inquired if Council had read the letter from Ms. White regarding the use of disabled parking stalls.

Mayor Basran:

- Parking staff already monitor the use of accessible parking.

11. Termination

The meeting was declared terminated at 12:18 p.m.

Mayor

/slh



City Clerk



City of Kelowna Chauffeur's Permit Appeal Hearing Minutes

Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2015
 Location: City Hall, 1435 Water Street

Council Members Present: Mayor Colin Basran and Councillors Gail Given, Charlie Hodge, Brad Sieben, Mohini Singh and Luke Stack

Council Members Absent: Councillors Maxine DeHart, Ryan Donn and Tracy Gray

Staff Present: Acting City Manager, Joe Creron; and City Clerk, Stephen Fleming

Guests: RCMP, Stg. Patty Cook, NCO i/c Kelowna Municipal Traffic Section; and RCMP, Cst. Tim Montieth

1. Call to Order

Mayor Basran called the Hearing to order at 4:10 p.m.

2. Chauffeur's Permit Appeal Hearing - Kuldip Dhaliwal

City Clerk:

- Confirmed that the RCMP Members were in attendance and that Mr. Dhaliwal has yet to arrive.
- Summarized the efforts to confirm Mr. Dhaliwal's attendance and recommended that the Hearing proceed.

Council:

- Decided to proceed after waiting until 4:10 p.m. for Mr. Dhaliwal to appear.

Cst. Tim Montieth:

- Provided background to the RCMP's reasons for declining the Chauffeur's Permit.
- Confirmed that this is a new Permit application and not a renewal.

City Clerk:

- Made reference to the written email correspondence from Mr. Dhaliwal dated July 15, 2015 and confirmed it was circulated to Council as part of their Agenda package.

Council:

- Confirmed they received and had read Mr. Dhaliwal's email correspondence.
- Raised a concern with the previous traffic violations.
- Raised a concern with the seriousness of the criminal charges.
- Noted that Mr. Dhaliwal could reapply depending upon the outcome of his Court case.

Moved By Councillor Given/Seconded By Councillor Stack

CP001/15/07/28 THAT Council confirms the decision of the RCMP to NOT issue a Chauffeur Permit to Mr. Kuldeep Dhaliwal.

Carried

3. Termination

The Hearing was declared terminated at 4:25 p.m.

Mayor

/scf/slh



City Clerk

DRAFT RESOLUTION

Re: Southern Interior Municipal Employers Association Appointment

THAT Council appoints Mayor Basran and Councillor Stack as the representatives to the Southern Interior Municipal Employers Association;

AND THAT Council appoints two alternate representatives to the Southern Interior Municipal Employers Association;

BACKGROUND:

Community organizations or committees may require Council representation as part of their mandated membership. As a Member of the Southern Interior Municipal Employers Association, the City of Kelowna is required to appoint two representatives and two alternates to the Board of Directors.

This is to make appointments for the 2014-2018 term.

Date: July 27, 2015

Report to Council



Date: July 27, 2015

File: 0615-20

To: City Manager

From: J. Moore, Long Range Policy Planning Manager, Policy and Planning Department

Subject: Heritage Review Update - Phase 1

Report Prepared by: L. Sanbrooks

Recommendation:

THAT Council receives, for information, the report from the Policy and Planning Department dated July 27, 2015, with respect to Phase 1 of the Heritage Review;

AND THAT Council directs staff to proceed with Phase 2 of the Heritage Review as outlined in the July 27, 2015 Report from the Policy and Planning Department;

AND THAT Council directs staff to reinstate the Community Heritage Committee in an amended capacity as part of Phase 2 of the Heritage Review;

AND FURTHER THAT Council directs staff to report back with a Terms of Reference with respect to the scope and role of the Community Heritage Committee.

Purpose:

To provide Council with an update on Phase 1 of the Heritage Review and to receive Council direction to proceed with Phase 2 of the Heritage Review.

Background:

On March 2, 2015, Council supported staff's recommendation to move forward with a Heritage Review in order to ensure that heritage management in Kelowna is being undertaken in an efficient, effective and coordinated manner between all heritage groups and organizations involved. In order to involve members of the community as well as heritage stakeholders, a Heritage Review Advisory Committee (HRAC) was endorsed by Council, to support the process. Given the magnitude of the project, it was later determined that the Heritage Review would be a multi-phase project. The HRAC was Phase 1 of the Heritage Review.

The Heritage Review Advisory Committee was led by internal City staff, with the assistance of an independent facilitator. The HRAC met three times for morning sessions on May 5, June 2 and June 16, 2015. The HRAC consisted of the following nine (9) key stakeholders from the community:

- One member from the community at large that has served at least one term on the Community Heritage Committee (CHC)
- A representative of the Kelowna Museums Society (KMS)
- A representative of the Okanagan Historical Society (OHS)
- A representative of the Central Okanagan Heritage Society (COHS)
- A First Nations representative
- A Tourism Kelowna representative
- One member of the public at large having relevant experience in business and/or finance
- One member of the public at large within the legal profession
- One member of the public at large within the real estate profession

Phase 1 - Heritage Review Advisory Committee

The purpose of Phase 1 of the Heritage Review was to leverage the insight and expertise of the HRAC to address the governance challenges of Kelowna's existing heritage model.

The pros and cons of Kelowna's existing governance model of heritage, the Independent Actors model¹, were discussed by the HRAC at first meeting. As an outcome of that initial meeting, the HRAC also determined the overall governance challenges related to delivering heritage management activities which include:

- Overlapping and confusion of mandates;
- Organizational sustainability (including funding and human resources);
- Public credibility gap;
- A lack of coordination & communication (both internal and external); and
- Cultural diversity being underrepresented.

At the second HRAC meeting, the Committee members explored possible alternative governance models of heritage management. Best practices research of other communities helped to guide the direction for the new heritage governance model for Kelowna.

At the end of the third meeting, the Committee agreed on a long-term vision for a *Heritage Council* governance model, with an interim step to transition.

Under the Heritage Council model, which is an adaptation of the Edmonton Heritage Council model, all of the independent heritage organizations may still exist, but funding and strategic planning support would come through the not-for-profit organization at arm's length - the Heritage Council. The Heritage Council would work to unify Kelowna's heritage community and to give it a single voice. Using the Edmonton Heritage Council as a guide, Kelowna's Heritage Council would likely be involved in connecting and encouraging collaboration

¹ The Independent Actors model involves organizations acting as independent heritage stakeholders with limited collaboration and communication among the stakeholders.

between Kelowna's heritage stakeholders, providing public education and advocacy on heritage programs, as well as possibly administering and distributing grants on behalf of the City of Kelowna.

The Heritage Council model would work within an overarching Contract for Service with the City of Kelowna in order to provide a framework for reporting and accountability. The Heritage Council model would develop programs and projects that bring heritage closer to the community and create valuable dialogue and engagement around heritage and culture.

The Heritage Council governance model will address the aforementioned governance challenges by:

- Implementing a unified approach to planning and fund development to support large scale heritage initiatives which no single heritage organization can currently undertake on its own, including capital projects, community wide programming and heritage tourism promotion;
- Improving communication to City Staff and City Council through a unified voice amongst the heritage stakeholders;
- Improving cultural diversity through a broader membership;
- Improving coordination & communication (both internal and external) through a unified voice/body; and
- Identify overlap or opportunities for collaboration and partnership by centralizing communication, funding and perhaps human resources.

For further details on the three HRAC meetings and the summary report, please refer to Appendix A - Report on Planning Sessions for the Heritage Review Advisory Committee.

Next Steps

The Heritage Review is a unique project that sees the City continuing to lead challenging conversations with multiple partner organizations in heritage management. In order to achieve a balance between the City's influence over process and community ownership, staff are suggesting that Phase 2, as well as the first step in Phase 3 - Implementation, be led by City staff. Consultation and collaboration with the heritage stakeholders will be prominent throughout Phase 2 and the first step in Phase 3. Many of the organizations and stakeholders are passionate about their historical role and function in heritage in the community and change will come with time; as trust and understanding grows.

Phase 2 - Understanding Roles and Responsibilities

Should Council endorse the recommendation to proceed with Phase 2 of the Heritage Review, Phase 2 will commence in August 2015 and will conclude in November 2015. The purpose of Phase 2 is for staff to better define the roles and responsibilities of new and existing heritage stakeholders, including the City, in relation to the Heritage Council model. In addition, staff will determine the funding and resource commitments related to Phase 3 - Implementation of Heritage Council. Upon completion of Phase 2, staff will report back to Council on next steps, including a Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee, prior to moving forward to Phase 3 - Implementation of the Heritage Council.

Staff are recommending that the equivalence of a Community Heritage Committee (CHC) be reinstated with an amended name and scope as part of Phase 2 of the Heritage Review. The members' expertise and involvement are assets in creating a community with a unique identity by supporting heritage conservation and management efforts. The CHC revised scope of work is to include review of major heritage-related development applications, with meetings to occur on an as-needed basis. This model should help focus energy and effort on the most important heritage applications and allow Community Planning staff to utilize their expertise in processing smaller applications in a timely manner. Similar to past CHCs, Community Planning staff will provide support for Committee review meetings. Staff will report back to Council with a Terms of Reference for the revised scope of the Community Heritage Committee.

Phase 3 - Implementation of Heritage Council

In order to ensure the success of the new governance model, staff are recommending a gradual start to the commencement of a Heritage Council. Staff are in the early stages of determining the timeline of the Heritage Council creation; however, staff are anticipating strategic planning and financial planning will commence in January, 2016. The Heritage Council would commence in 2017 as noted in Appendix B.

Heritage Strategy

Staff and Donald Luxton & Associates Inc. have provided a light update to the Heritage Strategy (2007) in order to correct some insensitive wording in the published document. This same wording has been corrected in all other heritage documents produced by Donald Luxton & Associates Inc. Staff are anticipating a more significant update to the Heritage Strategy will occur as part of Phase 3 - Implementation of the Heritage Review. In the interim, the Heritage Strategy remains a strong, relevant document that provides guidance to staff, Council and the community.

Summary

The Heritage Review process to date has generated innovative and out of the box dialogue with regards to heritage management in Kelowna and is proving to be a positive steps towards improved heritage management in the city of Kelowna. The long-term governance model that is being proposed will ensure a more sustainable, efficient, effective and coordinated manner of delivering on Kelowna's heritage portfolio. Similar to how the Edmonton Heritage Council was first established; the proposed gradual-start to the Kelowna Heritage Council will ensure the overall success of the new model as well as build capacity along the way.

Internal Circulation:

City Clerk
Cultural Services Manager
Active Living & Culture Divisional Director
Planner Specialist - Parks and Building Planning
Park & Building Planning Manager
Infrastructure Divisional Director
Community Planning Department Manager
Community Planning and Real Estate Divisional Director

Legal/Statutory Authority:

Local Government Act, section 953

Community Charter, section 143

Existing Policy:

Heritage Strategy 2007

Official Community Plan - 2030

OCP Objective 9.2 - Policy 3 - Financial Support

Continue to support the conservation, rehabilitation, interpretation, operation and maintenance of heritage assets through grants, incentives and other means.

2012-2017 Cultural Plan - Goal 4 -Cultural Roots and Branches

Integrate Heritage As Part Of Cultural Vitality

Financial/Budgetary Considerations:

No anticipated costs for Phase 2.

Considerations not applicable to this report:

Legal/Statutory Procedural Requirements:

Personnel Implications:

External Agency/Public Comments:

Alternate Recommendation:

Communications Comments:

Submitted by:

L. Sanbrooks, Planner II, Policy and Planning

Approved for inclusion:
Planning



Danielle Noble-Brandt, Department Manager of Policy &

cc:

City Clerk

Cultural Services Manager

Active Living & Culture Divisional Director

Planner Specialist - Parks and Building Planning

Park & Building Planning Manager

Infrastructure Divisional Director

Community Planning Department Manager

Community Planning and Real Estate Divisional Director

Attachments:

Appendix A - Report on Planning Sessions for the Heritage Review Advisory Committee

Appendix B - Heritage Review Timeline

CITY OF KELOWNA

**REPORT ON PLANNING SESSIONS FOR THE
HERITAGE REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MAY-JUNE 2015

Submitted by Hugh Culver MBA, CFP, CSP

20 June 2015

City of Kelowna - Heritage Review Advisory Committee

Contents

Objectives	1
Conclusions	1
Planning meetings	2
Pro's and con's with existing model for heritage management	2
Draft new model	4
Considerations with the new model	5
Heritage Review Advisory Committee Members	6

Objectives

The Heritage Review Advisory Committee was created as a temporary body to assess the current status of heritage properties and values in the City of Kelowna in terms of private sector management and operations.

The goal was to highlight issues that need to be resolved, consider alternative management models and reach consensus on a new model that would satisfy both the City and heritage management stakeholders represented in the committee.

The three, three-hour planning meetings were held at City Hall between May 5th and June 16th, 2015, attended by the Committee members as well as City staff and facilitated by Hugh Culver MBA, CFP, CSP.

Conclusions

The Heritage Review Advisory Committee agrees that the existing system of independent stakeholders is ineffective and needs to change. They are also in consensus that of all the models presented, their choice is some kind of “Council” model with an independent coordinating body made up of active, participating heritage stakeholders liaising with the City and providing a means for open and consistent communication between parties involved. They accepted the model of transitioning from the existing model to an “Alliance” of founding members and then to a “Council” model. A number of considerations were voiced (see below) including security of funding, future distribution of funding, and inclusion of more stakeholder groups.

Planning meetings

Three morning meetings were held with the Heritage Review Advisory Committee. The dates and broad objectives of each meeting were:

5 May - understanding what each heritage management stakeholder does and identifying pro's and con's with existing model for heritage management

2 June - learning about alternative models for heritage management from seven communities and drafting possible new models for Kelowna

16 June - more information about the "Council" plan model and reaching consensus on high-level new plan and considerations

Pro's and con's with existing model for heritage management

The following list of pro's and con's of the existing "independent" model were recorded in the first meeting and used as a sort of checklist against future design options.

PROS

- NFP commitment
- Volunteers commitment
- Save significant sites
- Collaboration - groups
- Publication archives
- Societies continue
- Valuable work @ low cost
- Working together:
 - Heritage week
 - CHC
 - Projects (cemetery)
- Grant program
- Good process
- Education (home owners)
- Collaboration: Museum/WFN/SD23
- Curriculum program gr 4
- Expertise locally

CONS


- What is the emotional significance of the heritage site?
- Under funding
- Heritage still has too low a profile
- Overlaps:
 - activities
 - roles
- Limited funding constrains achieving objectives
- Burnout: volunteers, supporters, funders
- Cultural diversity underrepresented
- Lack of coordination (internal and external)
- Lack of public understanding - polarized debate
- Organizations need to build more diverse revenue sources and more earned revenue
- Lack of clarity re: roles - council and the community need to know who does what and why?
- Missed partnerships: First Nations and Tourism Kelowna
- Asset management funding
- Duplication of administrative tasks and cost of multiple organizations
- The myth that 'heritage' has one meaning
- Fear of 'heritage' status
- Lack of interpretation of sites (enlivened)
- 3 organizations running heritage sites
- Redundancy
- Lack of heritage strategic plan. Align common goals/vision of all stakeholders
- Missed opportunity of CHC to be a 'cementing' body for heritage organizations
- Heritage narratives are evolving - are we keeping up?
- Public credibility gap. Objectives-deliverables-communications
- Inability to value heritage assets and indirect revenues (e.g. tourism revenues - property values of other non-heritage properties)
- Practical building material ideas

Draft new model

The proposed “Council” model provides an independent coordinating body made up of active, participating heritage stakeholders liaising with the City and providing a means for open and consistent communication between parties involved.

Associated options include:

- CHC becoming a sub-committee of the Council with a reduced mandate to review and advise City Council on heritage related development applications.
- Adding a “Heritage Network” membership group to include more stakeholders.
- The new Council to receive and distribute operational funding from the City.
- The new Council to take on a centralized fund raising program targeting private funding sources.
- Expanded Council Board of Directors to include more stakeholders (after the first year).



Considerations with the new model

Outcomes

- Grow the funding “pie” with potential funding from the private sector and foundations
- More inclusive definition of “heritage”, including: tangible heritage assets and intangible heritage values
- One coordinated voice with City
- Better stewardship of built assets
- Improved communication between stakeholders
- More opportunity for centralized education of stakeholders e.g. asset preservation, marketing, fund raising, etc.

Considerations

- Should start with existing heritage stakeholders (on Board of Directors)
- Need to ensure security of funding (e.g. for one year) to stakeholders
- Need City staff as liaison with new Council
- Position the move to Council as a transition from the existing model to an “Alliance” (current stakeholders) and then to a “Council” model, which would include a larger number of stakeholders.
- In the future the Council may manage flow of operational funding
- Opportunity for a centralized web site with stakeholders, events, calendar of activities, etc.
- Opportunity to redirect the operations of COHS in part or in whole to new Council.
- Asset management considerations:
 - add to the new Council, or not?
 - need for staff expertise to be redirected e.g. from KMS to manage COHS properties
- Role of CHS - possibly as a sub-committee of the new Council?

Heritage Review Advisory Committee Members

- Brian Anderson, Chair, Community Heritage Committee
- Linda Digby, Executive Director, Kelowna Museums Society
- Janice Henry , Executive Director, Central Okanagan Heritage Society
- Bob Hayes, President - Okanagan Historical Society Kelowna Branch

Public at large

- Jordan Cobel, Westbank First Nation
- Nancy Cameron , CEO, Tourism Kelowna
- Kevin Crookes, Grant Thornton
- Tom Fellhauer, Pushor Mitchell
- Dustin Sargent, Davara Enterprises


City Staff:

- Terry Barton, Park & Building, Planning Manager
- Sandra Kochan, Cultural Services Manager
- James Moore, Long Range Policy Planning Manager
- Lauren Sanbrooks, Planner II

Facilitator:

- Hugh Culver (Marathon Communications)

HERITAGE REVIEW TIMELINE




*At each major milestone, a report will be brought back to Council to determine next steps.

HERITAGE REVIEW

PHASE 1



HERITAGE REVIEW TIMELINE



*At each major milestone, a report will be brought back to Council to determine next steps.

PHASE 1 - OVERVIEW


- ▶ Pros and cons of existing governance model discussed
- ▶ Alternative governance models discussed
- ▶ Heritage Council model selected

HERITAGE COUNCIL MODEL

- ▶ Adaptation of Edmonton Heritage Council
- ▶ Existing independent organizations + non-for profit organization at arm's length
- ▶ Address governance challenges in Independent Actors governance model
- ▶ Contract for Service for reporting and accountability

NEXT STEPS

HERITAGE REVIEW TIMELINE



*At each major milestone, a report will be brought back to Council to determine next steps.

SUMMARY

- ▶ Appreciation for stakeholders and public members at large
- ▶ Heritage Review = balance between City's influence over process and community ownership

Report to Council



Date: August 4, 2015
File: 1310-30
To: City Manager
From: Terry Barton, Parks and Buildings Planning Manager
Subject: Parkinson Recreation Centre - Planning Overview

Recommendation:

THAT Council receives, for information, the Report of the Parks and Buildings Planning Manager dated August 4, 2015 regarding the Parkinson Recreation Centre - Planning Overview;

AND THAT Council endorses the Directional Development Principles for the future of the Parkinson Recreation Centre as described in the Report of the Parks and Buildings Planning Manager dated August 4, 2015.

Purpose:

To provide Council with an overview of the 2013 Sport and Recreation Needs Assessment in relationship to the more specific planning on the future of the Parkinson Recreation Centre.

Background:

As part of initiating the 2020 Capital Plan project in September of 2012, a needs assessment was conducted to determine the long-term needs and potential gaps in the City's major sport and recreation facilities over the next 10 to 15 years. As in most communities across Canada, Kelowna is challenged with meeting the funding requirements associated with developing new facilities while maintaining its existing stock of assets in good repair. The following strategic imperatives were developed by the City's recreation consultant, John Frittenburg to frame the development of facility needs:

- Reinvesting in existing infrastructure (where need remains evident) should generally be a higher priority than building new infrastructure;
- Improving programming efficiencies should be sought in all City facilities;
- Changes to an existing facility's design or footprint should only be considered if renovations result in "increased benefits" to a community;
- Where facilities are deemed as being no longer consistent with existing or emerging needs, consideration should be given to re-purposing facilities for alternate uses;
- Where possible and appropriate, attempt to co-locate programs and services at community recreation centres; and

- Project-specific feasibility studies should be required prior to any significant facility expansion, re-purpose or development.

The City's future population growth and anticipated shifts in local demographic profiles drive the need to create a long-term strategic development plan to guide future investments in sport, recreation and parks. The final report of the study and its findings is attached as Attachment 1.

The report presents the results of the planning process, introduces the basis for and rationale of facility provision standards and describes Kelowna's recreation and sport facility requirements until 2031. The report also details facility provision strategies and illustrates the requirements of implementing the long range plan. It assesses the needs for five different sport facilities: Aquatics, Arenas, Program Space including Gyms, Indoor Turf, and Tennis.

The following represents the highest priorities that were identified, in terms of new facility investments, and are presented here in order to provide Council with a indication of the types of facilities that are most in need in our community :

1. Rebuild of the Parkinson Recreation Centre (PRC) - the existing facility is nearing the end of its operational and functional lifespan;
 - Additional programming space is required to address community needs;
 - Consider joint-use facility and partnership opportunities (for example opportunities within the health and sport /recreation sector and SD23)
2. Develop 2 additional Ice Sheets - existing ice facilities near capacity
 - Programming and bookings for City arenas is at 95%
 - Limitations with Memorial Arena
3. Develop Indoor Turf Field - to accommodate popularity of soccer year round
 - Programming and bookings for indoor turf are currently at 90% - 100% depending on the time of year
4. Add supporting infrastructure to existing facilities - to better utilize existing facilities e.g. Artificial Turf Field, Rutland Recreation Park, etc.

Parkinson Recreation Centre

Since completing the 2013 Sport and Facilities Needs Assessment, Council approved funding to begin the planning for the new facility in 2014. A Functional Space Program was developed as an extension of the Sport and Recreation Need Assessment. It specifically examined the opportunities and challenges associated with the redevelopment of PRC. The Space Program defined the requirements for the future of the facility in terms of the types of rooms and their desired sizes (e.g. athletic program space - gymnasiums and fitness, aquatics, program space, customer service areas, offices and administrative space, and building operations and support).

A partnership analysis was also conducted that investigated potential partner organizations that could be involved with or utilize a new PRC. It was evident that there were a few partnership opportunities that should be prioritized and further explored: i) Pacific Sport partnership targeting sport participation and improved sport performance; ii) School District

#23 partnership on a joint-use high school as part of creating a community hub; and iii) Interior Health partnership in the delivery of health and wellness programs. Pacific Sport, Interior Health and SD23 may also offer some advantages in attracting senior government capital funding assistance in recognition of the facility's status as a partnered project.

Several **Directional Development Principles** have been developed for Council's consideration to help inform and make future decisions on the Parkinson Recreation Centre. The principles are as follows:

- Meet today's needs while planning for the future
- Act as the "one-stop recreation and sport destination" for as many City residents as possible
- Differentiation by maximizing accessibility
- Be a community hub through the implementation of the neighbourhood engagement model
- Leverage partnerships to elevate facility profile and maximize utilization
- Amplify public value through "big picture thinking" and remaining focused on the long term perspective

Staff anticipate presenting a follow-up workshop(s) to Council in the coming months regarding the more detailed planning at Parkinson Recreation Centre.

Financial/Budgetary Considerations:

Due to limited funds and other important civic projects, none of the sport and recreation projects are identified as a priority for funding in the 2020 Capital Plan. Alternative funding strategies will need to be developed in order to realize these projects. In the past, other funding sources have included debt financing, potential support from City reserves and/or senior level government assistance.

Internal Circulation:

Active Living and Culture Divisional Director

Considerations not applicable to this report:

Existing Policy

External Agency/Public Comments:

Legal/Statutory Authority

Legal/Statutory Procedural Requirements

Personnel Implications

Communications Comments

Alternate Recommendation

Submitted by:

T. Barton, Manager Parks and Facilities Planning

Approved for inclusion:



A. Newcombe, Director of Infrastructure

Attachment 1: Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Plan - Final Report
Attachment 2: Parkinson Centre Council Presentation - Aug 10 2015 V2

cc: Active Living and Culture Divisional Director
Civic Operations Divisional Director
Infrastructure Planning Department Manager



City of Kelowna

Infrastructure Planning to Meet Future Recreation Needs

The City of Kelowna has for decades developed and operated recreation facilities that are valued by its residents. Kelowna's provision and maintenance of an adequate recreation facility inventory enables the community to realize important health, social, economic and environmental benefits. The City's future population growth and the anticipated shifts in the local demographic profiles caused City officials to create a long-term strategic development plan to guide future investments in sport, recreation and green infrastructure. This Report presents the results of the planning process, introduces the basis for and rationale of facility provision standards and describes Kelowna's recreation and sport facility requirements until 2031. The Report also details facility provision strategies and illustrates the requirements of implementing the long range plan.

