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1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Study

This assignment has been initiated as part of the City of Cambridge Community Services Master Plan and provides direction on major capital requirements related to indoor recreation facilities.

The purpose of this report is three-fold:

(1) to identify key trends and demand indicators that may impact indoor recreation facility provision;

(2) to assess existing municipal indoor recreation facilities and summarize known challenges and opportunities; and

(3) to identify current and future indoor recreation facility needs, including possible building components, based on the aforementioned inputs.

Facilities assessed within this report include arenas, indoor pools, indoor turf, gymnasiums, indoor walking tracks, fitness and wellness centres, older adult centres, and associated amenities. New lines of business for the City (i.e., non-core services) are not currently anticipated and have not been examined.

In addition to informing the Community Services Master Plan, this report also provides preliminary findings that can be used as a foundation for further analysis regarding a proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre. It is anticipated that further public and stakeholder consultation will be undertaken to review the report findings and to provide directions on next steps. Future planning stages may also consider the assessment of specific facility provision options and strategies, outdoor facility needs, feasibility / business planning, partnership identification, architectural design, and/or fundraising.

The methodology used in this report relies heavily on existing information, including recent public input (household survey, community meeting, and unsolicited proposal), demographic profiles, participation trends, facility utilization data, and lifecycle assessments of municipal facilities. Through an evidence-based approach, the facts relating to existing facilities and community needs can be clearly articulated and communicated to municipal officials and local residents.

The needs assessment places a primary emphasis on meeting the current and future needs of Cambridge residents. Where known, potential regional, provincial, and/or national demand for sport tourism facilities has been noted, but is not the driving force for this assessment. As the study relates to major capital infrastructure, much of which
has a City-wide focus, the specific needs of each neighbourhood have not been identified; location considerations may be identified at the next stage of analysis. It is also important to note that the assessment of existing facilities was limited to information provided by the City; engineering services are beyond the scope of this Study.

1.2 Current Situation

The City of Cambridge is strategically located astride Highway 401 in Southwestern Ontario, providing excellent accessibility to growing regional and provincial markets. Cambridge is part of Canada’s Technology Triangle and has a diverse economic base that is supported by a range of industries, post-secondary institutions, affordable housing opportunities, and vibrant community activities. The City of Cambridge was created in 1973 by the amalgamation of the former City of Galt, the former Towns of Preston and Hespeler and parts of North Dumfries and Waterloo Townships.

With a robust blend of facilities and programs, the City’s Community Services Department is a primary provider of recreation opportunities in Cambridge. There are several other community providers of facilities and programs within the City, such as the private sector (e.g., arenas, etc.), non-profit sector (e.g., YMCA, Langs, sports associations, etc.), and public sector (e.g., schools, etc.). The City is promoted as Ontario’s Recreation Capital and is home to the Galt Arena Gardens, the oldest continuously operating arena in the world.

With a current population estimated at over 133,000, Cambridge is also poised for considerable growth based on a forecast of 178,000 people by 2031. This anticipated population growth is expected to place pressures on existing facilities and create demands for new opportunities. Fiscal accountability – balanced against meeting the highest priority needs of local residents – remains an important goal for City Council. Recreation activities are strong contributors towards the City’s high quality of life and this Study seeks to identify needs and preliminary strategies to assist the City and its partners in planning for future facility provision.

At present, the City of Cambridge has one major indoor recreation facility project within its 10-year (2014 to 2023) capital forecast – that being the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre. The Southeast Galt facility is intended to serve the local residential community and is a partnership with library and school boards on a City-owned parcel. Possible components identified by City staff include indoor pool (leisure/teaching pool), gymnasium, fitness centre, gymnastics, and program rooms (estimated at 50,000sf in total). Site preparation is slated for 2016 and construction for 2017; however, timing is uncertain as surrounding development has not yet occurred. The estimated construction cost is approximately $11.1 million.
As part of the Community Services Department’s Five-year Master Plan Review, the need for new capital facilities is being addressed, among other items. A Citizen Task Force was created to advise staff in undertaking a public input process to inform a major capital facilities plan for the 2015 to 2024 capital budget forecast. To date, the City has completed the following consultation initiatives to support the capital component of the Master Plan Review:

- random sample household telephone survey (October 2013)
- public meeting (October 2013)
- staff visioning workshop (April 2014)

Cambridge is becoming an increasingly sophisticated community and expectations continue to rise regarding the quality and quantity of recreation, sport, arts, and cultural facilities. Most notably, the City of Cambridge lacks a large-scale sport and recreation facility that is an increasingly common destination in many communities. Furthermore, facilities such as Dickson Arena, Karl Homuth Arena, and Duncan McIntosh Arena are old and do not provide amenities that are typical of modern community facilities, particularly those used to host competitive events such as tournaments and meets. For example, dressing rooms in these facilities are not able to accommodate the number of players and size of equipment that is employed by today’s participants. Circulation space, washrooms, and heated viewing areas also fall below community expectations.

Preliminary information provided by local sports organizations (unsolicited) suggests that there is interest in a single, large-scale facility to meet multiple sport and recreation needs, rather than the decentralization of activities amongst several smaller, single-purpose facilities. A recent community-wide survey found some public support for a new Multi-Use Sports and Recreation Complex (45% agreed that it should be a high priority for City Council, while 29% disagreed and 26% were neutral); however, the majority of residents appear to be reasonably satisfied with the facility opportunities that are currently available. In general, residents expressed hesitancy in funding new facilities through increased taxes.

Subsequently, on May 5, 2014, City Council adopted the following resolutions:

THAT the City confirms its commitment to establish a recreation centre comprising a swimming pool, gymnasium and gymnastics centre in Southeast Cambridge and that a function and space requirement study for such a facility be completed in 2014 in conjunction with Cambridge Libraries and Galleries and the Public and Catholic School Boards;

AND THAT a land study to identify potential sites for future City facilities be included within 2015-2024 Capital Budget Forecast;
AND FURTHER THAT, on the recommendation of the Master Plan Steering Committee, Council, as part of the 2015 budget process, consider the establishment of an additional capital project for a city wide multi-use sports and recreation complex to be included within the 2015-2024 Capital Budget Forecast.

Development of a Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility is not currently in the City’s long-term capital forecast, but will be considered through 2015 budget deliberations. Staff have identified a preliminary construction budget of $40 million for the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility (based on a 150,000sf concept), in addition to $13 million for land purchase, design, and servicing. Operating costs associated with a capital project of this magnitude are estimated by staff to be in the range of $1.2 million annually.

Through the “Cambridge Sports and Community Complex campaign” initiative and an online petition (sportsplex4cambridge.ca), some in the community has expressed interest in a Multi-Use Sports & Recreation Complex. Some members of the community have expressed a wide range of expectations for the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility. A separate proposal has also been presented to City Council involving a multi-sport oval containing an indoor long-track speed skating course.

Building components for the Multi-Use Sports & Recreation Complex are yet to be determined (with direction from this study) and but may include (but not necessarily be limited to): ice pads (2), aquatic centre, walking/running track, gymnasium, youth/older adult space, outdoor amenities, and specialized spaces (e.g., gymnastics, indoor tennis, indoor playground, group offices, retail/restaurant, leased space, etc.).

1.3 Study Methodology

In making decisions to provide new and modern infrastructure, a prudent and fiscally responsible approach is to look critically at existing facilities to determine potential gaps, duplications, and redundancies