Table of Contents

• Introduction	1
• Preface	1
• The Benefits of Community Recreation Infrastructure.....	1
• The Infrastructure Planning Process	2
• Project Goals and Work Program.....	3
• Contextual Planning.....	5
• Corporate Alignment.....	5
• Respecting Community Needs and Priorities.....	6
• Strategic Decision-Making.....	7
• Community Profile and Important Trends.....	9
• Important Demographic Trends and Influences.....	9
• Trends That Influence Facility Provision Strategies.....	10
• Demographic Influences.....	10
• Recreation Infrastructure Trends and Influences.....	11
• Recreation and Sport Participation	11
• Summary	12
• Green Infrastructure	13
• Context.....	13
• Existing Studies and Plans	13
• Major Pending Park Projects	15
• Setting the Stage for Facility Planning.....	16
• Market Driven Planning	16
• Comparable Communities.....	17
• New Capital Developments vs. Capital Reinvestment.....	17
• Capital Investments in Sport, Recreation and Park Facilities	18

- **Facility Needs Assessment 19**
- **About the Needs Assessment 19**
- **Need for Indoor Pools 19**
- **Need for Ice Arenas 24**
- **Need for Indoor Community Program Space 30**
- **Need for Indoor Turf Fields 39**
- **Need for Fitness Facilities 44**
- **Recommended Facility Standards and Need Implications 53**
- **Facility Provision Priorities and Strategies 55**

Introduction

Preface

For decades sport and recreation facilities have been fundamental to the lives of Canadians. The local arena, pool or community hall are places where bodies are strengthened, skills are learned, friendships are developed and lifelong memories are made. These important community assets have always been central to the fabric of Canadian society.

Community sport, recreation and green infrastructure (“green” being parks, trails and open spaces) is critical to the health, well being and quality of lives of Canadians. Countless studies, papers and conferences have identified the health, social, economic and environmental benefits of recreation and confirmed that a strong recreation system is essential to effective community building. There is an undeniable connection between healthy people and vibrant communities.

Throughout Canada, community sport and recreation facilities are provided by municipalities, not-for-profit agencies, charitable organizations and school boards – in most jurisdictions, municipalities provide the largest number of assets. And in the case of local governments, while the provision of these assets is not legislatively mandated, most municipalities have a department or an authority that presides over recreation, sport, cultural and leisure activities and facilities. Communities that track local preferences usually discover that sport and recreation facilities including parks, trails and open spaces are highly valued commodities and key priorities of their citizenry. Yet, in times of financial restraint, recreation departments are often among the first asked to justify their budgets or rationalize their spending¹.

In view of the Kelowna’s projected population growth and anticipated shifts in the local demographic profiles, City officials have created a long-term strategic development plan to guide future investments in sport, recreation and green infrastructure. The plan is based on a long term vision for sport, recreation and parks development and is supported by economically sound and socially justifiable rationale.

The Benefits of Community Recreation Infrastructure

It is well documented that Canada is facing a significant health crisis caused in part by the growing incidence of obesity. It is quite clear that the cause of this predicament is lifestyle-related: simply put, poor dietary choices combined with a lack of adequate regular physical activity. It is also well known that regular moderate exercise and other forms of activity not only combat the threat of obesity but also provide some degree of immunity against many modern lifestyle diseases including certain types of cancer, cardiovascular disease and diabetes.

¹ Community Recreation and Parks Infrastructure, Commissioned Paper, National Recreation Summit, Frittenburg 2011

Young Canadians are of particular concern. There is a large volume of research illustrating that rises in obesity are particularly affecting the health of children, teenagers, and young adults. Coincidentally there is evidence that the independent mobility of children is being increasingly restricted and that perceived time challenges are negatively affecting historical participation in sport and recreation endeavours as well as spontaneous play. This decline can be linked to a variety of factors including a lack of accessible infrastructure as well as parents increasingly driving children to school and to recreational destinations. This has caused many researchers in the field of children's leisure to stress the need for children to become more physically active for reasons other than physical health.²

Several presentations and position papers prepared for the 2011 National Recreation Summit (Lake Louise, Alberta) illustrated the important role that city planners and leisure professionals should play in the fight against escalating levels of public inactivity. There is now consensus that local governments must provide adequate and appropriate infrastructure – such as sport and recreation facilities, parks and trail systems - to facilitate an increase in the general public's propensity to participate in regular physical activity. Furthermore, the act of engaging in activity is in itself a positive leisure experience that contributes to the physical and mental health of individuals and the general well-being of the community as a whole.

The Infrastructure Planning Process

This Infrastructure Planning Study was overseen by a Project Committee comprised of City staff representing the following departments: Infrastructure Planning; Recreation and Cultural Services; Civic Services; Real Estate and Building Services; Financial Services; and Development Services.

The planning process was initiated to determine Kelowna's recreation facility requirements for the next 20 years by answering the following questions.

- Which of the City's existing facilities are needed to meet near and long term community needs?
- What rehabilitation to the existing stock is required to enhance or renew the City's facilities so they are capable of continuing to meet the recreation needs of Kelowna residents?
- What new facilities does the City need to meet future needs?
- What is a reasonable and rational plan to meet long term needs and what are the capital cost implications of the plan?

² Audit of Community Infrastructure for Walking – Case Study, Cunningham, Mangels, Reams – 11th Canadian Congress of Leisure Research, Nanaimo, BC, 2005

The initial premise of the study was that the City's current recreation and sport facility portfolio requires some rehabilitation and that the existing facilities may not be capable of fully meeting present or future needs. While the study largely focused on "major facilities" (i.e. arenas, pools and community centres) care was taken to establish needs for less prominent facilities that are well received by the public or that are important to the vibrancy of Kelowna. To a certain extent the study also considered outdoor "built infrastructure" such as parks, sports fields, stadia, and playing fields.

Recreation and sport services contribute directly to City residents' quality of life including their personal health and social cohesion. Moreover, recreation facilities and activities as well as parks and beaches are among the leading reasons for tourists to visit the Kelowna area. As a result, a goal of the study was to develop an overall facility strategy that increases personal and community benefits to residents and visitors to the City. For this reason, it was imperative for the study to consider not just infrastructure data and facts related to "future builds", but also how the preferred facility investment strategy would affect the long-term vitality of the City and the wellbeing of those who live and work or visit and play in Kelowna.

The study examined the physical and financial requirements associated with the City's capital assets as well as the activity and service needs of the community into the future. In doing so, the study took into account: (1) program design implications and the manner in which recreation and service delivery trends will influence future program design; and (2) geographical distribution of facilities throughout the City and if/how distribution implications should affect facility provision strategies going forward.

Project Goals and Work Program

The study strived to achieve the following goals:

- To create a responsible and cost effective strategy that ensures the City's recreation and sport facility portfolio is able to meet current and future community needs, and
- To develop a capital development strategy including financially sound rationale for providing the City's sport and recreation infrastructure.

The work plan was divided into two phases each of which involved several important initiatives. Implementing the work program was the joint responsibility staff and an external consultant.

<i>Phase One</i>	
Start Up	These initial activities involved were based on the appropriate contextual information necessary to inform the balance of study. Background studies, previous reports, demographic information, population projections and other pertinent data were compiled, tabulated and analyzed. Recreation and leisure trend information was also collected for later use in the study. Staff assembled a complete inventory of all of the City's recreation, sport, park and cultural facilities as well as the historical use profile of each asset.
Facility Review	The location, physical condition and life-cycle status of each facility was confirmed. This stage of the study involved a review of previous studies as well as site visits during which physical inspections were undertaken.
Analysis	The facility use data was analyzed to determine the physical capacity of each facility to accommodate recreation and leisure activities. A nine step progressive market driven assessment and planning technique was used to establish facility provision standards that are based on the unique characteristics of the City over the next 20 years.
<i>Phase Two</i>	
Provision Options	The results of Phase One were utilized to develop a number of different facility investment and distribution options that were analyzed. Each option was evaluated based on its associated operational implications and capital cost requirements. The process allowed for the development of an implementation plan and the establishment of key priorities to guide future investments and funding strategies
Finalization	The study's recommendations were finalized and communicated to senior municipal officials. The study will be complete once the final report is presented to Council.

Contextual Planning

Corporate Alignment

It is important that this infrastructure planning process recognize the key elements and pertinent aspects of Kelowna's Strategic Plan. To this end, the underlying principles of this study were aligned with Kelowna's future directions and strategic objectives.

The vision articulated in the City of Kelowna Strategic Plan (2004) is:

Kelowna is a vibrant city where the agricultural and beautiful natural setting, community spirit, economic stability and stewardship of the environment enhance the quality of life for citizens.

There are three goals that support this vision:

- To maintain, respect and enhance our natural environment
- To foster a strong, stable and expanding economy
- To foster the social and physical well-being of citizens and visitors

Kelowna's strategic objectives (2008) are:

- FINANCE - to ensure a fair balance between taxation, other revenue and control of expenditures in order to have sufficient resources for ongoing services, capital expenditures and financial reserves.
- HUMAN RESOURCES - to retain, develop and attract appropriate staff, volunteers and elected officials who are committed to our vision and mission.
- PARTNERSHIPS - to identify and develop partnerships that will provide efficient and quality services.
- FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT & TECHNOLOGY - to provide appropriate technology, spaces and places to support our programs, services, staff and volunteers.
- IMAGE - to be respected and valued by our community.
- RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT - to continuously seek improvements in corporate performance and to monitor key community and external indicators that may influence future operations.

Respecting Community Needs and Priorities

In 2007/08, the City of Kelowna implemented a recreation, parks and culture planning process that involved considerable consultation and interactions with community groups, recreation program participants, sports organizations, facility users, stakeholders and the general public. The planning and consultation processes were grounded in the findings of a statistically valid research study that examined the community's preferences and opinions about the future of recreation and culture in Kelowna. The results of the consultation process – and in particular stakeholder input – became the foundation for an overarching recreation, parks and cultural vision which was supported by commitments for the future delivery of recreation services and facilities in Kelowna.

Vision

Kelowna is a spectacular place where people pursue active, creative, connected and healthy lifestyles in a sustainable natural and urban setting.

Commitments

We will meet the needs and aspirations of the community using methods that are engaging, relevant and effective. In doing so, we will:

- Engage citizens in decision-making and promote healthy lifestyle pursuits.
- Build and strengthen neighbourhoods through the provision of facilities and the delivery of services.
- Provide program, park and facility options that are financially and physically accessible.

We will foster a spectrum of pursuits for residents and visitors and ensure that options are accessible for all. In doing so, we will:

- Deliver a broad array of programs that reflect the needs and interests of the community.
- Protect and promote the values of inclusion, engagement, equity, collaboration and innovation.
- Build awareness of the value of creativity in everyone's lives.

We will acquire, design, develop and manage facilities and spaces that reflect Kelowna's heritage and identity and contribute to community connectedness and well being. In doing so, we will:

- Minimize the environmental impact of managing and developing civic facilities, public spaces and human activity.

- Retain and enhance the community's sense of place on a local, community and citywide basis.
- Provide and manage public spaces to meet the community's physical, social and lifestyle needs.
- Maintain existing and develop new facilities to provide accessible sport and recreation opportunities.

We will provide creative leadership in planning, financing, implementing and operating the City's infrastructure. In doing so, we will:

- Adhere to sound fiscal responsibility, revenue generation and allocation of sufficient capital and operating resources to core community priorities.
- Create partnerships and actively work with citizen groups, other agencies and private sector to fulfill the City's objectives.
- Utilize reliable principles to understand community needs and issues, plan ahead, effectively implement, evaluate and follow-up on the community services that we provided.
- Provide services that contribute to individual and community health and well being and that meet community needs while remaining sustainable from physical, human, and financial resources perspectives.

Strategic Decision-Making

The Consultant organized a number of planning sessions during which participants reinforced the need to align the results of this infrastructure study with the City's corporate strategy. Furthermore, this study's results should respect and to a certain extent support strategies, plans and directions presented in previous research and planning initiatives that are focused on Kelowna's recreation, parks and cultural services. The process of identifying the need for facilities and creating responsive provision strategies remained true to the philosophies, values and directions described in the preceding sections. Additionally, the Consultant recommended a number of strategic imperatives to help determine facility needs and to frame the development of the implementation plan.

- Overall recreation facility needs of the City should be used to determine the desirable facility provision targets and local community requirements should be considered as part of the implementation strategy.
- Reinvesting in existing infrastructure (where need remains evident) should generally be a higher priority than building new infrastructure.
- Changes to an existing facility's design or footprint should only be considered if renovations result in "increased benefits" to a community.

- Where facilities are deemed as being no longer consistent with existing or emerging needs, consideration should be given to re-purposing facilities for alternate uses.
- Where possible and appropriate, attempt to co-locate programs and services at community recreation centres.
- Project-specific feasibility studies should be required prior to any significant facility expansion, re-purpose or development.

It was agreed that the vision, commitment statements and the strategic imperatives would be utilized to test the validity and establish the priorities of the initiatives arising from this study. The results of these assessments are presented in the final section of this report.

Community Profile and Important Trends

Kelowna's community profile was comprehensively analyzed including current and projected residential populations, demographic trends including proportionate age cohorts, residential distribution, income, education and ethnicity. A summary of the key community profile trends and influences that were brought to bear on the strategic facility plan is presented below. A full description of the population and demographic trend factors is presented in Appendix A.

Important Demographic Trends and Influences

- In 2011 Kelowna's was home to 117,312 residents, representing a 9.6% population growth compared to the 2006 census tally. While the most recent five year growth pattern is below the 11.2% population increase the City experienced between 2001 and 2006, Kelowna continues to outpace growth profiles of both British Columbia and Canada as a whole.
- According to the 2011 census data, the City's median age is 43 years compared to the provincial median of 41.9 years. Over the past five years, the proportionate size of the population between 0 to 19 years dropped by 1.4%, while the number of 20 to 39 year old residents correspondingly climbed by 1.5%.
- Based on the 2011 census data and the 20 year growth projections included in the City of Kelowna's Official Community Plan, the facility needs analysis was based on the following age cohort population forecasts.

City of Kelowna Projected Population by Age Cohort

	Total Population	Age Cohorts			
		0-19	20-39	40-64	65+
2011-2115	128,339	25,668	32,213	43,507	26,951
2016-2020	138,478	26,311	35,312	46,390	30,465
2021-2025	148,033	26,942	38,193	48,407	34,492
2026-2031	157,063	26,072	41,308	49,475	40,208

Source: Adapted from the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan

- Significant population growth coupled with a general aging of the City's residential population will influence future needs for Kelowna's sport and recreation infrastructure. The aging of the City's population will inevitably result in the need for changes in the type of facilities – or adjustments to the customary design of traditional facilities – to meet the needs of a larger number of older adults. It is important to note that the absolute numbers of residents in each age cohort will continue to rise over time implying that growth related demand for facilities will steadily climb to 2031. Consequently, in the future, the City will be required to provide more traditional

facilities to accommodate growth related needs while also developing different types of facilities to meet the requirements of larger numbers of new users.

- In combination, these circumstances could create pressures on the City to: (1) provide more of its traditional facilities to meet the needs resulting from growth in numbers of current and usual users; (2) develop new or innovative types of facilities to accommodate changing participation patterns linked to demographic changes and the emergence of unconventional users; and (3) adapt programs or scheduling practices in both traditional and new types of facilities in response to evolving participation profiles and lifestyle changes (e.g. increasing reluctance of users to participate in activities scheduled in later time slots on week nights).
- Kelowna's median family income for couples with children is \$82,266 which is 4% above the provincial median of \$79,509. There is only modest deviation between the comparable income levels for couples without children and all private households suggesting that participation patterns demonstrated by Kelowna residents would conform to average rates.
- About 15% of Kelowna's residents are immigrants, which is slightly more than half of the provincial measure (27%). The vast majority of immigrants (73%) have lived in the City for over two decades (before 1991) and visible minorities make up less than half of the City's immigrant population. Although the City is relatively homogenous, national immigration trends suggest that the level of ethnic diversification may increase; which is a trend that could have an escalating local influence over time. As such, non-traditional programming options should be considered, as well as an increased sensitivity to a variety of leisure preferences and expectations.

Trends That Influence Facility Provision Strategies

Kelowna's facility provision strategy takes into account current or emerging trends that are affecting recreation participation, leisure patterns and the delivery of parks, recreation and cultural services across British Columbia as well as throughout Canada as a whole. A fulsome description of the various influences is presented in Appendix B. This section summarizes key trends that were considered.

Demographic Influences

- Older adults will progressively become far more active than seniors of the past and will strive to remain physically active.
- Older recreation participants will expect high quality facilities and services and will increasingly participate in less strenuous physical endeavours.

- Although Kelowna has a relatively modest immigrant population, it is advisable that the City's facility provision strategy consider the ethno-cultural preferences for social and group gatherings in both indoor and outdoor settings.

Recreation Infrastructure Trends and Influences

- Recreation and sport facilities – especially arenas and pools – consume significant amounts of energy. Where possible, major building retrofits and new facility developments should include energy efficiency improvements such as solar panels, heat recovery systems, enhanced insulation, motion sensitive lighting, etc.
- One-stop, multi-purpose facilities as destinations for a number of recreation, sport and social services is the preferred development model when compared to the more traditional and smaller single purpose facility approach. This can be accomplished by either providing several facility components “under one roof” or in a campus setting.
- Modern recreation facilities are often multi-generational, offering a variety of elements, services and programs oriented for youth, adults and older adults. Multi-purpose facilities that provide a variety of programs targeting the needs of all age groups are operationally more cost effective compared to several stand-alone facilities that are dedicated to a single age cohort – i.e. senior or youth centres.

Recreation and Sport Participation

- Recreation and sport participants – especially adult and older adults – are increasingly interested in spontaneous, unstructured activities. Similarly, participants in structured and scheduled programs are looking for programs requiring shorter time commitments.
- Outdoor endeavours are becoming increasingly popular. Across all spectrums, recreation participants appreciate opportunities to participate in outdoor physical activity as these types of pursuits contribute to an individual's personal health while enjoying the environment. It is therefore likely that the development of greenways and bike paths systems will be priorities for community open space systems.
- Modern program inventories often include experiential activities such as adventure programs, cross-cultural endeavours and intensive learning opportunities which may have facility design implications.
- Creative partnerships between recreation departments and the health care sector are resulting in programs being offered in the community rather than in a clinical setting, which has led to improvements in healthy lifestyle behaviours within communities.

- Progressive communities are creating partnerships between schools, parks and recreation departments, community sport organizations and parent groups to address the public obesity issue. This situation could also have facility implications such as joint use of school agreements or the development of facilities with several users under one roof.

Summary

All of the community profile and trend information was researched and documented to ensure that all pertinent considerations would be brought to bear on the planning and decision-making process related to the need for and provision of an adequate inventory of sport and recreation facilities. Some key trends that were considered as part of the deliberations include the following:

- The City's population is growing, aging and starting to become more ethnically diverse. Activity profiles are also changing; e.g. the seniors of tomorrow are expected to be more active than current and past generations.
- Financially, there is a gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" with those working in the service sector earning far less than the average income levels of City residents in general.
- Based on provincial norms, a larger than acceptable proportion of the City's children and youth population (and the population in general) does not engage in sufficient amounts of physical activity to achieve optimal health benefits and probably are dealing with weight management issues.
- There is growing interest in unstructured, informal and self-scheduled activities, often at the expense of organized sport and recreation activities.
- Some of the City's recreation assets are aging and not designed to modern standards - considerable investment is required.
- Users of recreation and community services are seeking multi-use facilities that provide "one-stop shopping" opportunities for the whole family. Multi-dimensional facilities can also offer economies of scale in terms of construction and operation.
- There is a growing realization that the City cannot meet all needs by itself, which has led to the development of creative partnerships.

Green Infrastructure

Context

As mentioned in the introduction of this report, the scope of the study was to primarily focus on Kelowna's need for new or revitalized "built infrastructure". However, it is clear that green infrastructure in the form of parks, sports fields and trails are valuable assets that contribute to the community's vibrancy and the health of the City's citizenry.

Numerous studies, frameworks and evaluation tools have highlighted the significant individual, commercial and societal benefits associated with green infrastructure. There is also increasing evidence that communities having comprehensive parks plans including active protection of natural areas are more successful in cultivating community pride through knowledge that open spaces and ecosystem services will be available for generations to come. Furthermore trails and linear parks are relatively inexpensive to build and operate even though they offer substantial opportunities for personal health and wellness improvement through walking, cycling and other active pursuits. Finally, co-located parks with sport centres or creating trail connections between recreation facilities presents complementary and synergistic services that are conveniently available to a wide range of potential users - including family members with different recreational interests.

It is therefore appropriate that this document presents an overview of relevant background information and plans for new or redeveloped outdoor spaces that fit within the context of the City's entire recreation and park system.

Existing Studies and Plans

City of Kelowna, Official Community Plan (OCP 2011) - Kelowna's Official Community Plan describes land use designations that define how land will be developed in order to accommodate people, businesses, institutions and agriculture. Location and anticipated population growth were considered in determining the designations as well as remaining sensitive to the 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy. The plan describes public open spaces and specifically refers to city, district, community, neighbourhood and linear parks. Major parks (city, recreation, community and linear) will be developed in accordance with the land allocation map included in the OCP, while neighbourhood parks will be provided at City standards as integral components of new and redevelopment initiatives. In 2010, land used for parks and recreational purposes represented 11% of the total hectares defined in the OCP. The plan anticipates that this will grow to 12% by 2030.

The City of Kelowna, Parkland Acquisition Guidelines (2011) - The guidelines help direct the City's decisions regarding the nature of the land required for parks in new neighbourhoods and mature areas of Kelowna. The guidelines contribute to parkland acquisition decisions and are

an important part of the City's planning, design and management processes. Application of the guidelines allows Kelowna's parks to be designed and built to play a key role in the lives of local residents, to create memorable experiences for visitors and to provide valuable economic and environmental benefits. The central role of the guidelines is to describe and illustrate key planning and design features to be considered in selecting parkland. The guidelines also outline the range of Kelowna's park classifications, the planning framework for parkland acquisition and the on-site services and amenities typical of each park classification³. This includes distinguishing between the spatial requirements and amenities contained within city-wide parks, recreation parks, community parks, neighbourhood parks, town plazas, pocket parks, natural park areas, lineal parks, as well as privately and publicly owned open spaces such as courtyards, pedestrian pathways and open plazas. The guidelines are based on the City's Official Community Plan population growth projections and the parkland service standard (i.e. area of parkland needed per 1,000 population) for city wide, recreation, community and neighbourhood parks.

The City of Kelowna, Linear Parks Master Plan (2009) - The Linear Park Master Plan was developed to provide long-term direction for the planning and construction of on road and off road walkways and bike routes. The Master Plan is to result in a trail network that is coordinated, sustainable and environmentally responsible. Spanning the entire City, the trail network is to provide recreational opportunities as well as accommodating alternative transportation by a diverse range of users. Recognizing that trails within the network will differ in their level of use, context and specific location, the Plan identifies six classifications including: major urban promenades; major multi-use trails; roadside corridors; standard multi-use trails; narrow multi-use trails; and nature trails. The Plan also identifies detailed design specifications for each classification of trail and illustrates existing and proposed linear parks on trail classes maps. The Plan contains an implementation and phasing strategy that is based on land acquisition and trail development priorities.

City of Kelowna, Sports Fields Needs Assessment (2010) - The Sports Fields Needs Assessment Study was undertaken to identify the number and type of sports fields that are necessary to maintain existing service standards of field user groups - primarily soccer, softball and baseball organizations. This was accomplished by examining the capacity of the City's existing sports fields inventory compared to service level demands of field user groups. The study also compared Kelowna's field provision level to service standards in other similar British Columbia communities and created five classes of playing fields based upon their size, amenities and design features. Lastly, the Study took into account demographic projections and user trends to determine the City's need for sports fields until 2030. It recommended that:

- the City should increase the current soccer field capacity by the equivalent of 6.6 fields by 2020 and by 12.5 equivalent fields by 2030.

³ City of Kelowna Parkland Acquisition Guidelines, January 2011

The study concluded that provision of new sports fields in the new Recreation Park in the Glenmore sector, coupled with a strategy of improving and upgrading existing fields could accommodate future growth while maintaining existing service levels. The Glenmore sector is currently under serviced in this regard, and the Recreation Park approach to sports fields development allows for a cluster of fields, the provision of artificial turf, sports lighting and supportive infrastructure that could not typically be justified with development of a single field.

Major Pending Park Projects

The preceding studies and plans have been used as the basis for the creation of a draft 2020 Plan for Priority One community parks. The draft plan also has considered the significant value and community benefit realized through the development and maintenance of a vibrant park system. Projects currently identified by the plan are:

- Kerry Park
- City Park
- Stuart Park Phase Two
- Glenmore Park
- Rowcliffe Park
- Mill Creek, Bellevue Creek and Mission Creek Linear Parks
- Knox Mountain Park

While the focus of this infrastructure study primarily concerned major recreation facilities, the City's long term capital and development planning should take into account parks projects within the context of the entire recreation and park system. By doing so, the City would demonstrate a commitment to achieving its overarching goal of improving community health, wellness and fitness by maximizing the contribution of all of its physical assets - that include not only recreation centres but also parks, trails and neighbourhood focused facilities.

Setting the Stage for Facility Planning

The Consultant organized a number of planning sessions that focused on confirming recreation facility provision targets. The targets considered capacity and the physical status of the City's current inventory of facilities, provision levels in other communities, recreation participation trends and demographic indicators. The targets were also tested against the values and philosophies as well as market variables described in the previous section.

Provision targets represent goals that assist in setting the City's long-term capital budgets for sport, recreation and leisure facilities. Collectively, the targets represent the City's overall needs that will be realized through the implementation of a systematic facility development strategy. While an implementation strategy is presented in the final charter of this Report, the City may decide to undertake additional analysis to ensure that community level market variables – reflecting localized needs - are included in the plan prior to finalizing development or re-development decisions.

Market Driven Planning

In Phase One of the study the Consultant recommended a process to determine appropriate facility provision standards that are specifically applicable to Kelowna. This recommendation was based on the notion that the traditional population based method to determine future needs should be supported by a market driven assessment and planning technique. To this end, the following systematic process was employed to establish standards that are based on Kelowna's market variables. A detailed description of each step in the process is presented in Appendix C.

- Determine Existing Capacity
- Measure Use Compared To Capacity
- Project Tentative Future Need
- Adjust to Reflect Demographics
- Adjust to Reflect Future Trends
- Possibly Adjust Municipal Strategic Planning Policy
- Possibly Adjust to Reflect Economic Reasonableness
- Possibly Adjust to Reflect Geographic Location
- Determine Final Standard
- Recommend How Best to Implement the Standard

Comparable Communities

While the facility provision standards are to be specific to the needs of Kelowna, the provision levels in comparable communities could be usefully applied to test the reasonableness of the study's conclusions and recommendations. Accordingly, the facility provision standards of Abbotsford, Langley, Kamloops, Surrey, Vernon and Victoria were considered during the decision-making process. These municipalities were selected because of their proximity to Kelowna or their similarity to the City's demographic and age profile.

Each municipality supplied facility information including the number of units within each category of facility as well as their configuration – e.g. single pad vs. twin pad arena, rectangular vs. leisure pool, etc. The project consultant calculated the number of facility units per population. Where applicable, these ratios were compared to Kelowna's current provision levels and the proposed future levels that respond to the long term facility needs analysis.

The following table presents the population size and age breakdown of each of the comparable jurisdictions.

<i>Size and Age Composition – 2011 Statistics Canada Data</i>							
	<i>Kelowna</i>	<i>Abbotsford</i>	<i>Langley</i>	<i>Kamloops</i>	<i>Surrey</i>	<i>Vernon</i>	<i>Victoria</i>
2011 Population	117,312	133,497	104,177	85,678	468,251	38,150	80,020
2006 Population	106,700	123,864	93,725	80,375	394,980	35,940	78,057
2011 Age Data							
0-4	5,340	8,530	5,915	4,305	29,160	1,830	2,820
5-19	18,610	26,270	21,260	14,670	92,715	5,785	7,195
20-39	30,110	35,610	24,350	22,075	128,410	8,475	27,855
40-64	40,840	43,385	38,765	31,275	161,395	13,265	27,430
65+	22,415	19,700	13,880	13,345	56,570	8,800	14,715

New Capital Developments vs. Capital Reinvestment

Some of the City's existing recreation infrastructure has been in service for many years. In all cases, the facilities have received regularly scheduled maintenance or emergency repairs to resolve unanticipated remedial requirements. Additionally, select buildings have been renovated to update their designs or increase their physical capacities to meet the evolving recreation and leisure needs and expectations of facility users.

It was inevitable that during the planning process, choices would be required between investing capital to retrofit an existing building compared with developing a new facility – likely re-purposing the original asset. To facilitate decision-making, it was elected to utilize the Facility

Condition Index method (FCI) to determine the most appropriate choice between these alternatives.

The FCI method compares an existing structure's replacement value against known or anticipated capital renewal costs to the end of the study period – in this case 2031. The renewal cost includes deferred maintenance and scheduled or required structural, mechanical and electrical improvements to keep the facility functional - escalated annually at CPI - but not including efficiency upgrades or planned expansions. The FCI is calculated by dividing the capital renewal cost by the replacement value of the facility based on its current size, design, components and amenities. As the FCI ratio rises, the cost to maintain the structure gets closer to the cost to fully replace the building. Structure replacement costs of the existing asset – not the costs for a modern building – are used in the above formula.

In general, a higher FCI ratio indicates that the capital improvements are more immediate and significant. The following are FCI ratings that were utilized during the deliberations:

<0.05 – Good, reinvest to maintain the facility over time

0.05 - 0.099 – Fair, resolve immediate requirements and maintain the facility over time

0.10 - 0.29 – Poor, conduct a facility audit to determine viability of maintaining the building

>0.30 – Critical – consider replacing the building

Capital Investments in Sport, Recreation and Park Facilities

The City's population has grown by about 20% over the past 14 years - 99,026 in 1998 to 119,500 in 2012. This growth has led to the need for new or larger facilities to accommodate the sport, recreation and leisure requirements of Kelowna's expanded citizenry. Furthermore, the City has updated certain facilities in response to changes in sport and recreation participation patterns and renovated centres that have required remedial attention caused by age and heavy utilization. In combination, these factors have resulted in a significant level of investment in Kelowna's inventory of park and recreation infrastructure.

<i>Summary of Investments Between 1998 & 2012</i>	
<i>Asset Class</i>	<i>Investment</i>
Neighbourhood and Community Parks	\$8,014,014
Recreation Parks and Sportfields	\$17,508,955
Natural Areas and Linear Parks	\$6,039,610
City-wide Parks	\$5,325,931
Streetscapes	\$2,527,594
Pools and Aquatic Facilities	\$59,919,537
Arenas	\$21,581,353
Stadiums	\$3,860,784
Community Centres and Partnered Facilities	\$6,342,158
Total	\$131,119,936

Facility Needs Assessment

About the Needs Assessment

The purpose of the needs assessment was to establish direction for sport and recreation facility provision through the development of targets. The targets take into account current utilization profiles and demand/capacity ratios for each type of facility. Additionally, the targets reflect projected growth and anticipated demographic changes in Kelowna's residential population as well as recreation trends that are likely to influence future recreation and sport participation and facility utilization. Where applicable, benchmarks related to other community provision standards have also been taken into account.

The targets represent long-term goals that may be realized over time. Furthermore, the implementation of the recommended targets arising from this study may change when viewed through different lenses such as regional or community distribution strategies or the need to service certain neighbourhoods differently. Consequently, the targets are meant as guidelines indicating future facility needs with a view to projecting the long-term facility funding capital requirements.

It is noteworthy that this assessment has not taken into account the quality and condition of the existing supply. While the consultant has reviewed information provided by staff related to the long-term capital maintenance needs of the City's recreation facilities, the study's scope did not include structural inspections or examinations of conditions that may limit community use of certain facilities or components within certain venues. These types of analysis should be undertaken before the strategic implementation plan is finalized.

Need for Indoor Pools

The City's three public aquatic facilities contain one or more indoor pool basins and are available year-round for aquatic activities and programs. Indoor pools in Kelowna are a stand-alone facility (H2O), multi-purpose pools in a community serving facility (Kelowna Family YMCA) and a community recreation centre (Parkinson Recreation Centre). In all cases, the pool facilities are adjacent to program/meeting rooms, fitness areas or space for related programs or community rentals.

While each pool within the City's inventory is relatively well used, the use profile differs from site to site. For example, the aquatic instruction programs at the Parkinson pool are frequently oversubscribed while the H2O Centre lesson program is operating at about a third of its potential capacity. This may indicate the need for an examination of the cause of these use differences.

<i>Aquatic Centres</i>				
<i>Name</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Est. Capital \$ Required</i>	<i>Design/Access Issues or Comments</i>	<i>Use Ratio</i>
Parkinson	Built in 1972, this 51,739 sq ft. multi-purpose centre includes a pool/leisure pool, gymnasium, cardio/weight room, activities rooms plus banquet room Between 2009-10, the pool deck tile was redone (\$400,000) and the roof was repaired (\$100,000)	\$5M needed over 5 years	Restricted ability to host swim meets due to pool depth not complying with meet specs. Oldest pool in inventory. Swim lessons very popular. Has hosted many advanced lifesaving / first aid programs. Staff operate water parks in summer.	Lane - 68% Public - 52% Lesson - 90%
H2O	Built – 2009 50 M pool, Water Park, Whirlpool plus Flow Rider ; 3 water slides, river run, wave pool, splash park, 10,000+ fitness facility, yoga room, meeting rooms and offices	\$9,000 Critical to Urgent	Largest municipally owned pool/water-park in Canada. Operated by “Y” on a membership model. 80% members use fitness facility primarily. 5000+ members. Accommodates 80% of aquatic club use in City.	Lane - 86% Public - 38% Lesson - 30%
Kelowna Family Y	Built in 1980, this 46,993 sq ft facility including a 25M pool, dive tank, leisure pool plus hot tub, gymnasium, walking track, climbing wall, group fitness studio and strength/cardio centre	None – major addition and facility renovations occurred in 2011	Operated by YM/YWCA. Membership model. Requires lane availability for members at all times.	Lane - 69% Public - 50% Lesson - 79%

Trends and Best Practices related to Indoor Pools

- Swimming is one of the most popular recreation activities for all age groups, nationwide. There is an upward national trend in indoor swimming as each generation is more likely to swim than the generation before.
- Advances in pool design such as leisure pools with slides, wave action, pool and deck toys, etc. have resulted in an increase in the amount of swim visits per capita in jurisdictions that offer these attractive aquatic facilities – nationally, swim visits per capita range between four and eight occasions per year per resident.
- Swimming is a low impact activity that contributes to overall health and wellness. As the population ages, people are (and will be) looking for less stressful, non-weight bearing activities that contribute to their fitness, flexibility, core stability and muscle tone.

- According to the Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute, swimming is the top ranked activity for children ages 5 to 17 and one of the top five activities preferred by adults. Swim Canada promotes swimming as a “cradle to grave” activity. Participation data illustrates that all ages are using indoor aquatic facilities for a range of activities including learn to swim programs, lane swimming, aqua fitness classes, leisure swims, family fun swims, competitive training, etc.
- Swim lessons are an important element in any pool’s program schedule. Aquatic instruction primarily attracts children between the ages of 5 and 13 years, after which there is a sharp drop-off in lesson participation.
- Competitive swimming is popular amongst a segment of the Canadian population - 50,000 competitive swimmers registered with Swim Canada. Nationally, participation in competitive swimming programs declines significantly after the age of 15.
- Master swimming, water polo, diving and synchronized swimming are specialized and often competitive activities that remain popular in most jurisdictions across the country.
- Aqua fitness and water aerobics are well-liked programs – especially by women and older adults. As the population ages, industry insiders expect these activities to become much more popular.
- Leisure pools attract significantly more bathers than rectangular pools – either 25 metre or 50 metre designs. Leisure pools are capable of simultaneously accommodating more than twice the bathers than can be handled by rectangular pools. An industry standard capacity formula is: 25 swims per year per square foot of water surface area where the water is over 5 feet deep and 60 swims per year per square foot of water surface area where the water is less than 5 feet deep.
- The most successful indoor aquatics centre normally includes a variety of features that are designed to accommodate all ages and abilities with increasing emphasis on the needs for an aging population.

Current Provision Levels of Indoor Pools

As per national norms, 25 metre tanks and leisure pools are counted as the provision of one pool whereas a 50 metre tank is considered as two pools. This provision calculation is applicable even if more than one pool basin is included in a single facility. While operating approaches could influence participation rates at specific locations – i.e. membership fee based facility vs. a pay-as-you-go alternative – most pools within municipal inventories are mandated to be affordable and accessible and therefore comparisons of provision levels are applicable regardless of the management and operating approach of individual sites.

Given the current distribution of aquatic service throughout Kelowna, the fact that two locations (H2O and Kelowna family Y) offer more than one tank would have little if any influence on supply / demand calculations.

	<i>Kelowna</i>	<i>Abbotsford</i>	<i>Langley</i>	<i>Kamloops</i>	<i>Surrey</i>	<i>Vernon</i>	<i>Victoria</i>
2011 Population	117,312	133,497	104,177	85,678	468,251	38,150	80,020
2006 Population	106,700	124,258	93,725	80,375	394,980	35,940	78,057
Indoor Pools	5	2	4	4	5	2	2
Pools per Population	23,462	66,749	26,044	21,420	93,650	19,075	40,010
Pools per 0-19 Population*	4,790	17,400	6,794	4,744	24,375	3,808	5,008

Note: * the provision level per population under 19 years of age is an important indicator as children and youth are the predominant users of pool.

Observations

- Each of Kelowna's three pools offers a mixed use format that attracts varying levels of participation. The H2O facility attracts the most significant number of annual bathers who use both the water-park and 50 metre tank. While the Parkinson and KFY pools accommodate fewer swimmers per year, their use per capacity ratio is actually superior to H2O's performance.
- Based upon swimmer head counts and other facility use data provided by aquatic staff, it appears that the City's average per capita swim rate in indoor pools equates to 5.5 swim visits per resident per year.
- The lesson program at KFY is full with a waiting list and Parkinson's instruction program operates at over 80% of its capacity. There is significant un-used capacity in the H2O lesson program.
- Lane swimming at Parkinson and KFY operate at approximately 70% of capacity while H2O is at about 90% - largely based on the swim club.

Needs Assessment

Kelowna's three pools have a collective capacity of slightly more than 961,000 unique swim visits per year. Facility use data supplied by staff indicates that the pools collectively attract about 644,000 visitors per year – representing 67% of total capacity. While certain prime time hours in all pools are filled to capacity, there is unused potential within certain types of scheduled uses (public swims) in prime, shoulder and off peak hours.

The City's annual average indoor swim rate is 5.5 visits per capita, made up of swimmers attending family and fun swims, lane swimming, instructional programming and other elements of the pools' mixed use format. This rate is in the mid range of the national average of 4 to 8 swim occasions per capita per year. Trends suggest that swimming will remain a popular activity for all age groups for years to come. This suggests that the City's swim rate will either stay at current levels or climb as active older adults elect to replace rigorous endeavours with less stressful activities such as swimming.

The vast majority of participants in the aquatic instructional program are children and youth under the age of 13. The absolute number of Kelowna residents in this age cohort will gradually rise to 2025 before slightly receding. It is therefore reasonable to expect that the participation rate in the lesson program will remain reasonably constant over the period of this study.

If the City maintains its current per capita swim rate, the number of indoor pool visits will increase proportionate to population growth. However, if recreation participation trends result in an increase in the frequency that residents visit pools, the demand for pool time will grow more quickly than population increases.

Projected Pool Visits Based on Population Growth and Increases in Swim Rates			
	5.5 Swim Visits per Capita (Current)	6 Swim Visits per Capita	7 Swim Visits per Capita
Capacity	961,550	961,550	961,550
2011-2015 Demand	705,866	770,036	898,375
2016-2020 Demand	761,630	830,869	969,347
2021-2025 Demand	814,182	888,199	1,036,232
2026-2031 Demand	863,847	942,379	1,099,442

Suggested Provision Standard

The City's existing supply level of approximately one pool per 23,500 residents offers more aquatic capacity than is required to meet the needs of the current population (at the prevailing swim rate). If the swim frequency remains at current levels, the City's existing pool inventory should be sufficient to meet aquatic demands caused by population growth for the period covered by this study.

The existing inventory would be capable of accommodating aquatic demand even if swim rates grow by 10% (6 annual visits per capita) over the next 20 years.

If swim rates increase by 30% (seven per capita swim visits per year) and population growth reaches projected levels, aquatic demand will begin to exceed supply in 2021.

In view of the City's existing aquatic program mix and swim participation rates, we suggest a city-wide provision standard of one pool for every 30,000 residents. Should the participation rate climb by 20% to 30%, it would be reasonable to adjust the standard to one pool for every 25,000 residents.

Other Considerations

- If the Parkinson pool is removed from the City's aquatic inventory – or dramatically changes its programming profile in favour of older adults, the system would lose capacity equivalent to approximately 180,000 swim visits per year. Based on the current swim rate, H2O and KFY should be able to accommodate this demand. However, the City would be required to build a replacement pool by 2021 in response to demand based entirely on population growth. Adding a new replacement pool would be required between 2016 and 2020 if the swim rate increases by 10%.
- Residents place a very high value on aquatic facilities and often consider them to be cornerstones of community building. The preceding needs analysis is based entirely upon comparing facility capacity with anticipated demand and does not take into account supply distribution factors. Consequently, City officials may come under pressure to provide additional pools that are located in new or redeveloped communities.
- Any new pools should be located in multi-purpose recreation community centres and not built on a stand-alone basis.

Need for Ice Arenas

Arenas are public facilities containing one or more indoor ice sheets predominantly used and programmed for ice sports/activities such as hockey, figure skating, public skating, etc. Depending on the length of the ice season, arenas may also provide opportunities for floor uses such as ball hockey, lacrosse, special events and other activities. Arenas in Kelowna are combined with other types of facilities such as indoor turf fields and a fitness facility (Capital News Centre) and to a lesser extent community rooms and concessions (Memorial and Rutland Twin Arena).

For the purposes of this needs assessment, the calculated capacity and demand calculations have focused on the availability of arena space to satisfy ice user group requirements rather than groups that utilize arena floors. The rationale for this approach is based upon the fact that summer arena activity is generally sporadic and staff report that there is sufficient supply to meet the needs of floor users.

<i>Ice Arenas</i>				
<i>Name</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Est. Capital \$ Required</i>	<i>Design/Access Issues or Comments</i>	<i>Use Ratio</i>
Capital News Centre	Built – 2003 2 NHL sheets plus small leisure rink and associated amenities. See Community Centres.	None	Facility experiencing longer ice season due to spring ice requests and increased requests for summer camps. Ice use at near capacity in winter season. Sport courts booked to capacity in winter. Less sport court use in summer.	98%
Rutland Twin Rinks	Built – 1973 2 NHL sheets West arena 1,000 spectators -east arena second ice sheet addition in 1993 with 250 seats. Concession and liquor primary in place. West slab, boards and roof replaced in 2010.	West slab & mech. modifications (\$1M) Elec. upgrades (\$350,000) Roof (\$200,000) General repairs (\$600,000)	Increased ice usage in summer has resulted in moving maintenance shutdown to May/June. Significant day time use from private hockey academy, school hockey skills program, JR “B” practices, noon hour drop in hockey and school bookings. Ability to accommodate school booking limited by full schedule.	97%
Memorial Arena	Built – 1945 1 undersized sheet	\$1,000,000 Critical to necessary repairs required	Restricted use for assemblies due to Fire Department risk assessment. Not sprinkled. Accessibility issues to second floor. Cannot book adults into facility w/o permission from RG Prop.	88%
Prospera Place	Built – 1999 -1 NHL sheet. Seats 6,000. Restaurant, club boxes, box office, offices Home of Kelowna Rockets. Operated by RG Properties. Hosts concerts, trade shows, and special events.	None	1,500 annual hrs. available for City use. Unable to use all hours due to Rockets schedule and other restrictions. Community bookings are confirmed 30 days in advance (which is problematic). Minor sport groups reluctant to book this arena. Actual hrs booked: 2009 – 258, 2010 - 236, 2011 - 275	15% to 18% of available City Hours

Trends and Best Practices related to Arenas

- Youth participation in hockey and other ice sports has remained reasonably stable in recent years. However, on a national basis, participation in figure skating has experienced a decline in many jurisdictions. This is not the case in Kelowna where the skating club experienced close to a 40% climb in new registrations between 2006 and 2009.

- Participation in girls' and women's hockey expanded between 1990 and 2005 although there appears to be a certain leveling off of this growth in the past half decade.
- Adult hockey players are sticking with the sport longer than in the past. Therefore, the number of adults registered in senior, masters and old-timers leagues is climbing. This phenomenon appears to be applicable to Kelowna given the registrations in the Rutland Men's Group climbed by almost 70% between 2006 and 2009. Interestingly, adults are no longer content to be restricted to only non-prime time hours. This new expectation is putting increased pressure on arena operators to break from tradition and allocate a larger portion of prime time ice hours to adults.
- New and emerging sports that are vying for increasing amounts of ice time include Ringette, sledge hockey, speed skating, etc.
- Consumers' expectations relative to the quality of arena developments are rising. Modern facility design features such as top quality dressing rooms, showers, washrooms, separate female change rooms, officials' rooms, etc. are now commonplace in new arena developments. Some rinks are also including walking tracks and other non ice amenities that are attractive to a variety of different age groups and users.
- Most new arena developments include multiple pads of ice – sometimes in conjunction with other types of facilities in a community centre configuration. These multi-dimensional facilities offer increased program potential and help to offset operating costs due to order of magnitude savings. Where logistically and politically possible, certain municipalities are attempting to decommission single pad arenas in favour of multi-pad designs.
- Summer floor use has historically been occupied by lacrosse leagues. However, the popularity of lacrosse is waning and as a result some facilities are finding it difficult to remain busy during the non-ice season. Certain jurisdictions have instituted inline hockey leagues in an attempt to fill this void.
- Arenas are “drive to” facilities and are rarely accessed via foot or public transit – with the exception of arenas that offer instructional or figure skating programs and are also located adjacent to schools. Ice users are generally willing to travel to facilities that provide added value – such as modern, up-to-date and well maintained facilities or more desirable ice times.

Current Provision Levels of Ice Arenas

	<i>Kelowna</i>	<i>Abbotsford</i>	<i>Langley</i>	<i>Kamloops</i>	<i>Surrey</i>	<i>Vernon</i>	<i>Victoria</i>
2011 Population	117,312	133,497	104,177	85,678	468,251	38,150	80,020
2006 Population	106,700	124,258	93,725	80,375	394,980	35,940	78,057
Indoor Ice Sheets	6	6	6	3	16	3	1
Sheets per Population	19,552	22,250	17,363	28,559	29,266	12,717	80,020
Sheets per 0-19 Population	3,992	5,800	4,529	6,325	7,617	2,538	10,015

Observations

- Over the past ten years, participation in Kelowna's ice sports leagues and programs has increased on a much steeper curve than population growth. According to registration data, participation in ice related activities (hockey, skating, skill development, adult leagues, etc.) grew by 131% between 1999 and 2009. Interestingly, staff report that many of Kelowna's ice sport organizations are the largest associations in the province. Additionally, interest in spontaneous or casual skating (as evidenced by public skating attendance) has also dramatically climbed in the past decade, rising by 136% to almost 20,000 skaters in 2009.
- Based on the previous observation, it is not surprising that five of the six municipal ice pads are extensively utilized. The Capital News Centre and the Rutland Twin Rink facilities are virtually fully occupied during prime time hours of the ice season.
- The City has access to 1,500 hours of ice time at Prospera Place, however ice user groups are reluctant to book Prospera ice due to several scheduling and use issues. This contributes to the very low utilization rate – groups use less than 20% of the available City ice time.
- Depending on the municipality's definition of prime time, on average, a single sheet of ice provides between 2,500 and 3,000 prime time hours during the winter months – based on a 38 week season. Based on this standard, the City's allocated ice at Prospera represents between 50% and 60% of the time that would normally be accessible on a single pad. If Kelowna's ice provision standard was based on an inventory of 5.5 ice sheets, the provision level would change to one sheet per 21,329 in total population or one sheet per 4,355 residents under the age of 19 years.

- Memorial is the oldest rink in the City's inventory and is the only single pad community arena in Kelowna – Prospera is considered a stadium rink as opposed to a community arena. Given that Memorial was originally constructed in 1945, it is not surprising its design is dated and its amenities are not consistent with modern standards. Furthermore, there are accessibility issues and use restrictions caused by code deficiencies in the facility's fire protection system. Additionally, the City's management and operating agreement for Prospera includes certain restrictions related to adult use at Memorial. These contractual provisions limit the City's ability to allocate and schedule Memorial's ice with unencumbered flexibility. Finally, Memorial Arena's remaining service life is estimated at 20 years assuming the consistent availability of considerable capital reinvestment funds.

Needs Assessment

The primary users of prime time community ice time are youth groups. The absolute number of Kelowna residents below the age of 19 years is expected to continuously climb to 2025 and then gradually decline.

Nationally, participation in ice sports has remained relatively stable for years. Since 2003, Kelowna ice user groups have experienced increases in registrations that have surpassed rates of population growth over the same period. Therefore, ice sports groups are servicing a higher proportion of children and youth today than was the case a decade ago. In view of these facts, it would seem reasonable to anticipate that demand for ice time to serve the City's children and youth population will continue to increase at least proportionate to rates of population growth.

There are also more adult ice users today than was the case in 2003. It would therefore seem reasonable that demand for ice will grow proportionate to population increases in the older age cohorts. However, if older adults continue to be active longer and participate in ice sports into their later years, demand from this age cohort may increase faster than population growth.


If Kelowna were to maintain its current provision standard at approximately one ice surface per 4,000 children and youth under 19 years of age and if all City hours at Prospera are taken into account, the City is currently under supplied by approximately ½ an ice sheet. If the actual Prospera utilization is factored into the equation, the City's immediate needs grow to about one additional ice sheet.

A similar conclusion is reached when taking into account the preceding factors and applying them to the current ice provision ratio for the total population.

If Kelowna was to maintain its current provision level for children and youth, and if Prospera is considered as half a single pad rink, the City would be required to add one sheet of ice to its supply by 2015. Utilizing the current provision level for the total population produces the need to add slightly more ice in the near term. At current standards, demand for ice to satisfy the

program needs of the entire population will outpace ice needed to serve children and youth in each of the 5-year time periods included in this study.

Projected Ice Sheets Required to Maintain Current 0-19 and Total Population Provision Levels




Suggested Provision Standard

In view of the City's existing arena inventory and the prevailing ice utilization profile, we suggest a preliminary city-wide provision standard of one ice surface for every 4,000 residents between 0-19 years of age.

We also suggest that the City continue to monitor the amount of ice used by adults to determine if recent growth in adult participation is sustained. If so, we suggest that the provision standard be adjusted to reflect the influence of adult demand and therefore be based on a ratio of one ice surface to every 21,000 residents in total.

If utilization patterns shift to the extent that the adult market constitutes a significantly higher proportion of the potential ice users, the City should consider revisiting its ice allocation policy to ensure that the utilization of available ice is maximized. This may also include the introduction of an ice use policy that governs that manner in which groups assign ice times to their teams and leagues, ice "turn back" procedures, minimum ice users per hour, etc. The introduction of this type of measure may require a greater degree of vigilance by arena staff to monitor the manner in which ice times are used by groups and to identify opportunities of where more efficient and effective ice use could be achieved.

Projected Ice Sheets Needed to Meet Suggested Provision Levels



Other Considerations

- Under the current circumstances, the City is effectively under supplied by the equivalent of about one ice sheet. In large part, this deficiency is caused by the scheduling and allocation impediments at Prospera. If these impediments were alleviated, the supply/demand ratio would be improved. In an effort to rectify the situation, the City should approach RG Properties to determine if the current scheduling, confirmation and ice use restrictions can be alleviated. These discussions should also focus on the fact that the Prospera contract negatively influences the City's ability to maximize ice use at Memorial. The financial consequences of changes to the contract should be weighed against the capital and operating cost implications of adding a new rink to the City's ice inventory. This is because if efforts fail to alter the contract to be more in the City's favour, Kelowna is in immediate need for one new sheet of ice.
- The age, physical limitations and urgent capital improvements necessary at Memorial implies that the City should consider replacing the facility as an ice arena. Given the history and prominence of Memorial, it would be advisable to consider re-purposing the building for another municipal recreational use - recognizing the this alternative would require major capital investment (estimated at one million dollars or more).
- Any future ice facility developments should be multiple pad designs preferably located in multi-use community centres.

Need for Indoor Community Program Space

Kelowna's indoor program spaces are located in a variety of settings. A wide range of program types and community functions occur in program rooms, gymnasias and meeting rooms located

in publicly accessible community centres (Parkinson Recreation Centre and the adjoining multi-age activity centre), wellness and recreations centres (Kelowna Family “Y”) and multi-purpose sports centres (Capital News Centre). Important sub-sets of this facility category include venues that are designed to accommodate the particular needs of certain user groups. For example, Kelowna’s relatively new concept of multi-age activity centres provide public indoor spaces designed for a variety of program alternatives with a particular focus on the needs of older adults. While these centres are intended to be multi-purpose by catering to the needs of all potential user groups, the operating profiles suggest targeting the needs of an older clientele (i.e. in some cases Senior Societies run the programs).

Similarly, the City owns a number of other facilities that predominantly cater to the needs of a particular user group (i.e. Badminton and Curling Clubs) but offer community rooms, halls and program spaces that are also used by the public in general. It is noteworthy that if any one of these assets were removed from service, the community would lose access to a certain proportion of the existing indoor program space – with the potential need of replacement.

<i>Facilities with Community Program Spaces</i>			
<i>Name</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Est. Capital \$ Required</i>	<i>Design/Access Issues or Comments</i>
Parkinson Recreation Centre	Includes gymnasium, fitness centre, multiple convertible program rooms, banquet room, offices, lobby& lounge.	Significant \$ required (up to \$5M) for PAC upgrades and retrofits	New 13, 285 sq. ft. multi-age activity centre slated to open in Nov 2012. Replacement for existing Water Street Activity Centre.
Rutland Activity Centre	1974 (9704 sq ft)	\$28,000 Urgent	90% + used by Seniors society. Some community programs.
Okanagan Mission Activity Centre	1973 (2571 sq ft)	\$62,500 Urgent to Necessary	Used extensively by Seniors Society. Lots of summer rentals due to beach location. Nearing end of service life.
Cedar Creek Community Centre	Built - 1975 Size – (2620 sq ft) converted 2 bay fire hall in south Mission area	\$50,100 Critical to desirable	Fire Hall decommissioned and converted to recreation. Main hall & meeting room dedicated to radio club. City programs, after school (B&G Club) and rentals. Limited use but rising.
Kinsmen Centre	Built - 1980 Size – (1200 sq ft) description?	\$92,250 Critical to Necessary	Built by Kinsmen Club. Some exclusive space and monthly use of meetings. Program space rented for tournaments, wedding, reunions etc.

The operating model of facilities that provide community spaces could influence the manner in which the spaces are used as well as the profile of groups or individuals that rent the rooms or participate in programs.

The City manages the Parkinson Recreation Centre and therefore entirely controls the program delivery model and the allocation of spaces to various community groups. By comparison, the Kelowna Family Y and the Capital News Centre are managed by third parties that are responsible for the programming and allocation of community spaces within their venues. Although the City has limited control over the community use practices at these two locations, both offer a small number of general purpose rooms and therefore have a negligible impact on the overall municipal inventory of community program space.

Partnered Function Facilities

Partnered facilities are municipal buildings located on City-owned sites that are operated by community or not-for-profit organizations. Normally the arrangements are in the form of leases, contracts or operating agreements through which the City is responsible to maintain the building envelope and major equipment while the community group is responsible for the building's interior including day-to-day repairs and maintenance or enhancements to leasehold improvements. As the partners are responsible for the scheduling and allocation of community rooms within each venue, there is no accurate measurement of the amount of general community use accommodated in these facilities.

<i>Partnered Facilities</i>			
<i>Name</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Est. Capital \$ Required</i>	<i>Design/Access Issues or Comments</i>
Badminton Club	Built – 1949 - Size – (10,101 sq ft) operated by Kelowna Badminton Society Recently the City replaced the facility roof.	\$50,100 Critical	5 courts plus kitchen and banquet area on second floor. Membership model. 400 members.
Curling Club	Built – 1978 - Size – (46,236 sq ft) operated by the Kelowna Curling Club – 12 sheets, largest facility in western Canada. 2 floors of lounge space (24,000 sq ft) including 2 kitchens, 6 rest rooms, a commercial elevator. Building is wheelchair accessible but does not have electric doors. In 2008-09 the Club's washrooms were renovated and an elevator was added.	NA	Used extensively in winter months. A few home shows, special event bookings in summer.
Central Okanagan Small Boat Association	Operated by COSBA	NA	Built on City owned land. Building is owned and operated by COSBA.

<i>Partnered Facilities (con't)</i>			
<i>Name</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Est. Capital \$ Required</i>	<i>Design/Access Issues or Comments</i>
Martin Education Centre	Built – 1960 Size – (18,152 sq ft) operated by Boys and Girls Club	Urgent Capital Investment Required	Decommissioned as a School. Purchased by City. Leased to B&G Club. EOS within 10 yrs.
Glenn Avenue School	Built – 1910 – (17,942 sq ft) operated by Boys and Girls Club – 2 story structure. Gym, program space and offices.	\$115,350 On-hold	Built originally as a school. Outdoor playground and some green space.
Rutland Youth Centre	Built – 1980 - (13,486 sq ft) operated by Boys and Girls Club. Contains gymnasium, kitchen, program space, meeting room, youth lounge.	NA	Run as a youth center by B&G Club. Not available for other uses.
Okanagan Gymnastics Centre	Built – 2001. 2 storey+ structure 18,340 sq ft operated by Kelowna Gymnastics Club – trampoline, tumbling, bars, beams, etc. Meeting room and offices. In 2007, the facility was expanded by 2,800 sq. ft. at a cost of \$800,000.	NA	City Owned - Financed and operated by Gymnastics Club. Well used. Has hosted international competitions.

Trends and Best Practices related to General Community Program Space

- Community program spaces are often located in multi-purpose recreation centres that offer high quality facilities suitable for the entire family. Multi-use, multi-cultural, multi-generational centres that are flexibility designed will be the most widely used facilities in a recreation department's inventory of assets.
- Recreation participants will travel to top quality centres – often bypassing facilities of lesser quality. This phenomenon is leading to the creation of “service areas” defined by travel time rather than prescribed geographical market areas.
- Multi-purpose centres appeal to all age cohorts and “active older adults” will be loyal patrons. To prepare for future demand arising from an older population, centre designs should consider that there will be an increasing number of “special needs” older adults as this cohort ages.
- Design emphasis should be on maximizing flexibility and including components that can be utilized for numerous purposes – i.e. multi-purpose rooms and gymnasias – and that enable cross-programming.

- Traditionally, school gymnasias have been utilized by the community for organized activities. School use is becoming more expensive and problematic (bumping) which is intensifying demands for gymnasias that are affordable and conveniently accessible.
- Multi-purpose activity spaces provide for programmatic synergies and often become the hubs of the community.
- Co-locating several facility components in a single multi-purpose building or in a campus setting can result in cost advantages through increased efficiencies – e.g. one management team overseeing numerous operating units - and order of magnitude savings in utilities, operating supplies, etc. Additionally, multi-purpose complexes are less expensive to build than several standalone facilities.

Trends and Best Practices related to Older Adult Program Spaces

- Baby Boomers are the largest demographic age cohort in Canada. The oldest Boomers are already of retirement age with the balance of this group reaching 65 years over the next 1 ½ decades.
- Participation patterns of older adults suggest they will pursue less physically rigorous activities and prefer to engage in more informal, casual and self directed endeavours.
- Older adults will have higher expectations in terms of the quality of services and facilities and will pursue more arts and cultural activities as the desire to be creative and to express individuality increases as people age.
- Swimming and golf will remain popular activities for older adults and there will be increased demand for lifelong learning as a means of developing new skills and gaining knowledge to cope with life transitions.
- Three distinct groups of older adults are emerging: younger seniors – 55 to 65 years who will remain physically active; middle seniors – 65 to 75 years who make up most of the membership in traditional seniors clubs; and old seniors – 75+ years who may be more frail and who will require more support and specialized programs. As the population ages, there will be a need to alter programming and services to reflect the needs of each distinct group. In general though, older adults of today and tomorrow are expected to be more physically active than in past generations.
- It is clear that “one size does not fit all” when it comes to older adults. Therefore, a wide variety of programs and facility options will be required to support greater focus on the mind, body and soul of this expanding cohort.

- The new generation of older adults is expected to cycle through periods of work and leisure. While they may be retired from their “career” many will work part time or start new endeavours. This will shift the traditional hours that municipal services facilities and programs will be required. Furthermore, boomer women are more educated and independent than previous generations implying the need for creative types of programming that cater to their interests, lifestyles and financial capabilities.
- It is very likely that older adults will continue to utilize a variety of municipal facilities that provide leisure and program opportunities consistent with their requirements. Therefore, it is expected that active older adults will continue to patronize community centres, arenas and pools as well as other facilities offering more age specific programs such as Kelowna’s multi-age activity centres.
- By 2031, one in four Kelowna residents will be over the age of 65. It is therefore imperative that the City address the facility and program requirements of this important group.

Trends related to Community Halls and Partnered Facilities

- As is the case in most communities, Kelowna has a number of facilities that have been developed in partnership with community organizations or that the City has inherited for a variety of reasons. While these facilities generally meet the needs of designated groups, they are frequently utilized by the general community on a rental basis.
- In most cases, the operating responsibility and associated financial risks of the partnered facilities rests with the community organization. The City retains ownership of land and is responsible for major capital repair or maintenance items of the building.
- The vast majority of facilities within these two categories are well beyond a reasonable lifecycle for indoor programmable space.
- There are no commonly applied or universal provision standards related to these sorts of community assets. However, most municipalities are struggling to fund the capital maintenance costs of keeping halls and partnered facilities functional so that existing service levels can be effectively maintained. In certain cases, aging infrastructure has been removed from municipal inventories when the upkeep of the building is deemed too expensive. When the facilities are decommissioned the services are often replaced by the development of a new facility – usually as part of a multi-purpose recreation centre.

Observations

- Community program space is used for a variety of purposes including City programs, rentals by community user groups or individuals, special events, etc. According to staff, on a weekly basis the each room offers between 55 and 60 weekday prime time hours plus 18 weekend prime time hours. Municipal records indicate between 75% and 85% of available prime time hours are booked or otherwise utilized.
- Community program space in the Parkinson Recreation Centre is very well patronized and highly popular with a wide range of users.
- The Kelowna Family Y has been recently renovated and is in excellent physical condition. The Capital News Centre is 9 years old and is therefore in the first 1/5 its anticipated life cycle. Both facilities are sound and should be capable of physically serving the community for the foreseeable future. However, neither facility offers a consequential number of community program rooms beyond the space allocated to or otherwise used by the normal clientele of each operation. Therefore it is unlikely the Family Y or CNC would meaningfully contribute to serving the program or rental requirements of the broader community.
- Information provided by staff indicates that the Parkinson Recreation Centre is in need of almost \$1M in urgent capital repairs and \$5M in remedial upgrades within the next 5 years. Not surprisingly for a 40 year old building, PRC has significant physical limitations including partial accessibility, sight line restrictions and traffic congestion issues as well as the need to sprinkler the entire building if future facility size increases at all.
- Partnered facilities and community halls that are designated as multi-age activity centres are valued by certain segments of the community. The program and service influence of these facilities should be considered when making decisions regarding future investments in community programming space.
- Kelowna is taking a proactive approach to dealing with the needs of current and future older adult populations by creating the relatively new concept of multi-age activity centres. These facilities are meant to respond to the shifting participation trends and changing expectations of an aging population.
- The addition of the 13,285 square foot multi-age activity component to the Parkinson Recreation Centre creates a more appealing environment and augments the reach of the facility compared to the former Water Street Activity Centre. It would be advisable to explore opportunities to duplicate this scenario in other locations – i.e. multi-age activity centre on the same site as other community sport or recreation facilities, configured in a campus setting.

- Kelowna currently utilizes an integrated service delivery approach through which programs and activities appealing to older adults are incorporated into the program schedules of community recreation facilities. For example, PRC's program mix appeals to all age groups and interests. This approach is clearly "on trend" because older adults are no longer as interested in segmented programming but rather prefer to be included in general service areas.
- The Rutland and Okanagan Mission Centres inventories of programs and services are primarily organized by the seniors groups and societies that call these facilities home.


Needs Assessment

Currently, the City offers a total of over 52,500 square feet of indoor community program space representing a provision ratio of .45 square feet of space for each Kelowna resident. Reported room utilization is between 75% and 85% of prime time available hours indicating a program trend that is approaching maximum capacity. Additionally, staff report that the most popular hours (weekday evenings) are highly sought after by many individuals, groups and associations.

The space provided by the City's designated multi-active age activity centres - that have a focus on older adults - represent a provision ratio of 1.14 square feet of space for each Kelowna resident over the age of 65 years. If this space was exclusively dedicated for seniors, it would represent an extremely generous provision ratio – as most communities strive for between 0.5 square feet and 0.7 square feet of dedicated seniors space. However, these centres are multi-purpose attracting users from all age cohorts and therefore a higher provision ratio is warranted.

If Kelowna was to maintain its current provision level of community program space, the amount of additional square footage that would be required is equivalent to rises in both the general population and growth in the number of older adults - resulting in the need for substantially more space over the time period of this study.


Space Requirements to Maintain Current Supply Level



Suggested Provision Standard

Given that the existing amount of program space is utilized to almost full capacity, we suggest a provision standard of .5 square feet of general community program space for each City resident – an increase of 10% about the current provision level. In keeping with the City’s direction of an integrated delivery model offering older adult oriented programs and services in multi-use centres, we suggest that a portion (or sub-set) of the overall program space be designated as multi-age activity centres based on 1 sq. ft. of space for each resident over the age of 65 yrs.

Projected Community Program Space Needed to Meet Suggested Provision Levels



Consideration

If future older adult requirements can be accommodated by Kelowna's integrated program delivery model – i.e. in multi-purpose community recreation facilities – the suggested provision level for multi-age activity centres could be reduced. Furthermore, we suggest that Kelowna rationalize major capital investments in partnered facilities (possibly using the FCI method) and that any future facility decisions be scrutinized using the partnership framework included in the preliminary draft report.

Need for Indoor Turf Fields

There are currently two indoor turf fields located at Capital News Centre (CNC) that are servicing the needs of a wide variety of sport participants. The fields are consistent with the size of an NHL ice surface (185' X 85') and are surrounded by "rink" boards. The City decided on the "boarded configuration" after consulting with user groups during CNC's pre-construction phase. Since CNC was constructed in 2003, the development of indoor turf fields has evolved to the extent that most new facilities are either full or half sized soccer fields with no boards, frequently under air supported dome structures - examples include Vernon, Kamloops and several lower mainland communities. This open configuration is conducive to many types of program alternatives and is especially applicable to year round soccer training and development. A large, open indoor turf field facility is not currently available in Kelowna.

As discussed earlier, the CNC complex is managed and operated by RG Properties. The management contract stipulates that the City controls and is able to allocate indoor field time to user groups between 6:00 AM and 8:00 PM weekdays and 6:00 AM to 5:00 PM on weekends. Groups utilizing City control hours rent field time at the preferable municipal rental rates. Almost all of the prime time City controlled hours are fully utilized during the winter season and staff report that there is insufficient available time to meet the needs of several community sport groups.

RG Properties programs the fields between 8:00 PM and midnight weekdays and 5:00 PM to midnight on weekends. These hours are either rented to community groups at market rates or utilized to accommodate soccer leagues organized by the facility manager. According to staff, all of RG's hours are used to full capacity during the winter months.

The City's field allocation process places highest priority on meeting the needs of local not-for-profit groups serving children and youth. Minor soccer is the predominant field user with other sport groups receiving limited hours.

The Central Okanagan Youth Soccer Association (COYSA) is the largest soccer club in the district with a registration of over 5,000 children and youth in the summer (outdoor) program. According to staff, registrants in the Association's outdoor program reside in Kelowna, West Kelowna and Lake Country. There are additional (yet smaller) soccer organizations (e.g.

Kelowna United) and other field user groups (e.g. football and baseball) that also utilize sports fields in the summer months and to the extent that the indoor City controlled hours are available, patronize the CNC indoor fields in the winter. Staff report continued and escalating requests for additional indoor winter field time from these groups.

According to Association representatives, the number of City controlled winter turf field hours that are allocated to COYSA limits the organization's indoor soccer registration to 1,000 participants. The Association reports that participation in the indoor program could double if sufficient time was available (2,000 registrants). Additionally, City staff suggest that there is significant pent up demand for field time by other local sport groups including rugby, lacrosse and Ultimate Frisbee. In the absence of City hours, many un-served groups use school gymnasias or rent field time from RG Properties at market rates.

While user groups are most desirous of prime time field hours, City staff endeavour to expand utilization into the less desirable non-prime times. For example, a drop-in lunchtime soccer program is filled to capacity - with a waiting list. Additionally, three schools offer academically accredited programs on the turf fields, which currently occupy 6 day time hours. Municipal staff suggest that the success of this initiative could be the basis for expanding day time field use by encouraging other schools to offer similar programs.

Trends in Soccer

- Soccer underwent enormous growth in the '90s when it replaced baseball and hockey as the most popular team sport among Canada's youth. Although participation growth rates have been more modest over the past decade, registrations have remained at impressive levels. Today, more Canadian children between 5 and 14 years are registered in soccer programs or play on teams than any other sport in the country.
- It is generally accepted that there is a direct correlation between the number of outdoor soccer players in a jurisdiction and the propensity of indoor play. In 2011, there were over 100,000 U18 registered soccer players in BC and almost 21,000 registered adult players. The popularity of adult soccer is on the rise as more active adults take up the sport and as the most active adults continue to play soccer to an older age.
- Although the torrid growth of the outdoor game has recently waned, growth in indoor play is rising where appropriate facilities are available. The demand for indoor facilities has been driven by soccer's continued appeal plus an increased emphasis on year-round training and competition. While only a segment of the overall soccer market play indoors, more players are looking for year round soccer opportunities – a trend that is elevating registrations in indoor programs. According to the Canadian Soccer Association, over the past two years the ratio of outdoor to indoor soccer players is about 3.5 to 1. The proportionate number of indoor players is different than was the case ten years ago when the outdoor to indoor ratio was 7 to 1. The number of

registered indoor players has continued to rise even as year over year registrations in outdoor soccer have leveled off or declined.

Trends in Indoor Turf Field Use

- As is the case in Kelowna, soccer organizations are the predominant users of most indoor turf facilities during the winter season. On average, soccer groups use 80% or more of available field time. Normally, indoor soccer programs include a combination of House League and Rep team games and practices as well as training camps and tournaments.
- Other typical field users include football, baseball, field lacrosse, Ultimate Frisbee, cricket, rugby and field hockey. The amount of field time required by any one of these groups is generally dependent upon the strength of the local organization that governs the sport in the jurisdiction.
- Most sport groups – including soccer organizations - prefer an open field configuration (as opposed to within boards) on a field approximately 100' by 200'. From a capital and operating perspective, the open field configuration it is more versatile, less expensive to build and easier to maintain.
- Indoor turf fields can be accommodated in permanent buildings or under seasonal air supported dome structures. There are capital and operating differences (and benefits) of each of these options. Development decisions are normally based upon an evaluation of local circumstances such as the availability of an appropriate site, the amount of available capital funding, partnership opportunities as well as preferences of local user groups.
- As discussed in the previous sections, there are normally nuances and operating differences between private and public sector indoor turf facility managers. Private operators tend to rent fields at rates that are market sensitive and organize leagues and other programs to maximize revenue production. Municipal operators generally rent field time at more modest rental rates (normally governed by municipal pricing policies) to user groups that provide their own programming and leagues. This is an important distinction because community sport groups (especially soccer organizations) frequently depend on the net income produced by leagues and other programming to financially support the affairs of the association – including the provision of introductory programs or registration fee assistance initiatives.

Needs Analysis


Based on Canadian Soccer Association participation data, about a third of outdoor soccer participants can reasonably be expected to play indoors. Therefore, of the 5,000 children and youth that currently play outdoor soccer in the COYSA summer program, 1,500 would be potential indoor players. While there are youth players registered with other soccer groups, detailed registration data is unavailable and their relative contribution to indoor field demand has not been included in our analysis. Therefore, indoor players arising from COYSA should be considered as the minimum number of likely youth soccer participants.

On average, an indoor soccer program requires 1 hour per week of field time for each 10 to 12 program participants. Appendix D provides a detailed explanation of the participant based demand calculation technique that supports this participant metric. Assuming that the field demand of the City's soccer users is in the middle of this range, there is current need for 140 hours of field time per week to serve the anticipated number of youth indoor players.

Provincial averages suggest that about 2% of Kelowna's adult population play outdoor soccer – of which about 50% would play indoors. Based on the City's current adult population (20 to 64 years of age) it is therefore reasonable to expect there to be about 606 potential adult potential indoor soccer players. Using the preceding demand calculation metric of 1 hour of field time per week per 11 program participants, the existing adult soccer population would require 56 hours of field time per week.

Normally, indoor turf facilities cater to a variety of sport groups that typically use approximately 20% of the total available weekly hours. Staff report that a variety of Kelowna based sport groups are in constant search adequate indoor turf time, which supports the assumption that about one in five available indoor turf hours could be utilized for non soccer activities. This would increase the total demand calculation for an additional 39 hours per week.


Number of Required Indoor Turf Field Hours/Week



Based on the City's current operating profile at the CNC facility, on average, each soccer field provides 72 prime time hours per week – M-F 4:00 PM – 12:00 AM & S-S 7:00 AM to midnight. However, not all of these hours are suitable for children and youth because late evening times conflict with youth participation preferences and therefore are generally reserved for adult groups. Based on this assumption, a single field provides 54 prime time hours per week that are suitable for children/youth where as adults are potential users of the entire 72 weekly of prime time hours.

In view of the foregoing, there is current demand for 2.6 fields to meet indoor youth soccer requirements and .8 fields to serve adult soccer players. There is also the need for and an additional .7 fields to meet the needs of other sport organizations.

Number of Required Indoor Turf Fields



Suggested Provision Standard

Given the preceding calculations and the fact that the two existing fields at CNC are virtually used to full capacity, we suggest a provision standard of one indoor turf field for every 30,000 City residents. Applying this standard would result in the addition of two indoor turf fields to the City's current inventory. As illustrated above, a total of four fields should be sufficient to accommodate demand caused by population growth for the time period covered by this study.

Additionally, we suggest that the City continually monitor the amount of unmet demand, particularly field needs arising from adult soccer players. In the event that additional available field time increases the proportion of adults who play soccer, it may be necessary to re-examine the number of required fields, with a view to increasing the standard utilizing the participant based demand calculation technique.

Need for Fitness Facilities

The City currently operates a fitness centre at the Parkinson Recreation Centre and facilitates the delivery of fitness services through its relationship with the Kelowna Family Y at the Rutland YMCA facility and H2O Adventure and Fitness Centre. Additionally, there is a fitness centre located in the CNC.

The vision statement for recreation, parks and cultural services commits to ensuring that Kelowna is a place where people pursue active, creative, connected and healthy lifestyles. The delivery of fitness services is entirely consistent with this vision. It is therefore reasonable that the City should maintain its role of ensuring that residents have access to appropriate fitness, wellness and related services. This may mean that the City becomes the direct service provider by operating a fitness centre – as is the case at PRC. Or, circumstances may suggest that a facilitation role is more appropriate if an appropriate alternative is available.

The following sections provide an overview of aspects of the fitness industry that should be taken into account in determining which role is most suitable in future facility developments.

The Canadian Fitness Industry

Over the past four decades, the Canadian fitness industry has grown, matured and advanced well beyond the wildest expectations of its early pioneers. The small, cluttered and dimly lit gyms of the 60s have evolved into today's magnificently designed, elegantly appointed and seriously equipped fitness facilities – whether they be commercial clubs, public community centres or amenities to hotels, condominiums, hospitals or universities. Moreover, the industry has advanced to the extent that fitness professionals are beginning to be considered important and respected wellness service providers that contribute to the spectrum of services required by a fulsome public health care system.

Beginning in the mid eighties, fitness and related industries blossomed into a significant force that helped to shape certain aspects of our cultural and lifestyle norms. Fitness, health and racquet clubs became places where people not only shared their interest in sport and exercise, but also where they gathered for social purposes. In the mid nineties healthy living emerged as an important theme that would help to underpin many initiatives undertaken by public and private sector fitness and health service providers. By the mid two thousands the words fitness and exercise were routinely replaced by terms like regular physical activity, healthy weights and proper nutrition which are now known to be important prerequisites of healthy living. And the industry has not evolved in isolation. It has forged alliances and facilitated advancements in a variety of fields including the development of medical and health promotion strategies. For example, Ken Cooper's research - at the Dallas Aerobics Center - has been used as the foundation for many cardiac intervention programs employed by physicians throughout North America.

The industry in Canada is made up of a wide variety of service providers in a number of different sectors - large publicly traded chain operations, small single unit health clubs, fitness facilities as part of not-for-profit or charitable organizations, municipal fitness centres, hospital wellness centres, condominium and hotel fitness facilities – and the list continues to grow. But, there is one key success factor that is common to all operators regardless of sector – their ability to provide health, fitness, lifestyle, wellness, nutrition or related services that are consistent with the needs and expectations of their clientele. And, if the industry can be

characterized by one constant, it is its never ending pursuit of new strategies, services and methods to effectively adapt to individual and societal changes.

Pertinent Industry Data

The International Health, Racquet and Sportsclub Association (IHRSA) is a non-profit trade organization serving the world wide health, recreation and fitness industry. IHRSA is the leading source of industry specific information in terms of operating profiles, market considerations, penetration rates and other important data germane to the success or failure of a fitness operation.

IHRSA's research is relevant to sport, fitness and wellness facilities in the private, not-for-profit and public sectors. Furthermore, combining IHRSA's data with information available through the Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Institute and Statistics Canada's Canadian Health Survey illustrates the necessary ingredients for a successful fitness venture regardless of the sector within which it operates.

Fitness Membership Trends

For the first half of the past decade, the fitness industry experienced impressive growth. From 2001 to the early 2004, average year over year membership levels increased by an average of approximately 7% per year. Even during the recession of 2001/02, the industry experienced average membership growth of about 5%.


Over the past six or seven years however, growth has been sporadic or non-existent. In 2005/06, the industry had no membership growth despite a very robust economy. In 2007, total memberships across the industry declined by approximately 3% - the first net decline in fitness memberships since the early eighties. Importantly, this downward trend in membership levels began before the 2008/09 economic crisis. However, membership growth rebounded in 2008 and 2010, with 2009 being another flat year.

Fitness industry experts suggest that fitness and related wellness activities will continue to be services that are valued and pursued by traditional and new groups of clients to the extent that the industry can expect continued growth in the future. However, there may be "membership and participant turbulence" on a year to year basis caused by economic factors, competitive pressures or new trends that unexpectedly influence consumer buying patterns.

Gender and Age Factors

Although there have been year over variances in the number of men and women fitness participants, the gender based proportion of facility patronage has remained relatively constant for most of the past decade.

Chart Eight: Proportionate Gender Profile of Fitness Patrons




Source: IHRSA/American Sports Data Health Club Trend Report

While the proportion of members or facility users between genders is about equal, women tend to participate in group exercise and aqua-fit programs most often, while men frequent weight training and aerobic equipment areas on a self-scheduled basis.

In 2010, 88% of all members of organized recreation, leisure, wellness and fitness facilities were purchased by adults over 18 years of age. While the number of younger members is growing in some organizations (such as YMCAs), most frequently “junior members” are enrolled by their parents who participate at the same facility. According to IHRSA, contrary to popular stereotypes that portray many health and leisure operations as catering to the young and ultra fit, nearly 60% of all North American members are now over the age of 35. This is particularly important in the operation of municipal facilities that generally cater to an older clientele compared to centres operated by the private sector.

Chart Nine: Fitness Centre Patronage by Age Cohort



Source: IHRSA/American Sports Data Health Club Trend Report

Members in the 55+ age group grew more than any other segment between 2006 and 2009 before leveling off in 2010. Importantly, the 55+ age group patronized their facility more frequently than any other cohort with an average usage profile of about 100 days per year. The largest age cohort - consumers between the ages of 18 and 54 - typically used facilities about 90 days a year (on average 1.75 times per week).

There will be continued growth in the number of older fitness members which will be a product of demographic changes in the general population rather than “physical activity converts” arising from this age cohort. However the aging trend is important because these consumers have different lifestyle and fitness goals and varied life cycle needs that will affect facility and program offerings for years to come. According to a study undertaken by George Washington University, common preferences of older recreation facility consumers include the following.

- The availability of personal instruction
- Optional group or individual activities
- Safe and clean environment
- Friendly atmosphere
- Convenient and accessible location
- Affordability⁴

Not surprisingly, marketing techniques and efforts to retain customers in this age category must be sensitive to their preferences and desires. For example, incentives and rewards such as


⁴ IHRSA/George Washington University – Older Adult’s Evaluation of Facilities, Spring 2008.

raffles and complimentary merchandise are seldom of interest to this group, which suggests that older adults are most driven by intrinsic motivation such as becoming stronger and more fit so they can remain independent and healthy.

Financial Factors

Profiling information of individuals who choose to become members of organized fitness centres indicates that they are generally well educated and financially secure. Interestingly, there is very little difference in the level of education and household income of members connected to public, not-for-profit or private facilities. (Note: individuals who take advantage of fee assistance programs at organizations are not included in income profiling data).

Chart Ten: Income of Fitness Consumers



Source: IHRSA/American Sports Data Health Club Trend Report

Penetration Rate

The Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute (CFLRI) estimates approximately 15% of the Canadian population are members of public, commercial and not-for-profit recreation, fitness and sports centres. This penetration rate has remained constant for the past 10 years. Supporting CFLRI's calculation, IHRSA's research estimated that in 2010, 16% of the Canadian population was a member of a parks and recreation centre, hospital fitness centre, YM/YWCA, college and university centre, or a commercial club. Applying this penetration rate to the residential populations within the trade areas of a facility helps to determine the total number of potential members available to the organization.

According to the American Sports Data trend report, certain lifestyle segments have higher penetration rates than others.

Table Two: Penetration Rates by Lifestyle Segments

<i>Lifestyle Segment</i>	<i>Penetration Rate</i>
Age 25 to 44 years with household income of \$100K +	35.2%
Household income of \$150K	33.1%
Advanced university degree	32.1%
Single (not married) with income of \$75K	29.5%
Lives in large metro area and income over \$100K	28.5%
Two income couple, no kids and under age 45	28.3%

Source: IHRSA/American Sports Data Health Club Trend Report

Clearly, life status, education, income and the geographical location of an individual's residence can dramatically influence his or her propensity to join a fitness facility.

Market Share

Potential members of fitness centres may choose to patronize commercial, not-for-profit or public sector facilities. Their choice will typically be dictated by three factors:

- convenience;
- facilities and services consistent with their needs; and
- perceived value of the centre's offerings.

Over the past decade, operating profiles, prices, facilities and programs provided by fitness centres have become reasonably in-line with each other, regardless of the sector within which they operate. Certainly the market continues to be segmented by price and quality, but each sector has its high, middle and low-end providers. Therefore, consumers are less apt to select a facility because of its sector – as was the case years ago – and more inclined to patronize a centre that meets the criteria described above. For this reason, market share between sectors varies from year to year as consumers migrate from one type of facility to another.

In 2010, The JF Group completed a self funded research study that examined municipal fitness centre operations in Southern Ontario. This first-of-its-kind study produced a number of useful benchmarks such as municipal fitness centre provision standards and participant capture rates sub-tabulated by community size. The participant capture rate (which expresses the number of fitness members and program participants as a percentage of population) for municipal fitness centres that participated in the study ranged from a low of 1.5% to a high of 4.1%. Pertinent to this study, fitness centres in smaller communities captured the highest proportion of the available fitness clientele – likely because fewer private sector competitors choose to locate in jurisdictions with smaller populations.

Operating a Public Fitness Facility

Municipal fitness operations compete for the same pool of potential members as are pursued by commercial clubs and N-F-P or charitable fitness facilities. However, most public fitness facilities are somewhat disadvantaged in this competition because of systemic or political influences that are specific to municipal fitness operations.

Municipal systems occasionally limit fitness facilities' ability to be aggressive in marketing and promotional efforts to attract and retain members. Political sensitivities at times result in real or implied restrictions on the amount of advertising and the type of promotion that public centres can undertake. This could be caused by concerns of "not wanting to be seen as competing with private clubs" or may be simply a matter of not being comfortable with marketing concepts that are outside of normal municipal practices.

Additionally, municipal fitness centres are often unable to remain up-to-date with cardiovascular or strength training equipment trends because of capital funding restrictions or the need to plan capital purchases in sync with municipal budget cycles.

In combination, these limitations frequently cause public fitness centres to be less nimble and market responsive than their private sector counterparts.

Government Responses to the Inactivity Crisis

As mentioned in the trends section, Canada is facing a national health care crisis caused by a combination of physical inactivity and poor eating decisions within most populations across the country. The combined effect of these unhealthy lifestyle choices has resulted in a dramatic rise in the number of obese Canadians. While historically these conditions were restricted to adults, it is now becoming increasingly apparent that young Canadians are not active enough to sustain adequate health levels over their lifetime. In fact, there is an increasing body of evidence that suggests that for the first time in history, the current younger generation will not have the longevity or quality of life enjoyed by their parents.

Federal, provincial and municipal governments are responding to this issue by developing strategies to increase awareness about opportunities for greater participation in regular physical activity as well as to encourage individuals to make wise food choices. The notion of being physically active and maintaining healthy weights through proper diet have become mainstream – popular media is now on board and are utilizing the concepts in advertising, news stories and lifestyle advice columns.

Many municipalities believe that the time is right to become part of the growing movement that has been initiated by senior levels of government as well as organizations with a mandate to promote and/or support healthy living behaviours. This may include simple strategies like aligning existing initiatives to encourage residents to eat more healthily, be physical active or to

participate in sports endeavours. It might also include strategic decisions to remain or become a direct provider of physical activity and healthy living services that may also involve the provision of fitness services offered in a publicly operated fitness centre.

Considerations for Kelowna

Clearly, the City has a role in ensuring that Kelowna residents have access to appropriate fitness facilities and wellness services. In fact, the vision and commitment statements articulated earlier in this report suggests that healthy living and wellness principles should be key drivers of decisions regarding future services and facilities provided by the City.

Fitness services are very synergistic with programming alternatives associated with other types of recreation facilities such as pools and gymnasium. It is therefore appropriate that any new community centre development or reconfiguration project consider the inclusion of facility components that are conducive to the delivery of fitness and wellness services. The size, scope and nature of these facilities will be dependent on local market conditions (i.e. the number of likely fitness consumers in the centre's catchment area), the competitive environment and the availability of other service providers, demographic characteristics of the trade area and the other facilities that are to be included in the new development.

To decide between the self delivery or partnership model, the City should employ the standardized partner selection process presented in Appendix E.

Recommended Facility Standards and Need Implications

The following table presents the recommended provision standards and the associated need implications in each category of sport and recreation facility. The standards reflect the data tabulation and needs analysis discussed in the previous sections.

<i>Facility</i>	<i>Current Circumstance</i>	<i>Recommended Standard</i>	<i>Needed in 2011 - 2015</i>	<i>Needed by 2031</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Aquatics	Capacity for 961,550 swims per capita	Capacity for 5.5 to 6 annual swims per capita	Current capacity able to handle demand	At 6 annual swims per capita and projected population, existing capacity can absorb demand for required 942,379 swims	No new pools required unless one of the existing facilities is taken out of service after 2021
Arenas	6 ice surfaces including Prospera	1 ice surface per 4,000 children/youth under 19 yrs.	one new pad for a total of 7 pads to meet current demand	another new pad for a total of 8 pads to meet demand related to population growth	If Memorial is decommissioned, 1 additional sheet will be needed to meet the standard
Community Program Space	Total of 52,580 sq. ft. throughout the inventory	.5 sq. ft. per capita including 1 sq. ft. of active age centre space for every person 65 yrs.	Total of an 11,800 sq. ft. added to current inventory – of which 10,400 sq. ft. is general program space (note: space in the new PAC is included in the above total).	Total 26,200 sq. ft. added to current inventory – of which 11,600 sq. ft. is general program space and 14,600 sq. ft. multi-age space	Additional space may be required is community rooms in partnered facilities are taken out of service
Indoor Turf Fields	2 indoor turf fields at CNC	1 indoor sport field per 30,000 City residents	2 new fields for a total of 4 fields to meet current demand	No additional fields required	Monitor adult soccer participation to ensure standard remains appropriate over time

Chronological Sport and Recreation Facility Requirements

The following table provides a timeline of the need for each facility type based on the accumulated demand for the facility resultant from population growth.

Facility Type	Current Inventory	New Units Required to Meet Standard				Total at End of Study Period
		2011 - 2015	2016 - 2020	2021 - 2025	2026 - 2031	
Aquatics	5 tanks	0	0	0	0	5 tanks
Arenas	5 ice surfaces (Excluding Prospera)	2 ice surfaces	0	0	2 ice surfaces (assume Memorial Decommissioned)	8 ice surfaces plus Prospera
Multi-Age Activity Space	25,506 sq. ft.	1,445 sq. ft.	3,514 sq. ft.	4,027 sq. ft.	5,716 sq. ft.	40,208 sq. ft.
General Program Space	27,074 sq. ft.	10,398 sq. ft.	1,576 sq. ft.	770 sq. ft.	0	39,818 sq. ft.
Total Community Program Space	52,580 sq. ft.	11,844 sq. ft.	5,089 sq. ft.	4,796 sq. ft.	5,716 sq. ft.	80,025 sq. ft.
Indoor Turf Fields	2 – 100' X 200' fields	2 fields	0	0	0	4 fields

Notes:

- (1) The number of units or volume of space requirements should be read as incremental to the previous time period – e.g. 5 ice pads today plus two new pads required in 2011 – 2015 period for a total of seven. Two additional pads required in 2026 – 2031 which is one new pad to meet growth related demand and one pad to replace Memorial that will be taken out of service. Therefore at the end of 2031 the total City ice inventory would be 8 pads plus Prospera.

Facility Provision Priorities and Strategies

Guiding Principles Development Considerations

The planning process involved the development of five overarching principles that would guide decision making for future facility developments.

- Build vibrant and creative communities by promoting the healthy development of Kelowna residents
- Ensure that appropriate levels of recreation services are supported by the availability of necessary infrastructure
- Invest strategically in the development, redevelopment or repurposing of public recreation facilities
- Meet the needs of our growing and diverse community and ensure physical and financial accessibility
- Exercise fiscal accountability

Additionally, new project or facility redevelopments would take into account several key considerations that support the guiding principles.

- Clustering a number of required facility components in a single multi-purposed setting is a much superior provision strategy than developing single purpose facilities on standalone sites. Clustering can be achieved by developing large multi-purpose complexes or by co-locating facilities on a recreation campus.
- As in most communities, Kelowna's recreation consumers will be served by a combination of large "precinct or district" serving facilities and smaller more locally focused facilities.
- There are four natural districts in Kelowna – the Mission Recreation Park, the Downtown Recreation Park, the Rutland Recreation Campus and Glenmore.
- Kelowna's community halls and partnered facilities are generally well used and currently serve the needs of sport or community groups. Furthermore, these facilities are used by segments of the general public that are renting general programming spaces for a variety of purposes. A certain number of these facilities will require capital investment to extend their useful lives.

Provision Priorities

This project was to create a responsible and cost effective development strategy that ensures the City's recreation and sport facility portfolio is able to meet current and future community needs. The strategic development of required facilities was to conform to the vision, commitments, principles and strategic imperatives that guide the delivery Kelowna's parks, recreation and cultural services.

The following table utilizes abbreviated versions of the commitment and principle statements as criterion to test the manner in which each of the three major facility additions would contribute to the City's sport and recreation system while complying with community priorities that have emerged from various previous studies and plans.

<i>Conforming with Community Priorities</i>			
<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Add Ice Surfaces</i>	<i>Add Community Space</i>	<i>Add Indoor Turf Fields</i>
Meet the needs and aspirations of the community	Meets current and future needs	Meets current and future needs	Meets current and future needs
Ensure that options are accessible for all	Increased time improves accessibility	Creates flex space – usable by a wide variety of groups	Increased time improves accessibility
Develop and manage facilities/spaces promoting community well being	Expands activity opportunities	Multi-use spaces add to community cohesion and social connectedness	Expands activity opportunities
Provide leadership in planning, financing, and operating the City's infrastructure	Adding ice pads allows multi- pad configuration which is more efficient and economical	Flexible spaces are more versatile and are more efficient than space dedicated to one use	Domes need less capital \$ and are more operationally flexible
Reinvesting in existing infrastructure should be a higher priority than building new infrastructure		Redeveloping PRC would satisfy a proportion of the space needs and rectify existing physical issues	

<i>Conforming with Community Priorities (con't)</i>			
<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Add Ice Surfaces</i>	<i>Add Community Space</i>	<i>Add Indoor Turf Fields</i>
Changes to an existing facility's design or footprint should only be considered if renovations result in "increased benefits" to a community	Addition of ice would increase # of current users and expand opportunities for new participants	Community spaces appeal to the broadest number and variety of users	Addition of fields would increase # of current users and expand opportunities for new participants
Where facilities are deemed as being no longer consistent with needs, consider re-purposing facilities	Repurposing Memorial later in the development cycle would be advisable	Redeveloped PRC could include multi-purpose spaces fit for active and passive pursuits	
Attempt to co-locate programs and services at community recreation centres	All additions would be in co-located configuration	Redeveloped PRC would offer many facility alternatives in a co-located configuration	All additions would be in co-located configuration

Based on the preceding comparison of community priority compliance, we suggest that the three major facility additions be addressed in the following priority:

- (a) redevelop Parkinson Recreation Centre;
- (b) add 2 ice pads; and
- (c) add turf fields – under a dome sooner, in building later.

It is also noteworthy that if PRC is replaced with a redeveloped building that is comparable in size to the existing 51,739 sq. ft. structure plus an additional double gymnasium, the new City-wide community program space requirements would be satisfied – assuming that all community halls and partnered facilities remain within the inventory.

Implementation Strategies

This study has identified and examined opportunities to modify the City's inventory of sport and recreational infrastructure through adding and repurposing facilities. These adjustments are necessitated by a combination of: an inability of the current supply to meet existing demand, particularly in the areas of community space and ice; anticipated increased demand caused by population growth; and certain facilities being close to or beyond their functional life span. While a physical integrity inspection was not within the scope of the study, it may be also

necessary to remove additional certain older facilities from active service due to the need for significant capital upgrades or physical enhancements to rectify under-utilization issues. This is particularly the case in the area of community halls and partnered facilities.

The following implementation strategies focus on the three major facility types that have emerged from our research and analysis. Nothing in this report should keep the City from undertaking other necessary or desired upgrades (e.g. upgrades, capital repairs, accessibility improvements, LEED energy efficiency upgrades, etc.) to viable facilities as identified through building condition assessments, annual business plans, or similar processes. As mentioned previously, before any facility is developed, removed from service or undergoes substantial expansion, the City may require that public consultation and/or a feasibility study be completed to engage users in identifying specific needs, impacts, and design implications.

Recommended Strategies – Redevelop Parkinson Recreation Centre

	<i>Initiative</i>	<i>Timing</i>
1	Develop a functional program for the redeveloped facility including replacement components of the existing PRC, plus additional community space responding to the deficiency of space identified by this study. Consider the addition of a double gymnasium – which should be considered to as part of the provision standard for community space.	
2	Develop a space program and conceptual plans for the redeveloped PRC.	
3	Create a preliminary capital budget for the redeveloped PRC.	
4	Undertake the development of a feasibility study/business plan demonstrating the operational and financial implications of the redeveloped PRC.	
5	Develop a capital funding strategy including funds necessary to subsidize the start up phase of operations.	
6	Seek Council approval to undertake the project.	
7	Begin the normal municipal facility development process.	
8	As part of future additions or redevelopment projects undertaken at the Mission Recreation Park, include additional community program space to broaden the Park's recreational appeal.	
9	As community halls are taken out of service, add or increase the amount community programming spaces at multi-purpose facilities.	

Recommended Strategies – Arena System

	<i>Initiative</i>	<i>Timing</i>
1	Undertake negotiations with RG Properties to investigate opportunities to improve accessibility and ice use certainty of the City's hours at Prospera Place - also focus on maximizing the ice use effectiveness and user group flexibility at CNC.	
2	If negotiations with RG are successful in lifting the current restrictions, add a new single pad to either Rutland Twin Rinks of CNC.	
3	If limited use of Prospera persists either build a new two pad complex in Glenmore or add two new pads to either Rutland or CNC.	
4	Develop conceptual plans for the addition of for the selected option arising from initiatives 2 or 3.	
5	Create a preliminary capital budget for the selected option of initiative two.	
6	Undertake the development of a feasibility study/business plan demonstrating the operational and financial implications of the additional ice services.	
7	Develop a capital funding strategy including funds necessary to subsidize the start up phase of operations.	
8	Seek Council approval to undertake the project.	
9	Begin the normal municipal facility development process.	
10	Study opportunities for re-purposing Memorial Arena for another recreational use.	
11	Repeat initiatives 4 through 9 for two ice surfaces as part of a new or existing multi-purpose recreation facility.	

Recommended Strategies – Indoor Turf Fields

	<i>Initiative</i>	<i>Timing</i>
1	Examine opportunities to add a new air supported dome structure to an existing or new artificial turf field. Preferably, the field should be adjacent to existing support amenities such as change rooms, washroom facilities, storage space, etc.	
2	If a suitable location can be found for the dome structure, develop conceptual plans for bubbled indoor turf facility.	
3	If a suitable location for dome structure is unavailable, examine opportunities to add to turf fields either as an addition to CNC or part of a multi-use complex elsewhere in the City	
4	Create a preliminary capital budget for the selected option of initiatives 2 and 3.	
4	Undertake the development of a feasibility study/business plan demonstrating the operational and financial implications of the additional turf fields services.	
5	Develop a capital funding strategy including funds necessary to subsidize the start up phase of operations.	
6	Seek Council approval to undertake the project.	
7	Begin the normal municipal facility development process.	

Appendices

Appendix A


Community Profile

Population and Traditional Growth Patterns

Understanding the City's community profile represents an important step towards determining current and future sports and recreation facility requirements. Furthermore, tracking the demographic characteristics of Kelowna residents – age, income, ethnicity, etc. – helps to identify factors that will influence facility use patterns and ultimately affect the need for facilities in years to come.

The most recent census information (released in 2011) reports Kelowna's population at 117,312 residents. This represents a 9.6% growth in population since the 2006 census. While the five year growth pattern is below the 11.2% population increase between 2001 and 2006, the City continues to outpace growth profiles of both British Columbia and Canada as a whole.

Five Year Population Growth Patterns, Kelowna-BC-Canada, 2001 to 2011



Source: Statistics Canada, Community Profiles, 2011

Age Profile

Age plays an important role in determining the types of activities that are pursued by residents. For example, children and teens are more likely to participate in organized active sports such as hockey or soccer than adults and older adults. Conversely, older adults prefer more moderate activities such as personal fitness endeavours or making use of trail systems.


In 2011, the City's median age was 43 years which was older than the provincial median of 41.9 years. The population of Kelowna is aging, as demonstrated by the fact that the City's median age was 40.6 years in 2001. This aging of the population is a common demographic trend that is being observed in BC and across Canada. Kelowna's population can therefore be expected to continue to age throughout the foreseeable future.

Comparison of Population by Age Cohort – Kelowna and British Columbia (2011)

Age Cohort	Kelowna		British Columbia	
	Population	%	Population	%
0 - 4	5,340	4.6%	219,665	5.0%
5 - 19	18,610	15.9%	732,860	16.7%
20 - 39	30,110	25.7%	1,125,460	25.6%
40 - 64	40,840	34.8%	1,633,350	37.1%
65+	22,415	19.1%	688,715	15.7%

Source: Statistics Canada, Community Profiles, 2011

Proportion of Population by Age Cohorts, Kelowna and BC



Source: Statistics Canada, Community Profiles, 2006

In 2006, children between the ages of 0 – 19 years constituted 20.5% of Kelowna’s population which was slightly below (1.2%) the proportionate size of the same age group province-wide. In addition, Kelowna had a smaller percentage of its population within the 20 - 64 age cohort (60.5%) compared to British Columbia as a whole (62.7%). Conversely, residents in the 65+ age cohort represented a considerably larger population of Kelowna population (19.1%) than the proportionate population of older adults in the province (15.7%).

Population Forecasts

Kelowna’s sport and recreation infrastructure needs will be largely dependent on the number of City residents that each type of facility will be required to serve over the next two decades. To set the stage for the study’s facility needs assessment phase, the consultants used the City’s Official Community Plan’s population growth and demographic information to determine the number and characteristics of Kelowna residents over the next 20 years. The plan estimates that the City’s five year growth rates by using short term rates based on census trends and longer-term rates based on British Columbia’s statistical projections, adjusted to local trends.

The Community Plan projects that Kelowna’s population will climb by an annual rate of 1.51% to 2031. The Plan’s population estimates were based upon a 2010 population of 118,657 individuals. However, the City’s current population – as per the 2011 census data - is 117,312. To normalize the population projections, we have applied the Community Plan’s annual escalation rate to Kelowna’s actual 2010 population.

By 2020, Kelowna’s residential population is projected to grow by approximately 21,166 individuals which is an increase of about 18% above current levels. This pace of growth is expected to gradually recede between 2021 and 2031.

City of Kelowna Growth Rates and Population Forecasts

	<i>Annual Growth Rate</i>	<i>New Population</i>	<i>Population - End of Period</i>
2011-2115	1.88%	11,027	128,339
2016-2020	1.58%	10,139	138,478
2021-2025	1.38%	9,555	148,033
2026-2031	1.22%	9,030	157,063

Source: Adapted from the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan

The proportion of residents in each age cohort will continue to change over the next 20 years. The number of older adults - over 65 years – will steadily rise as a proportion of the City’s population. And while the absolute number of youth - under the age of 19 - will continue to grow, this younger age cohort will increasingly become a smaller proportion of the population. The number of residents in both the 20 - 39 and the 40 – 64 age groups is expected to


significantly climb over the next two decades although the proportion of the population represented by these cohorts will remain relatively stable.

City of Kelowna Projected Proportion of Population by Age Cohort

	<i>Total Population</i>	<i>Age Cohorts</i>			
		<i>0-19</i>	<i>20-39</i>	<i>40-64</i>	<i>65+</i>
2011-2115	128,339	20.0%	25.1%	33.9%	21.0%
2016-2020	138,478	19.0%	25.5%	33.5%	22.0%
2021-2025	148,033	18.2%	25.8%	32.7%	23.3%
2026-2031	157,063	16.6%	26.3%	31.5%	25.6%

Source: Adapted from the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan

City of Kelowna Projected Population by Age Cohort



Source: Adapted from the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan

Significant population growth coupled with a general aging of the City's residential population must be taken into account while developing Kelowna's sport and recreation infrastructure provision strategy. As mentioned earlier, the aging of the City's population will inevitably result in the need for changes in the type of facilities – or adjustments to the customary design of traditional facilities – to meet the needs of a larger number of older adults. Other facility development and operational pressures will be dependent on the localized nature of the recreation trends discussed in the next chapter.

While changes in the City's demographic make-up is an important consideration, it is noteworthy that the absolute numbers of residents in each age cohort will continue to rise over time implying that demand that is simply dependent on population growth will steadily climb during the years the facility provision strategy is to cover. Consequently, in the future the City may be required to provide more traditional facilities to accommodate growth related needs while also developing different types of facilities to meet the requirements of larger numbers of new users.

In combination, these circumstances could create pressures on the City to: (1) provide more of its traditional facilities to meet the needs resulting from growth in numbers of current and usual users; (2) develop new or innovative types of facilities to accommodate changing participation patterns linked to demographic changes and the emergence of un-conventional users; and (3) adapt programs or scheduling practices in both traditional and new types of facilities in response to evolving participation profiles and lifestyle changes (e.g. increasing reluctance of users to participate in activities scheduled in later time slots on weeknights).

Residential Distribution

Kelowna's Official Community Plan projects approximately 20,000 new housing units will be developed within the City's growth areas by 2031. The new housing will occur as a function of both development and redevelopment in some areas and new development and initiatives in growth areas. More than half of the development is anticipated to be multiple units while 43% growth will be in single or two-unit housing.


Distribution of new residential locations will be considered as part of the sport and recreation infrastructure provision strategy. While certain facility types serve a city-wide or regional market, others are neighborhood oriented facilities that offer "walk to" recreational opportunities. Consequently, the strategy will recognize the different markets and use patterns served by each variety of facility within the City's sport and recreation inventory and the associated jurisdictional supply implications.

Income, Education and Ethnicity

Research suggests that income and education are variables which tend to influence participation in physical and social pursuits. Generally speaking, the higher the level of income and education, the more likely a person is to participate in sport, recreation and leisure activities.

Information from the 2006 census indicates that Kelowna's median family income for couples with children was \$82,266 which is 4% above the provincial median of \$79,509. There is only modest deviation between the comparable income levels for couples without children and all private households suggesting that it would seem reasonable to expect that participation patterns demonstrated by Kelowna residents would conform to average rates.

City of Kelowna Household Income - 2006



Source: Statistics Canada, Community Profiles, 2006

The level of education attained can also impact participation rates, with many studies correlating increased participation levels with higher degrees of education. A review of the 2006 census data revealed that a lower proportion of residents of Kelowna have attained a University certificate, diploma or degree compared to the provincial rates but a slightly higher proportion of citizens have earned a college, CEGEP, or other non-university certificate or diploma. This data suggests that the City may expect similar participation rates as compared to the provincial average.

Education Attainment – City of Kelowna and British Columbia - 2006

Level Attained	% of Population Over 15 Years	
	Kelowna	British Columbia
No certificate, diploma or degree	20%	20%
High school certificate or equivalent	30%	28%
Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma	13%	11%
College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma	19%	17%
University certificate or diploma below the bachelor level	5%	5%
University certificate, diploma or degree	14%	19%

Source: Statistics Canada, Community Profiles, 2006

The 2006 census reported that 15% of Kelowna's residents are immigrants, which is about half of the provincial measure of 27%. Additionally, the vast majority of immigrants (73%) have lived in the City for over two decades (before 1991) whereas there are relatively more recent immigrants province-wide (46%). Visible minorities make up less than half of the City's immigrant population with about half arriving from China and South Asia.

Although the City is currently more homogenous than the province as a whole, national immigration trends suggest that the level of ethnic diversification may increase; which is a trend that could have an escalating local influence over time. As such, non-traditional programming options should be considered, as well as an increased sensitivity to a variety of leisure preferences and expectations.

Appendix B

Trends That Influence Development and Operational Strategies

Kelowna's facility provision strategy takes into account the influence of current or emerging trends that are affecting recreation participation, leisure patterns and the delivery of parks, recreation and cultural services across British Columbia and generally throughout Canada. This section summarizes relevant trends.

Demographic Influences

- Older adults are (and will progressively become) far more active than seniors of the past. Primarily driven by the influence of the baby boom generation, older adults will strive to remain physically active and will expect high quality facilities and services that meet their needs. This group will increasingly participate in less strenuous physical endeavours as they grow older and will likely become more engaged in cultural activities.
- It is a nationally recognized that in the future, children (0 -19 years) will represent a smaller proportion of the general population. The influence of this trend on Kelowna's future demographic profile is reflected in the previous section. This could mean a reduction in sport participation or other programs that traditionally target children. Nationally, provincially and locally, the reduction in children will be offset by an increasing number of older adults.
- Compared to national or provincial norms, Kelowna has a relatively modest immigrant population. However, national immigration policies may cause this situation to change in the future. It may therefore be advisable for the City's facility provision strategy to take into account ethno-cultural preferences for social and group gatherings in both indoor and outdoor settings. This could take the form of shelters and washrooms provided in parks to accommodate outdoor social events or large indoor open spaces for community celebrations.

Recreation Infrastructure Trends and Influences

- For a variety of reasons, recreation departments have been less than successful in cataloging the life-cycle stage and status of major building systems and equipment. This has led to a national recreation infrastructure repair and retrofit crisis that threatens the long-term viability of the sector's current inventory of assets. At a local level, some jurisdictions are now developing sophisticated systems through which major facility components can be addressed on a systematic and strategically planned repair cycle. This type of plan allows for certain repair and replacement items to be accelerated or delayed depending in on their immediacy, cost or significance.

- Regardless of a facility's type or age, it will require a life cycle management plan to help guide the owner's repair and replacement decisions and to eliminate the possibility of unforeseen service interruptions caused by building failures. While the plan should take into account normal building and repairs strategies, it should also be flexible enough to respond to the municipality's fiscal circumstance, potential funding from senior levels of government, external or emerging partnership opportunities, etc.
- Recreation and sport facilities – especially arenas and pools – consume significant amounts of fossil fuels which is both costly and environmentally insensitive. Where possible, major building retrofits and new facility developments should consider the inclusion of energy efficiency improvements such as solar panels, heat recovery systems, enhanced insulation, motion sensitive lighting, etc. Where financially possible, it is advisable to employ green building techniques and to conform to LEED principles. Furthermore, low use water devices, water re-capture systems and supplementary energy sources (geothermal) are successful in reducing the environmental footprint of recreation facilities.
- Inventive recreation departments are becoming more involved with planning decisions that would encourage active transportation systems through the community. There is general recognition that active transportation is a major contributor to individual and community health benefits and the implementation of relatively simple infrastructure enhancements can stimulate increased uptake in non vehicular transportation – such as adequate, secure and convenient bicycle parking. Also, connectivity of walkways and bicycle paths to adjoining communities or to major recreation facilities within a community can help to encourage people to move from place to place under their own power.
- One-stop, multi-purpose facilities as destinations offering a number of recreation, sport and social services is the preferred development model when compared to the more traditional and smaller single purpose facility approach. Furthermore, large facilities are becoming multi generational by offering a variety of elements, services and programs oriented for youth, adults and older adults. It is likely that in the future, municipalities will not develop dedicated seniors or youth centres but rather multi-purpose facilities that provide more variety and that are more cost effective to operate.
- Outdoor facilities are also becoming more diverse. For example, clustering a variety of facilities targeting the younger age cohorts can result in attractive youth activity parks that appeal to numerous interests – elements might include a skateboard facility, sport courts, general social areas, etc.

Recreation and Sport Participation

- Recreation and sport participants – especially the adult and older adult markets – are increasingly interested in spontaneous, unstructured activities. In the future, there will be increased demand for recreation and sport drop-in opportunities offered in the most desirable times of the day – typically prime time hours.
- Participants who are interested in structured and scheduled programs are looking for programs requiring shorter time commitments that comply with their personal agendas – such as signing up for a one or two day cooking class rather than a 10-week culinary course.
- Outdoor endeavours are becoming increasingly popular. Across all spectrums, recreation participants appreciate opportunities to participate in outdoor physical activity as these types of pursuits contribute to an individual's personal health while enjoying the environment. It is therefore likely that the development of greenways and bike paths systems will be priorities for community open space systems.
- In some jurisdictions, recreation departments are expanding traditional program inventories to include experiential activities such as adventure programs, cross-cultural or inclusive endeavours and intensive learning opportunities. While this trend may have some influence on the number of required facilities, it could impact the manner in which certain facilities are designed – including climbing walls and other adventure elements - as well as how some features are scheduled or programmed.
- Schedule constraints and lack of time are two of the most significant barriers to participation in sport, recreation or cultural activities. As a result, it is becoming more difficult to encourage people to attend one-off or stand-alone social events. In response, creative programmers are offering post-activity socials to capitalize upon the presence of individuals already participating in a sport event or recreation program that becomes even more attractive with the addition of a social element.
- Volunteer recruitment and retention is becoming more difficult as the schedules of potential volunteers become more constrained. Furthermore, having a positive volunteer experience is extremely important in nurturing this important aspect of public recreation service delivery system. Certain municipalities are revamping volunteer strategies so that they involve time-limited commitments on short-term projects (sometimes referred to as episodic volunteering) that volunteers can undertake within their own communities. This is especially relevant to retired baby boomers and local youth that are two key target audiences for volunteerism.
- Partnerships between recreation departments and the health sector are helping to maximize the contribution of sport and recreation programs on the physical, social,

emotional and mental health of Canadians. In certain jurisdictions, programs offered in the community rather than in health care or clinical settings have led to more obvious and ongoing improvements in healthy lifestyle behaviours.

- Less than half of Canadian children are active enough for optimal health and adults are becoming increasingly overweight – many experts suggest the situation is bordering on epidemic. A reduction in physical activity programs in schools has exacerbated an overall decline in activity caused by too much “screen time”. Progressive communities are creating partnerships between schools, parks and recreation departments, community sport organizations and parent groups to address this issue. This situation could also have facility implications such as joint use of school agreements or the development of facilities with several users under one roof.

Environmental Implications

- Elevated awareness of the need for environmental protection could be leveraged into recreation programs that result in a host of community benefits. In certain jurisdictions, park cleanup initiatives, natural habitat restoration, outdoor facility rehabilitation and ongoing environmental stewardship initiatives have proven to be successful additions to traditional recreation programs. Furthermore, environmental consciousness can be used as rationale for the implementation of new conservation initiatives and result in adjustments to traditional operating practices – including wise use of water programs or adjusted hours of operations for outdoor aquatic facilities.
- Increased interest in nature and the environment presents interesting programmatic opportunities such as the introduction of interpretive signage on pathways, environmental education programs and information sessions or educational programs offered by departments.
- Energy conservation should be a key priority in renovations of older rinks and pools. Often referred to as “energy hogs”, the amount of energy consumed by these types of facilities can be markedly reduced by the introduction of up-to-date energy efficiency technologies.
- The impact of climate change will likely affect parks designs and the choice of flora and fauna in the future. Furthermore, in certain jurisdictions departments are pre-planning responses to major storms and weather disturbances that will likely be more frequent and severe as the impacts of climate change become more pronounced.

Appendix C

Setting Facility Standards Specific to Kelowna

There are no national or provincial guidelines to assist municipalities establish appropriate provision standards for recreation, sport and parks facilities. Accordingly, most BC municipalities that undertake facility review processes or that are contemplating the addition of new facilities, base their future plans on local rules of thumb and historical precedents. Additionally, they normally compare their own circumstances to provision levels of other similarly sized communities – with provision levels presented on a per capita basis. Although this approach is not very precise, the technique allows recreation planners to rationalize that their response to apparent facility deficits are within reasonable ranges of generally accepted industry practices.

Over the last decade or so, many communities have taken a more systematic market driven approach to determine future recreation and sport facility needs. This requires taking into account much more than just the number of facilities per capita. The market driven technique considers: the community's characteristics; how local demographics influence the frequency and manner in which a facility is used; and predicts the short and long term use capacity of the facility in question. This method of analysis is more precise and the associated facility provision response has more long-term relevance because the estimated need is based on the unique and specific characteristics of the community – not just historical practices and what is happening in neighbouring jurisdictions. The Kelowna Infrastructure Planning initiative includes a "like-community comparison" technique to test proposed future facility provision levels with other similar municipalities in BC.

At its initial planning meeting, the Project Committee discussed a complementary process to establish realistic and defensible facility provision standards that are based on the unique characteristics of the City over the next 20 years. The Committee agreed that the traditional population based method to determine future needs should be supported by a more progressive market driven assessment and planning technique. The consultant suggested employing a systematic process utilizing sequential steps to determine specific standards that are based upon market variables pertinent to Kelowna. The consultant's suggested model is described below.

Determine Existing Capacity

The first step is to calculate the capacity for each facility type currently included in the Kelowna facility inventory. In the case of some facilities, capacity can be measured by the number of visits the facility can reasonably accommodate annually. In other facility types, capacity is measured by the number of hours that can be reasonably used annually. In a few unique cases, it is the number of events or number of members that can be reasonably accommodated annually.

Measure Use Compared To Capacity

Staff will provide use data for each of Kelowna's facilities for the years 2000, 2005 and 2010 – the years have been chosen to correspond with census data results. These use numbers will then be compared to each facility's capacity (by facility type) to determine year over year use ratios – how much of the available capacity was used in each sample year. This information also indicated whether usage has increased or decreased over the past 10 years and will illustrate any possible connections to population or demographic changes between each period.

Project Tentative Future Need

Using the information gathered from steps one and two, we will be able to calculate over/under utilization by facility type – thereby indicating over or under supply in each facility category. Then, with the benefit of population projections, we can estimate facility requirements into the future. This step will also involve determining differences between “actual needs” and “wants” or “nice to haves”. To sort out these differences, the Committee and advisors will be required to distinguish necessary infrastructure from discretionary items.

Adjust to Reflect Demographics

Using demographic information, the facility requirements calculated in the previous step will be adjusted to accommodate more or less use by specific age groups if the proportion of the population in those age groups is expected to increase or decrease over time.

Adjust to Reflect Future Trends

Using national, provincial and local recreation and sport participation trends, the facility requirement calculations will be further adjusted to reflect the manner in which users are expected to behave in the future. This step will also involve applying local knowledge and use profiles obtained through city statistics and stakeholder interviews that reflect unique situations and circumstances that do not necessarily conform to national or provincial trends.

Possibly Adjust to Municipal Strategic Planning Policy

The infrastructure provision strategy should ensure that the sports, recreation and parks system is able to adapt to societal changes, emerging trends and economic realities over the next 20 years. This is entirely consistent with the City's intention to ensure that it remains resilient and more adaptable in the future. Therefore, this step would examine relevant City policy (such as the Official Community Plan, the Draft Long Term Capital Plan, the Sustainable Infrastructure Policy, relevant Parks, Recreation and Culture Plans, etc.) and ensure that the strategies, standards and priorities are consistent with all pertinent City policies and directions.

Possibly Adjust to Reflect Economic Reasonableness

This step is a reasonableness test that evaluates the financial implications of certain needs calculations and a benefit/cost analysis of potentially creating a temporary over-supply situation. For example, building a swimming pool today to meet needs 5 years out or basing a pool provision decision on less than accurate needs data is a great deal more costly than over building a tennis court. In addition, this step will involve balancing the priority of creating new facilities to meet growth related requirements against the prospect of implementing strategies involving necessary asset repair or replacement as the City's aging facilities reach the end of their useful life. It will be important to establish the parameters of this balance to ensure that the new facility developments are not negatively impacted by the financial limitations related to replacement of major items that could reduce the municipality's funding capacity.

Possibly Adjust to Reflect Geographic Location

Access to recreation facilities by all modes of transportation can be an important consideration in calculating facility usage and determining future needs. For example, on a stand-alone basis, the use ratio for a particular facility type might not indicate the need for additional capacity. However, the situation could be masked by the fact that a proportion of the City's potential users may simply not be able to access the site because of transportation or other logistical issues.

Determine Final Standard

In combination, the preceding steps will indicate an appropriate standard of supply to meet Kelowna's unique local needs. Once the standard has been established, we will assess the physical condition, quality and life-cycle status of each existing facility to determine if apparent capacity deficits are best filled with more facility space or improvements to existing spaces.

Recommend How Best to Implement the Standard

The final step in the process is to determine at what point in the future it makes sense to add or improve facilities. The process will be applied to each facility type in Kelowna's inventory as well as to additional facilities that are required to meet emerging needs or trend-related demand indicated by research or raised during consultation activities.

Appendix D

Participant Based Demand Calculation Technique

The participant per field-hour metric is an analytical technique that, in concert with other methods, helps to determine soccer field demand. The technique takes into account the manner in which soccer individuals and groups utilize field time. The metric is a blended approach that assumes the field will be occupied for a variety of different purposes including games, practices, tournaments and special training programs. The metric is calculated by a factor of the number of participants served by each type of use. For example, each hour used for a soccer game involves two teams (a total of 20 to 28 players) whereas each hour of practice time involves one team (10 to 14 players). Therefore, each game hour serves twice as many participants as each practice hour – assuming the practice is held on a full field.

The metric also considers the different use profiles of rep (competitive) and recreational teams that are generally involved with most soccer organizations. Rep teams sometimes play as many as two games per week plus one practice. Recreational or house league teams often play only a single game per week with no practices. Consequently, participants on rep teams require far more field time to satisfy their program requirements than do individuals who play on house league teams.

The metric is a function of the volume of registrants in an organization expressed as the number of players that can be comfortably served by one hour of field time. Based on our experience in numerous communities across Canada, the average metric is 10 to 12 players per field hour.

To demonstrate the calculation, assume that 500 players are registered in an organization, half of which play on 14-person rep teams and half play on 14-person house league teams. There would therefore be 18 teams competing in each skill level (250 registrants divided by 14 players on each team). The rep teams play 2 games per week and practice once requiring three hours of field time per week – 2 of which are shared with the teams against which they play. The house league teams require only one hour of field time on which to play their single weekly game against an opposing team. Collectively, 27 hours would be used for games (18 for rep teams and 9 for house league) and 18 hours for rep practices. Consequently, all of the organization's scheduled program requirements would be served by 45 hours of field time leading to a participant per field hour metric of 11 (500 players divided by 45 hours). The metric would be lowered in direct proportion to the number of hours utilized for special training programs and tournaments to serve the organization's registrants. Usage by sports other than soccer would also add to the demand for rental time.

As mentioned above, players involved on rep teams consume relatively more field time per player than recreational participants. For example, if all of the above assumptions remain constant yet the proportion of rep players represent 70% of the organisation's activities the

basic metric would fall to 10 players per hour. However, rep team regularly engage in more special events and tournaments so it is not unusual to observe metrics of 8.5 or 9 players per hour for organizations that are very competitively oriented. Conversely, if the preceding example remains constant except that recreational activity represents 70% of the programming, the metric would rise to 12 players per hour – likely with less pressure from special events and tournaments.

This participant per field hour technique is normally used in combination with other demand calculation and analysis methods including estimates of need based on historical rentals patterns, user group program plans, projected participant growth due to population increases, etc.

Appendix E

A Standardized Partnership Framework

Background

Kelowna's strategic objectives include a provision that states that the City is committed to "identify and develop partnerships that provide efficient and quality services". This commitment is likely to come into play as the City establishes its strategic direction and plans for its long term capital investments in sport, recreation and cultural facilities. As in most communities across Canada, the City will be challenged to meet the funding requirements associated with developing new facilities while maintaining its existing stock of assets in good repair.

We understand that the City deals with partnership opportunities on a case by case basis. Through discussion with the Project Committee, it was determined that a standardized partnership framework may be helpful in streamlining future processes and bringing clarity to the rationale for entering into agreements with outside interests.

The following sections outline a framework that many communities have used to guide partnership discussions. It contains samples of principles, rationale and a decision-making logic model that can help municipal officials examine the merits and drawbacks of relationships between a municipality and external groups. This sample framework is offered as an approach that Kelowna might determine is an appropriate standardized process. However, it will be necessary for the municipality to adjust certain aspects of the example presented here so that the City's final framework complies with Kelowna's organizational philosophy, administrative processes and context for relationships with external entities.

Alternative Facility Provision Approaches

Over the past decade, sport, recreation and culture service providers have dealt with unprecedented rates of change. Shifts in community socio-demographics, consumer lifestyle changes, new and elevated expectations related to facilities and services, intensified calls for increased accountability plus significant financial pressures have caused municipal officials to search for new facility provision strategies. Recognizing that doing more for less is daunting, most municipalities are looking at relationships with outside entities as a means to advance their effectiveness in responding to change and to deliver solutions that would otherwise not be possible.

Kelowna is no stranger to the concept of developing productive relationships with outside groups. Prospera Place, The Kelowna Family YMCA, the H2O Centre as well as the City's relationships with volunteer groups and not-for-profit agencies (Boys & Girls Club) are clear

evidence that Kelowna has a long history of successfully cultivating and securing productive partnerships.

In most jurisdictions, relationships with external groups are seen as one of several development methods for capital projects. And, as the number of partnership examples grows, it is becoming increasingly clear to municipal officials that partnerships involve nuances not normally found in traditional facility provision models. Consequently, many jurisdictions ensure that ALL potential partnerships undergo rigorous scrutiny through the application of a consistent screening mechanism before the project proceeds. Municipalities that have adopted a standardized partnership framework to assess and secure suitable partners have found that the process: (1) informs municipal officials of the merits and drawbacks of each partnership candidate and project; and (2) clarifies the expectations and obligations of organizations looking to partner with the municipality.

Should Kelowna adopt a standardized partnership approach, it would establish a framework that sets out a uniform, fair, equitable and transparent process for creating future relationship with outside entities.

Benefits of Partnerships

Several common elements are inherent with successful municipal partnerships.

- The venture will be mutually beneficial to each partner.
- There are clearly defined roles and responsibilities.
- There is a performance evaluation methodology.
- There is a shared commitment to serve the needs of those affected by the venture.
- There is a commitment to improve.
- There is fair and honest recognition of each partner's contribution.

Kelowna's relationships with outside groups are only practical if reasonable benefits accrue to the City and that the relationship supports municipal priorities as defined by its strategic priorities. To this end, it is the City's responsibility to thoroughly analyze each relationship prior to pursuing or approving the partnership. Generally, this analysis would involve an assessment of the relationship's ability to provide one or more of the following beneficial outcomes.

- create or maintain public infrastructure at less cost than a traditional municipal capital project;
- create public buy-in to the project by engaging the community;
- improve service levels through strategic investment in the development of municipal assets;
- gain access to techniques and resources that are beyond municipal capabilities by collaborating with others to seek innovative solutions;

- reduce development by exercising fiscal accountability;
- introduce a higher degree of productivity to an development process;
- provide greater access to new sources of capital; and
- leverage experience that is outside the normal municipal approach.

It would seem that several of the preceding benefits have been achieved through the City's existing partnerships. The go-forward challenge is to build on the City's past partnership successes to achieve its strategic objectives. This will require the application of a logical decision-making mechanism to determine the most appropriate course of action when considering future relationships with outside interests.

The following Standardized Partnership Framework sets out a process to evaluate potential relationships with outside entities for capital projects. The application of the Framework should take into account the preceding information pertaining to the benefits, drawbacks, success factors and beneficial outcomes of successful partnerships.

Standardized Partnership Framework for Capital Projects

As defined by City's vision, mission, values and strategic priorities, does the City have a role to play in providing the facility?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Is there demonstrated current and long-term community need for the facility?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Is the project identified as a priority in any previous municipal planning studies or supplementary analysis?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
If the project is not included the City's 10 year capital plan, would an evaluation process provide sufficient evidence that the City should consider adding the project to the capital plan?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Is the proposed project on City land, and if not, is the City able to control the long-term future of the project?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Does the project result in financial and liability risks that can be reasonably mitigated?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Does the potential partner have adequate capacity and resources to support its involvement in the project?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Consider providing facility using a traditional municipal approach.
Can the City enter into the partnership relationship on a sole source basis?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Issue a Request For Proposal or other procurement process specified by purchasing policies.
Are the proponent's terms, conditions, standards of delivery and responsibilities acceptable?	Yes	No ▼ ►	Negotiate mutually acceptable standards of responsibility with the outside entity.
Establish a relationship with an outside entity to undertake the project and adopt a mutually agreeable monitoring system.			

It is important that the City develop a relationship with a compatible and willing partner that shares the municipality's long-term vision for the project. Not only should the partner bring the necessary skills and resources to fulfill its project obligations, but also demonstrate a public service attitude. Recognizing that all partnerships should be developed in response to the specific circumstances of a particular project, potential partners should understand the City's intent to develop an open and honest relationship where each partner's contribution is important to the success of the project. Furthermore, the partner must be dedicated to the pursuit of the mutually accepted objectives and endorse a philosophy of constant improvement. Finally, there must be shared commitment to provide quality sport, recreation, cultural or leisure services in an environment consistent with the expectations of Kelowna residents.

Unsolicited Proposals

A uniform approach to evaluating potential partnerships is especially applicable when dealing with unsolicited proposal. In most municipalities across Canada, officials are often presented with ideas or partnership propositions from public, not-for-profit or private groups. Frequently, these proposals suggest that the partner would provide funding or offer some other contribution (like land, etc.) to help underwrite the cost of the project and/or to facilitate a more rapid development cycle. Sometimes, these projects bypass the usual capital planning and approval process and are simply inserted in the municipality's development plans - essentially parachuting it into the capital plan which sometimes delays the development schedule of other projects already in the plan. The size and scope of these projects are widely variable. They may range from relatively small undertakings (such as building an equipment storage facility adjacent to an outdoor sports field) to complex development and operating arrangements like erecting and operating an air supported dome structure over a municipally owned soccer field. By adopting a pre-set evaluation system, Kelowna would:

- create a process that enables thoughtful responses to proponents;
- position the City to identify projects with merit;
- cull projects that should be avoided; and
- establish a transparent evaluation process that can be consistently applied to all propositions, regardless of the group from which the proposal is received.

A pre-established evaluation mechanism is invaluable in demonstrating that the City will seriously entertain propositions, so long as they are within pre-determined parameters and meet pre-set criteria. This is particularly helpful when partnerships are proposed by community organizations, or other groups with longstanding relationships with the municipality. Sometimes these groups feel that they should receive "preferential treatment" because of previous public service or close connections with elected officials. A well conceived, fair and transparent evaluation mechanism sets out the ground rules of partnering with the municipality and helps groups understand that they must conform to a standard process that applies to everybody. Furthermore the evaluation framework allows potential partners to see the City's

expectations for the arrangement and appreciate the municipality's perspective in determining the value and community benefits of the relationship.

Given that the number and complexity of unsolicited proposals is likely to increase in the future, it would be advisable for Kelowna to establish a staff team – a Technical Review Committee – that would be charged with the responsibility of analyzing and evaluating propositions. The Review Committee should be made up of individuals with various backgrounds and skill sets likely with representatives from all five City departments.

It should be understood that simply because a relationship is proposed by a potential partner, it is not reason enough to pursue the arrangement. The venture must first demonstrate compliance with municipal vision, mission, values and strategic priorities similar to the first question in the preceding Standardized Partnership Framework. At a minimum, the following criteria should be employed to determine the applicability of the proponent's proposition.

- The proposition conforms to the City's mandate, values and strategic directions.
- In cases where the relationship is on-going, confirmation that there is legal authority to undertake the relationship.
- The proposition responds to a demonstrated need or presents an attractive benefit to the municipality.
- There is clear community benefit and/or economic spin-offs for, or within the municipality.

Assuming that there appears to be no conflict between the proposed project and municipal vision, mission, values and strategic directions, the proposal should be reviewed for its merits and drawbacks. The Review Committee would test the proposal against pre-established criteria that would be customized to the project. At a minimum, the following criteria should be employed during this analysis.

- There is a business plan demonstrating the revenue/cost and operating advantages of the proposal, relative to other proposals or to the City's ability to deliver the facility, project or service. If the proposal involves some sort of operating relationship, this assessment would involve the comparison of the proponent's business plan to a municipal comparator representing a cost estimate if the City were to undertake the project on its own.
- There is value inherent in the proposal that would provide the municipality with enhanced levels of service.
- The proposal includes a risk analysis (financial, continuity of service, public relations, liability, etc.) that is acceptable to the City.
- The financial and operating risk or other obligations that are proposed to be absorbed by the City are acceptable and can be managed within the municipal 10-year capital plan or annual budget.

- The proponent is capable of demonstrating operating and technical qualifications and financial ability commensurate with the nature and scope of the project.
- The project is clear of any environmental concerns.
- The proposal includes a benefit analysis for both the municipality and the proponent that is acceptable to the City.

Proponents will frequently contend that their propositions are unique and should qualify as a sole source opportunity. It will be important for the City to thoroughly investigate the validity of these claims prior to proceeding.

The issues that the City should consider regarding the proprietary nature of a proposed project when examining the merits of unsolicited proposals are listed below.

- magnitude of the project (dollar value and complexity);
- availability of other proponents with similar capacities or expertise;
- uniqueness of the idea or concept;
- trade mark and copy right issues;
- exclusivity issues;
- length of the proposed term of the relationship; and
- nature of the proposed agreement.

If the concept meets the proprietary test, the City would be free to negotiate with the proponent on a sole source basis. However, if the concept fails to meet the test, the City could elect to either pursue the project utilizing its normal Request for Proposal process or abandon the project altogether.

If the City is satisfied that the concept conforms with municipal values, is worthy of further attention and it is deemed proprietary such that a sole source negotiation would be appropriate, the proponent should provide detailed information, which at a minimum should include the following:

- a comprehensive needs analysis;
- a comprehensive business plan;
- the proponent's financial capacity;
- a clear demonstration of the sustainability of the project;
- in the case of a not-for-profit group, the organization's secession plan;
- detailed evidence of community benefit; and
- a full risk analysis.

The following Unsolicited Proposal Review Framework provides a simple and uniform method of evaluate partnership submissions to the City from private sector entities, community groups

or other external organizations. This Review Framework represents an additional evaluation mechanism in the City's standardized approach to developing successful partnerships.

Unsolicited Proposal Review Framework

The City receives an unsolicited proposal from an outside entity.



Proposal is forwarded to the Technical Review Committee for analysis.

Does the proposal fulfil the pre-established criteria related to compliance with municipal values, public-service philosophies and community focus?

Yes No
▼ ►

Reject the proposal.

Does the proposed project meet a demonstrated need and provide community benefit consistent with municipal priorities?

Yes No
▼ ►

Reject the proposal.

Does the proposed project fulfil the minimum requirements as set out by the pre-established criteria related to a business plan, risk assessment plan, value assessment, municipal financial and risk obligations, proponent's qualifications, etc.?

Yes No
▼ ►

Reject the proposal.

Does the proposed project or concept meet the proprietary test?

Yes No
▼ ►

Issue the City's customary Request for Proposal or reject the project.

Does the additional detailed information requested by the Review Committee meet the test of reasonableness and does the project seem viable?

Yes No
▼ ►

Reject the proposal.

Recommend the project to Council for its consideration.

Summary

A standardized approach to developing successful partnerships would normalize the evaluation of potential partners and help to position the municipality as “open for business”. In the absence of a standardized approach, roles, responsibilities, expectations, and relationship structures are often established in response to the characteristics of a particular project rather than what makes most sense for the municipality. Furthermore, knee-jerk decisions can cause difficulty in creating an equitable partnership that has the best chance for success. A standardized evaluation mechanism would protect the interest of potential partners while ensuring that the municipality does not enter into an arrangement before adequate due diligence has been undertaken. The Standardized Partnership Framework and the Unsolicited Proposal Review Framework combine to form a standardized approach to developing successful partnerships which should guide Kelowna’s future discussions with all potential partners.

Appendix F
City of Kelowna Tennis Strategy

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Context to this Study	1
The Study Process.....	1
Research Findings	3
Community Demographic Profile	3
National and Provincial Tennis Trends	3
Where Tennis is Played	5
Barriers to Playing Tennis	5
The Fun Factor	6
The Family Factor	6
Shrinking Prime Time Window	6
Convenience and Cost	7
Tennis Facilities, the Tennis Market and Recommendations.....	8
Kelowna’s Tennis Court Inventory.....	8
Tennis Court Availability in Other Communities	8
Municipal Court Capacity	10
Municipal Tennis Court Provision Recommendations	11
Indoor Courts.....	12
The Indoor Tennis Market	13
Indoor Tennis Court Recommendations	13
Summary of Study’s Recommendations	15

Appendices

- Appendix A – City of Kelowna Tennis Court Summary
- Appendix B - Tennis Court Provision Levels in Other BC Communities
- Appendix C – Tennis Court Locations in Kelowna

Introduction

Context to this Study

In March 2015, the City of Kelowna received a submission from Kelowna Futures Tennis, describing the group's interest in partnering with the City in the development of a new indoor/outdoor tennis facility. The comprehensive proposal describes the current national and provincial status of the tennis environment and presents information illustrating Kelowna's level of tennis facility provision compared to other similarly sized communities. The submission suggests that the City's level of tennis facility provision is resulting in missed opportunities to expand the level of recreational and competitive tennis that could be played within the municipality. Furthermore, it suggests that the City should consider increasing its level of service to include an indoor facility, so that tennis can be played year-round.

Although the submission is both thorough and well researched, City staff concluded that the provision of additional tennis facilities – whether they be indoor or outdoor courts – needs to be framed within the context of a broader tennis strategy. Therefore, staff undertook this tennis study to:

- estimate the current and future demand for tennis courts in Kelowna;
- determine the need for the development of new or reconfigured courts in response to the estimated demand;
- develop and recommend a tennis provision strategy to provide direction to future infrastructure planning; and
- if demand warranted, comment on the implications of the City participating in a project that would result in an indoor tennis facility in Kelowna.

The Study Process

The initial phase of the study involved research of the key issues that will influence tennis participation in the City including: current and future population and demographic projections; national, provincial and local tennis trends; local tennis participation rates; community programming and club activities; tournaments and other competitive tennis requirements; tennis facility inventory; and the needs of the local tennis community. Staff consulted with local tennis organizations and interested individuals during its deliberations. In doing so, staff considered information and input from local, provincial, and national tennis associations, Statistics Canada, the Kelowna Futures Tennis submission, tennis strategy reports previously prepared for other jurisdictions, examples of municipalities with public tennis courts covered by bubbles

and input from individuals knowledgeable about the sport. Information emerging from all sources was assembled and analyzed.

Preliminary research findings and conclusions were shared with representatives of Kelowna Futures Tennis for consideration and further input. Based on input, additional research and analysis was conducted in advance of the preparation of this draft report.

Research Findings

Community Demographic Profile

Kelowna's current population is approximately 122,000. Projected growth is expected to be 34% over the next ten years adding 42,000 new residents by 2025. By 2035, the City will be home to about 165,000 individuals. Population growth over the next 20 years is projected at 1.51% per year, which is higher than the 1.19% provincial average. Figure one illustrates the shifts in the anticipated proportion of the population in each of the four major age categories over the next 15 years.

Figure One: Projected Age Distribution

Yr/age	0 -19	20-39	40-64	65+
2006	21.8%	24.2%	34.55	19.5%
2010	20.0%	25.1%	33.9%	21.0%
2020	18.2%	25.8%	32.7%	23.3%
2030	16.6%	26.3%	31.5%	25.6%

The total number of residents in every age cohort will increase to the year 2030, while the proportion of total population will change over time. Interestingly, over twenty-five per cent (25%) of the city's total population will be 65 years of age or older by 2030. Indeed, the City's older adult cohort will grow significantly more than the provincial average (19.9% in 2014 to 25.6% in 2030).

Visible minorities in Kelowna make up 7.9% of the population, an increase of 4.5% since 2001. People from South Asia and China represent the most significant proportion of new Canadians residing in the City. This information is relevant to the study because tennis is a popular sport in both of these countries. It is therefore reasonable to expect that Kelowna residents from within this demographic group may utilize tennis facilities located in the City.

National and Provincial Tennis Trends

Staff's research into the national, provincial and local tennis trends has revealed the following:

- Tennis Canada reports that Canada boasted 6.5 million tennis players in 2014 representing a national participation ratio of approximately 18% - a tennis player is described as having played tennis once in the previous 12 months. Throughout Canada, participation in tennis has risen by 18.5% from 2008 to 2010 and by an additional 7% from 2012 to 2014.

- Tennis Canada defines a “regular” tennis player as someone who has played tennis three times in the preceding 12 months while a “frequent” player is someone who plays twice per month. Between 2012 and 2014 there was a 32% increase in more regular players and 13% more frequent players.
- Indicating the long-term health of the sport, there were approximately 600,000 children between the ages of six and eleven years who played tennis in 2014. Between 2012 and 2014, the proportion of the total tennis community represented by young players grew from 5% to 7%. Clearly, junior development programs and other national and provincial sport initiatives are having a positive effect on participation rates of younger Canadians.
- In Kelowna, an increase in the number of young tennis players can be attributed to programs such as Intro to Tennis, After School Programs, Little Aces, High School Leagues and recreational children’s programs delivered by City and Family “Y”. Approximately 1,000 youth under 18 years of age participated in one of these programs in 2014. The City of Vernon reports a similar trend in increasing youth tennis participation.
- Health and exercise benefits are the main reasons cited for playing tennis. Having fun is the most important reason for individuals between 12 and 24 years and socialization is increasingly important for 55+ cohort.
- In 2014, Ontario lead all regions in tennis participation (22%) followed closely by Quebec (17%) and BC (17%). In 2010, BC had proportionately more players than Ontario but since then, programmatic and demographic changes in Ontario seem to have increased tennis participation levels faster than in BC.
- It is important to note that large urban centres in all provinces are driving up provincial tennis participation rates. This is not only because of the sheer numbers of potential players located in urban areas but also the typical demographic makeup of these communities is conducive to proportionately more tennis players – usually including culturally diverse populations of newer Canadians who are more predisposed to tennis rather than hockey or other traditional sport pursuits. Germane to this study, 34% of all BC based tennis players live in Vancouver.
- A vast majority of tennis participation is for recreational purposes. It is therefore not surprising that the majority of tennis participants indicate relaxation and a desire to improve health and fitness levels as the leading motivators for taking up and continuing to play the sport.
- Although all age cohorts well represented within the tennis community, the fastest growing segment is the 18 to 24 age group. Similar to the demographic complexion of other “life-long” sports, tennis participants are generally getting older.

- Tennis has historically been played by the more affluent segments of the population. However, the recent growth in the number of younger players has somewhat normalized the income levels of tennis participants.
- Eighty percent of tennis players are considered “regular” participants (four times a year) while only two of every ten participants are “frequent” players (twice per month during the summer season). Not surprisingly, frequent players are the most likely candidates to become club members and almost all tennis enthusiasts who play indoors are also frequent players.

Where Tennis is Played

According to Tennis Canada, 77% of tennis enthusiasts in British Columbia report playing tennis in unorganized or unstructured environments. It is very likely these individuals are playing pickup games with friends and family rather than participating in leagues or tournament play. Eighty-five (85%) of all tennis participation takes place on public tennis courts or on school based facilities and most players report more frequently playing singles rather than doubles games. Approximately 20% of players indicate an affiliation with summer tennis clubs that utilize public courts, normally owned by municipalities.

There is a difference between the playing profile and location of play between children of tennis players and children of non tennis players. While children of tennis players generally play on public courts (like all other tennis participants), they are far more likely to have an affiliation with a summer tennis club or play in a year round tennis facility compared to the play pattern of children of non tennis players.

Slightly more than 10% of all tennis players report playing indoor tennis during the winter season.

Barriers to Playing Tennis

Competing leisure interests and a lack of personal leisure time are the most frequently mentioned impediments to greater levels of tennis participation. The inability to secure a partner of an equal skill level and a lack of convenient court time also inhibits play frequency. Cost seems to be less of an issue because most tennis is played in the summer time on public courts.

The Fun Factor

Having fun and keeping fit are the two most important motivators compelling tennis participants to take up and continue to play the sport. According to tennis associations and club operators alike, programming such as house leagues, round robins, and friendly group activities are critical to maintaining player interest by capitalizing upon the sport's enjoyable aspects and social interaction possibilities. Although a percentage of tennis participants are attracted to the competitive side of the game, the vast majority of players are interested in having fun, meeting people, and receiving the fitness benefits the sport provides.

The Family Factor

Tennis is usually played by more than one household member. In fact, tennis players are frequently introduced to the sport by a spouse or parent. Interestingly, juniors who play indoor tennis are almost always children of tennis players. Club operators indicate enrollment in programs targeting youth is always more successful if tennis playing parents encourage their children to participate. Furthermore, it seems tennis playing parents more easily justify the need to underwrite the costs for a child's court fees, memberships, and lessons.

Shrinking Prime Time Window

The ability to squeeze a tennis game into an increasingly busy schedule is a key determinant in the amount of tennis an individual will play. Lack of time caused by family and job pressures or other leisure commitments often makes it difficult to maintain a regiment of one or two games a week – hence the large proportion of players that report playing less frequently than they would like; as infrequently as 2 or 3 times a season. Complicating matters, lifestyles and social patterns have changed to the extent that tennis facilities, in both the public and private sectors, have been forced to redefine the traditional definition of primetime court time. Many community clubs have collapsed the schedules of times during which programs are delivered and private or commercial clubs charge non prime (lower) court fees on weekdays beginning at the 10:00 p.m. court time. Organizers and operators report a lack of interest in programs beginning after 7:00 p.m. during the week. Weekends also pose a challenge because of the magnitude of interests and activities occupying an individuals' time. The result of this situation is more tennis players vying for fewer (acceptable) prime time courts and pressure on tennis officials in all sectors to provide a balance between organized programs and open play.

Convenience and Cost

Lack of discretionary time is the most significant barrier to tennis participation. While time limitations vary between individuals, a combination of social, family, and work pressures, conflicting leisure priorities, and shifting lifestyle patterns cause players to be attracted to the most convenient tennis venue. Convenience factors include court availability and travel time.

Interestingly, although tennis players have higher than average household incomes, they are notoriously frugal. According to industry officials, players will patronize the least costly facility that provides an environment of acceptable quality. Cost factors include a combination of membership fees, court fees and program costs to pay for clinics or leagues. Quality issues are normally personal judgments most frequently related to basic tennis facilities like court surfaces, lighting, and temperature in an indoor facility. In an indoor environment, the availability of supplementary activities such as fitness centres, spas, shower/change rooms, restaurants, and lounges also factor into a player's facility choice decision. However, operators of both commercial and bubbled facilities suggest that while additional facilities and services are attractive to some, the majority of tennis players will gravitate to a facility offering convenient and inexpensive tennis.

Interestingly and a bit counterintuitive, operators of tennis bubbles report a large number of their members first play indoor tennis at commercial clubs. Given that program schedules and profiles of tennis bubbles often parallel those offered at commercial operations, price would appear to be the factor motivating player relocation decisions.

Based upon the input received during the research phase of this study, operators of tennis bubbles and commercial clubs as well as industry officials support the notion that tennis players will generally seek out and migrate to the most convenient and least costly tennis facility providing an environment of acceptable quality.

Tennis Facilities, the Tennis Market and Recommendations

Kelowna's Tennis Court Inventory

There are currently 26 municipal tennis courts distributed throughout Kelowna, with most courts located in neighbourhood parks. The distribution of small clusters of courts throughout the municipality is consistent with the City's community development and neighbourhood service delivery model that has been in place for many years. Also, many of the courts have been funded through agreements with developers that build residential communities which benefit from neighbourhood amenities that are attractive to potential home buyers.

Appendix A summarizes the tennis court locations, conditions and amenities available to Kelowna's tennis enthusiasts. Appendix B graphically illustrates the distribution of tennis courts throughout the City.

In addition to municipal courts, tennis players also have access to the following outdoor tennis facilities:

- 3 courts operated by Mission Tennis Club;
- 6 privately owned courts – Global, Kelowna GC and Gallagher's Canyon; and
- 5 school based courts.

Two of the privately owned courts and all of the school courts are considered to be in poor condition and less likely to be utilized by players other than beginners.

For the purposes of this tennis strategy, the inventory of publicly accessible facilities is considered to be 29 courts – the 26 municipal courts and 3 Mission Tennis Club courts.

It is noteworthy that the City invests approximately \$35,000 per year in tennis court maintenance and upgrades. Upgrades are undertaken annually based on the assessed condition of courts and prioritized based on a variety of factors.

Tennis Court Availability in Other Communities

Most municipalities throughout Canada provide public tennis courts as part of their recreation facility inventories. The number of courts provided in each jurisdiction is normally guided by a recreation services or facilities plan that balances the provision of a number of different facility types to ensure the community has access to a variety of sport, recreation and physical activity endeavours. Additionally, the number of tennis courts included within municipal inventories will be influenced by the design, operating profile and attributes of these important community facilities. For example, lighted tennis courts extend the hours of operation and the capacity of courts to meet


community needs. The availability of multi-purpose courts that can be used for a variety of activities – including tennis - will also have an impact on court provision standards. While these multi-use facilities are not ideal for competitive level tennis, they do serve as excellent breeding grounds for budding tennis players – especially children and youth.

The amount of casual tennis participation varies greatly by municipality and even from neighbourhood to neighbourhood within the same municipality. This can make it difficult to gauge how many courts are necessary to meet local demand or where tennis courts should be located. However, neighbourhood tennis courts are important community serving facilities because they offer opportunities for un-programmed play and casual usage, which encourages spontaneous physical activity and sport participation close to home. This provision approach also promotes family engagement that is one of the key factors in lifelong sport participation.

Although casual/no fee tennis courts are often the most preferred option to meet community needs, it is important to recognize the important role that the local or community tennis clubs play in promoting interest in the sport. Tennis clubs generally encourage participation in tennis by offering programs, lessons, tournaments, etc. and their members tend to be the most frequent players. Maintaining a strong membership base and promoting the appeal of the sport to a broad audience is important to the long-term health in the sport. By extension, a solid base of enthusiastic tennis players often leads to incremental increases in the use of neighbourhood courts. Therefore, in combination, no cost public court availability coupled with support for community clubs can lead to an active and robust community of tennis enthusiasts.

An examination of the number of publicly owned tennis courts within several BC municipalities illustrates differences in municipal tennis court provision levels.

Chart One: Comparative Municipal Tennis Court Provision Levels



The court per population variations are caused by a number of different factors including the demographic make-up of the communities, the strength of the local tennis organizations, physical characteristics of the court inventory (particularly the prevalence of lighted courts) and the availability of non municipal courts.

In view of the fact that over a third of BC based tennis players live in Vancouver, it is not surprising that North Vancouver would offer more courts than any other community in the comparative sample. It is likely that the healthy tennis court provision levels in Penticton, Vernon, West Kelowna and Lake Country are more a function of the relatively small populations within these jurisdictions rather than higher demand for courts from within their local communities.

Municipal Court Capacity

As demonstrated by the differing tennis court provision levels presented in the previous section, local circumstances and market demand for public tennis generally dictate the appropriate number courts that municipalities make available to their citizenry. To project an appropriate public tennis court provision level for Kelowna, we considered the following factors:

- 17% of BC's adult population play tennis at least once per summer season;
- 34% of all tennis players in the province reside in the Greater Vancouver Area meaning that the participation rate throughout the rest of BC is 14.3%;
- based on the above participation rate and the City's current population, in 2015 there are 14,680 adult tennis players residing in Kelowna; and
- 80% of this market are likely to play tennis four times per year (regular players) while 20% will play twice per month (frequent players).

These factors were employed in a formula to calculate the capacity of the City's 29 publicly accessible tennis courts. Other assumptions used in the calculations were:

- most tennis enthusiasts would prefer to play during 45 prime time weekly hours over the course of a seven month summer season;
- 25% of available court time will be utilized for programming such as junior clinics, individual lessons, league play, etc;
- half of play will be singles games with the other half being doubles games;

Based on the above factors and assumptions, the City's 29 publicly accessible tennis courts are able to accommodate slightly more than 90,000 player games per summer season. In view of the proportion of regular and frequent tennis players who reside in the City, it is estimated that there is local demand for approximately 88,000 player games per summer season. It is noteworthy that influences of inclement weather,

inferior court conditions or use restrictions (such as community club court reservation policies) could reduce the public tennis system’s capacity to serve local needs. On the other hand, a proportion of frequent players will play several times per week thereby increasing local demand.


A generally accepted tennis sector metric is that a single tennis court is generally capable of accommodating the needs of approximately 100 tennis players. Kelowna’s current provision level represents one court for every 101 frequent tennis players.

Municipal Tennis Court Provision Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in view of the foregoing information and calculations:

- maintain the current court provision standard of 1 outdoor, publically accessible tennis court to 4,180 population;
- working with the tennis community, continuously monitor Kelowna’s public tennis court capacity and local demand over the City’s growth period (to 2031);
- continue the City’s current practice of building courts using a neighbourhood distribution model, focusing on densely populated areas; and
- where possible, build new courts in clusters of 3 courts to facilitate sport development.

Chart Two: Court Provision Implications of Recommendations



If the City were to maintain its current level of tennis court provision, it would be required to develop four new public tennis courts over the next five years. By the end

of the planning cycle identified for the study, the City would provide a total of 42 publically accessible tennis courts to the community.

Indoor Courts

The desire for winter tennis opportunities has been advanced by Kelowna Futures Tennis as a mean for providing year round tennis play and programming. Winter tennis requires a covered and heated playing area which, in a municipal environment, commonly takes the form of a bubble or temporary structure installed over outdoor public tennis courts. Kelowna Futures Tennis' proposal expressed interest in a dome over courts that the group suggests could be erected over new courts developed by the City.

There are a number of benefits of providing a temporary dome or bubble as opposed to a conventional structure. A brief comparative summary of the merits and drawbacks of both facility options is presented in the following table.

Figure Two: Comparison of Merits and Drawbacks of Facility Types

<i>Consideration</i>	<i>Permanent Structure</i>	<i>Air Supported Dome</i>
Capital Cost	A permanent building is the more expensive option to construct with capital costs dependent on facility size, design specifications and construction quality	A bubble is the least expensive alternative with capital costs dependent on facility size, single or dual liner, type of lighting and equipment selection
Operating Cost	Staff and utility costs represent the most significant operating expenses over a permanent building's 12 month operating season	Utility costs are relatively more expensive per hour of facility use however, facility operating costs apply to a shorter indoor season – 5-6 months
Seasonal Implications	Popular winter venues although difficult to program and challenging to encourage utilization in the summer months	Offers flexibility as the courts can be covered in the winter and be converted to outdoor courts in the summer
Life Cycle	Similar to other types of community recreation buildings, the life of an indoor tennis facility would likely be 25 to 35 years	The bubble fabric has a life expectancy of 15 to 20 years – depending on UV protection and the operator's inflation and take down procedures
Consumer Opinions	Patrons generally enjoy the environment and the program flexibility of permanent tennis court facility	Consumers like the ability to play outdoors in the summertime. Some suggest that the air quality and temperature in a bubble is superior to a traditional indoor environment
Operating Considerations	Requires aggressive programming to keep occupied during the non peak summer season	Cannot be used as a "general gathering place" due to code issues thereby limiting certain program alternatives

Over and above sport programming responsibilities, staff must be trained to deal with the nuances of operating a bubble such as optimizing air pressure levels, performing interior and exterior maintenance, keeping snow loads off the side panels, etc. Many

municipalities contract out the process of erecting and dismantling dome structures because of the specific expertise that is required only twice a year. Additionally, the need to store the bubble fabric during the offseason is an additional operational consideration.

In view of the fact that indoor tennis courts would represent a new level of service for the City, a decision to proceed with the project must be rationalized and prioritized compared to other capital project contemplated by the municipality. Furthermore, the relationship between the City and the proponent of the project should comply with applicable elements of the City's Civil Partnership Framework. The Framework outlines the City's strategic direction for choosing the most appropriate service delivery alternative and should be used as a baseline for analysis of the proposal. This should include a determination of whether or not the project is able to be awarded to the proponent on a sole source basis or if the project should be the subject of a request for proposals process.

The Indoor Tennis Market

According to information from Tennis Canada, approximately 11% of all tennis players participate in indoor tennis facilities during the winter months. Based upon the estimated number of tennis players residing in the City, it is assumed that about 300 frequent and 1,500 regular Kelowna based tennis players are potential indoor facility participants.

Global Fitness and Racquet Club, a privately owned commercial facility that is located on Harvey Avenue offers the only indoor tennis courts in the Okanagan Valley. Club members and their guests are permitted to use the courts on a membership and court fee basis. According to Global, the Club's tennis membership roster includes 122 individuals. There may be a number of commercial or programmatic reasons for why a larger proportion of the estimated indoor tennis market is not currently affiliated with Global.

Indoor Tennis Court Recommendations

Given the size of the projected indoor tennis market and in light of the successes of other municipalities in the provision of the indoor tennis environments, it is reasonable to suspect that the City's tennis community would benefit from the introduction of a new indoor tennis facility. However there are a number of financial, organizational and operational considerations that Kelowna should take into account in determining its most appropriate position on the proposed project.

The provision of indoor tennis would be an entirely new level of municipal recreation service and the capital and operating cost implications represent significant financial exposure for the municipality. Therefore, it would be advisable that the City prudently

examine Kelowna Futures Tennis' proposal as well as the project's influence on other community services as well as the related implications of the project. For example, the proponents have suggested that their proposal is in no way meant to conflict with or do harm to other tennis clubs or organizations within Kelowna. To ensure that this underlying principle is maintained, an analysis of the project's potential impact on the Mission Tennis Club and the Global Fitness and Racquet Club is warranted. Furthermore, the City should undertake its own investigations into the business implications and sustainability of the proposed project to ensure that the business case of the facility is based on principles and assumptions acceptable to municipal officials.

It is therefore recommended that the City undertake the following initiatives in advance of determining its position on the proponent's proposal.

- investigate the operational and financial implications of a publically accessible indoor tennis facility through the implementation of a thorough feasibility study;
- in the near term, consider the development of a tennis centre as part of a future major park development; and
- create a "municipal comparator" to be used as a benchmark in assessing partnership opportunities.

Summary of Study's Recommendations

In accordance with this study's objectives described on page one of this report, the strategy was to produce recommendations about the number of tennis outdoor courts required to meet local community needs as well as an approach to determining the implications of the City's participation in a project to develop an indoor tennis facility. The following table summarizes the study's recommendations in these two key areas of focus.

Figure Three: Summary of Recommendations

Focus	Recommendations
Outdoor Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain the current court provision standard of 1 outdoor, publically accessible tennis court to 4,180 population; working with the tennis community, continuously monitor Kelowna's public tennis court capacity and local demand over the City's growth period (to 2013); continue the City's current practice of building courts using a neighbourhood distribution model, focusing on densely populated areas; and where possible, build new courts in clusters of 3 courts to facilitate sport development.
Indoor Tennis Facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> investigate the operational and financial implications of a publically accessible indoor tennis facility through the implementation of a thorough feasibility study; in the near term, consider the development of a tennis centre as part of a future major park development; and create a "municipal comparator" to be used as a benchmark in assessing partnership opportunities.

Appendices

Appendix A

City of Kelowna: Summary of Tennis Courts

City of Kelowna Municipal Tennis Courts

Park	Neighborhood	Surface	Condition	Courts	Lights	Washrooms
Basil Meikle	Central	2009	Good	6	Yes	Portables
Birkdale	Rutland/Blk Mtn	2011	Good	1	No	Portables
Blair Pond	Glenmore	2009	Good	1	No	None
City	Downtown	2014	Excellent	2	Yes	Yes
Crossglen	Glenmore	Unknown	Poor	1	No	None
Edith Gay	Rutland	2010	Good	2	No	Yes
Gerstmar	Rutland	2011	Good	1	No	Yes
Hartwick	Glenmore	2008	Good	1	No	Portables
Jack Robertson	Glenmore	2014	Excellent	2	Yes	Yes
Kinsmen	Lakeshore	2010	Good	2	No	Yes
Knox Mountain	Downtown	2005	Good	2	No	Portables
Parkinson South	Central	Converted to Pickleball				
Quilchena	Mission	2009	Good	1	No	Yes
Summerside	SE Kelowna	Unknown	Poor	1	No	None
OKM Tennis Club <small>*city owned/club operated</small>	Mission	2008	Good	3	No	Yes

Non Municipal Tennis Courts in Kelowna

Park	Neighborhood	Surface	Condition	Courts	Lights	Washrooms
OKM Tennis Club	Mission	2013	Good	3	Yes	Yes
Global Outdoor	Central	NA	Poor	2	NA	NA
Kelowna Golf Club	Central	Unknown	Good	2	NA	NA
Gallagher's Village	East Kelowna	Unknown	Good	2	NA	NA
KLO Middle School	Mission	Unknown	Poor	3	NA	NA
Immaculata High	Mission	Unknown	Poor	2	NA	NA
Manteo	Mission	Unknown	Good	1	NA	NA

Tennis Courts in Neighbouring Districts

Park	District	Courts
Lake Okanagan Resort	West Kelowna	2
Anders Park	West Kelowna	8
Last Mountain Park	West Kelowna	2
Mount Boucherie	West Kelowna	3
Shannon Lake	West Kelowna	2
The Cove	West Kelowna	1
Holiday Park	Lake Country	1
Coral Beach	Lake Country	1
Woodsdale Courts	Lake Country	4

Appendix B

Tennis Court Provision Levels in Other BC Communities

City	Pop. 2014	Outdoor Courts	Indoor Courts	Outdoor Courts per Population	Total Courts per Population
North Vancouver	52,346	100	9	523	480
Penticton	34,233	23		1,488	1,488
Vernon	38,861	22		1,766	1,766
West Kelowna	32,699	16		2,044	2,044
Lake Country	13,015	6		2,169	2,169
Langley	26,652	9	4	2,961	2,050
Victoria	83,200	28		2,971	2,971
North Saanich	10,941	3	4	3,647	1,563
Richmond	205,262	52	12	3,947	3,207
Kelowna	121,422	29		4,187	4,187
Kamloops	89,417	21	5	4,258	3,439
Coquitlam	141,132	32	5	4,410	3,814

PARKINSON RECREATION CENTRE

John Frittenburg

Council Presentation: 2015.08.10



QUALITY OF LIVES ARE IMPROVED BY SPORT AND RECREATION SERVICES

A robust recreation facility provision strategy positively affects Kelowna's long-term vitality as well as the well-being of those who live and work or visit and play in the City.



THOUGHTFUL RECREATION FACILITY PLANNING SHOULD CONSIDER:

- ▶ National and Provincial Recreation and Sport Trends
- ▶ Local Needs, Demands and Influences
- ▶ Social and Community Benefits
- ▶ Potential Partnerships
- ▶ Capital Funding Implications
- ▶ Business Case of the Proposed Facility



KELOWNA'S 2013 SPORT AND RECREATION INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY

- ▶ Establish principles for future capital investments in sport and rec. facilities
- ▶ What facilities are required to meet the community's needs to 2031
- ▶ What is the most appropriate provision strategy for meeting needs

THE PROCESS

- ▶ State of existing facility stock?
- ▶ What rehab may be required?
- ▶ What will be needed in the future?
- ▶ What is needed to fill gaps?
- ▶ What is a reasonable and rational plan?

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVES

- ▶ Needs driven provision targets
- ▶ Reinvest before building new
- ▶ Investments should result in clear benefit outcomes
- ▶ Re-purpose facilities when no longer required
- ▶ Co-locate where possible

KELOWNA'S COMMUNITY PROFILE

- ▶ The City is growing and graying
- ▶ Absolute number of residents will climb in all age categories to 2031



IMPORTANT TRENDS WERE CONSIDERED

- ▶ One stop, multi-purpose, multi-generational
- ▶ Considerable deferred capital maintenance
- ▶ New participation trends
- ▶ Partnerships
- ▶ Balancing needs of the haves vs. have-nots

MARKET DRIVEN PLANNING

- ▶ Existing + anticipated future demand
- ▶ Make adjustments for:
 - ▶ demographics, trends, municipal planning policies local conditions, location and economic readiness
- ▶ Determine provision standard
- ▶ Determine how to best implement standard



WHAT DID THE INFRASTRUCTURE
STUDY CONCLUDE

POOLS

- ▶ Swimming is a “cradle to grave” activity
- ▶ Pools accommodate multiple users
- ▶ Creative designs increase pool traffic
- ▶ Community utilization often measured by annual swim occasions per capita



KELOWNA'S POOLS

- ▶ H2O, Parkinson and Kelowna Family Y - 5 tanks
- ▶ Varying use profiles due to design and location
- ▶ Current provision - 1 tank per 23,462 pop.
- ▶ Total traffic = 5.5 annual pool visits per capita
- ▶ Pool system used to 67% of current capacity
- ▶ Most available unused capacity at H2O

SUGGESTED POOL PROVISION

- ▶ One pool per 30,000 residents
- ▶ If participation rates climb (20% - 30%) raise standard to 1 per 25,000 residents
- ▶ Standard could be adjusted in response to local community requirements
- ▶ New pools should be located in multi-purpose recreation facility complexes

ARENAS

- ▶ Participation in ice sports is relatively stable
- ▶ Prime time window is shrinking
- ▶ Consumer facility expectations are rising
- ▶ Arenas are “drive to” facilities
- ▶ Multi-pad arenas are most desirable


KELOWNA'S ARENAS

- ▶ Capital News Centre, Rutland Twin Pad, Memorial and Prospera Place
- ▶ Ice sport participation has risen faster than population growth
- ▶ Ice facilities are generally in good physical condition and are extensively utilized
- ▶ Prospera agreement represents .5 ice surface
- ▶ Current provision - 1 pad per 21,329 pop.
- ▶ Current provision - 1 pad per 3,992 pop. 0-19 yrs
- ▶ Memorial has physical limitations

SUGGESTED ICE PROVISION STANDARD

- ▶ One pad per 4,000 pop. 0-19 yrs
- ▶ If adult use grows, 1 pad per 21,000 pop.

Ice required to meet provision standard



COMMUNITY PROGRAM SPACE

- ▶ Publicly accessible space in various buildings
- ▶ Appeal to a broad array of users
- ▶ Program flexibility
- ▶ Facility quality expectations on the rise
- ▶ Sub-sets of “seniors” participate differently
- ▶ Program diversity a must
- ▶ Partnered stand-alone facilities have issues


KELOWNA'S COMMUNITY PROGRAM SPACE

- ▶ Parkinson, Rutland, Okanagan Mission, Cedar Creek and Kinsman
- ▶ Partnered facilities - ex. Badminton and Curling Clubs
- ▶ Significant capital maintenance required
- ▶ Current provision of .45 sq. ft. per pop.
- ▶ Current provision of 1.14 sq. ft. per pop. 65+ yrs
- ▶ 75% - 85% available time utilized

SUGGESTED PROGRAM SPACE PROVISION

- ▶ .5 sq. ft. per pop.
- ▶ 1 sq. ft. per pop. 65+ yrs.

Program space required to meet standard




INDOOR TURF FIELDS

- ▶ Appropriate for multiple types of activity
- ▶ Soccer often most dominate field user
- ▶ Recreational use - 100' x 200' field size
- ▶ Fields without boards are now the norm
- ▶ Air supported domes offer flexibility


KELOWNA'S INDOOR TURF FIELDS

- ▶ Two boarded 85' x 185' fields at CNC
- ▶ Almost all available hrs are utilized
- ▶ Soccer groups' growth is restricted by field availability
- ▶ Other potential field user needs unmet



SUGGESTED INDOOR TURF FIELD PROVISION

- ▶ One indoor turf field per 30,000 pop.



OUTDOOR TENNIS COURTS

- ▶ Tennis is a life-long activity
- ▶ 85% of all tennis is played on public outdoor courts
- ▶ Tennis participation is increasing – a big jump in younger players
- ▶ Vast majority of tennis is played by recreational players in unstructured settings
- ▶ Less than 10% of tennis players play indoors – regardless of the availability of indoor courts

KELOWNA'S TENNIS COURTS


- ▶ 26 outdoor municipal courts
- ▶ 3 courts operated by Mission Tennis Club
- ▶ 6 privately owned courts – Global, Kelowna GC and Gallagher's Canyon
- ▶ 5 school based courts



SUGGESTED OUTDOOR TENNIS COURT PROVISION

- ▶ One outdoor municipal court per 4,180 pop. based on a neighbourhood distribution model

Growth in Public Tennis Court Inventory



SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED FACILITY PROVISION STANDARDS

- ▶ Aquatics - no new pools required
- ▶ Ice - add two pads by 2015 and two more by 2031
- ▶ Program space - add about 11,000 sq. ft. by 2015 and then add about 10,000 sq. ft in each 5 year period thereafter
- ▶ Add 2 new fields by 2015
- ▶ Add 13 new courts between 2015 and 2031 and consider a sport development complex as part of future tennis provision plans

FACILITY DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

- (1) redevelop Parkinson Recreation Centre
- (2) add 2 ice pads
- (3) add turf fields - under a dome sooner, in building later
 - Kelowna United Soccer Centre added late 2013

PARKINSON REDEVELOPMENT STUDY

PARKINSON CURRENT STATUS

- ▶ Facility is tired and dated - not user friendly
- ▶ Ad-hoc additions were built under different building codes, standards and construction methods
- ▶ Mechanical and electrical systems are at the end of their service life
- ▶ Age related inefficient building systems
- ▶ Building envelope is in poor condition - pool membrane and exterior cladding are significant issues
- ▶ Hazardous materials present

PRC'S TRADITION

- ▶ an array of facilities and programs appealing to a vast number of Kelowna residents
- ▶ diverse offerings and unparalleled accessibility differentiate PRC from other community facilities in the City
- ▶ a neighbourhood engagement service model makes PRC a community hub
- ▶ relationships within the local community help to shape the nature and profile of PRC's services and programs

THE PRC FUNCTIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

- ▶ Reflect the principles of the Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Study
- ▶ Facility components responding to today's needs but planned for the future
 - ▶ facility types and sizes
 - ▶ maintain welcoming atmosphere
 - ▶ multi-purpose and integrated services
 - ▶ Parkinson campus as a destination
 - ▶ serve local interests and respond to regional needs
 - ▶ focus on wellness, active living and family fun

PARTNERSHIPS AT PRC

- ▶ Partnerships with School District 23; Pacific Sport; Tourism Kelowna; UBCO; Interior Health; Okanagan College; and Sports organizations could lead to:
 - ▶ a centre of learning and innovation
 - ▶ support for LTAD and life long activity
 - ▶ sport tourism
 - ▶ a vehicle for transformational wellbeing
 - ▶ connect students to the community
 - ▶ satisfy significant pent up demand for gyms
 - ▶ outreach and community development

THE NEW PRC'S RAISON D'ÊTRE

The new PRC will become Kelowna's premier full service community centre. It will stridently focus on the recreational and leisure needs of the family and the instructional and participatory needs of sport enthusiasts, while providing a host of programs and activities that will meet the needs of the broader community

VISIONING CONCEPTS AND DIFFERENTIATING FACTORS

- ▶ Welcoming
- ▶ Family oriented
- ▶ Distinctive
- ▶ Social gathering place
- ▶ Multifaceted facilities
- ▶ Warming and inclusive
- ▶ Vibrant
- ▶ Integrate outdoors
- ▶ Simultaneous multi-use
- ▶ Accessible
- ▶ Alive and fun
- ▶ Wellness focused
- ▶ Integrated spaces
- ▶ Promotes active living
- ▶ Comfortable and safe
- ▶ Bright and airy
- ▶ Destination
- ▶ Place for networking
- ▶ Affordable

FEATURES FOR IMPROVED SERVICE

- ▶ More organized facility design to facilitate use
- ▶ Larger, more versatile spaces to augment programming
- ▶ Appropriately sized facility components (i.e. gym)
- ▶ Augment accessibility, for people, cars, buses
- ▶ Add washrooms accessible from sports fields
- ▶ Aquatic re-design can differentiate PRC from other pools
- ▶ Gymnasium configuration should facilitate multi-use
- ▶ Consider walking/running track
- ▶ Multi-program and instructional spaces - e.g. teaching kitchen or computer labs

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

- ▶ Athletic components
 - ▶ gymnasium centre
 - ▶ fitness/wellness centre
- ▶ Aquatic centre
- ▶ Community program space
- ▶ Customer service and amenity space
- ▶ Administration space
- ▶ Operational support space

FUNCTIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

- ▶ To meet current and future needs the NSF of programmable area should increase from 41,512 sf. to 96,359 sf.
- ▶ Open, versatile spaces can be repurposed to new uses if participation profiles shift in the future
- ▶ A gross up factor will facilitate adequate functionality – social space, storage, circulation, etc.

DIRECTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES

- ▶ Meet today's needs while planning for the future
- ▶ Act as the “one-stop recreation and sport destination” for as many City residents as possible
- ▶ Differentiation by maximizing accessibility
- ▶ Be a community hub through the implementation of the neighbourhood engagement model
- ▶ Leverage partnerships to elevate facility profile and maximize utilization
- ▶ Amplify public value through “big picture thinking” and remaining focused on the long term perspective

NEXT STEPS

- ▶ Follow-up workshop with Council to fully explore the feasibility analysis of the PRC facility development options
- ▶ Additional work and reports on funding scenarios applicable to future sports and recreation developments
- ▶ Continuous consultations with community groups and stakeholders regarding other potential sport and recreation infrastructure priorities

THANK YOU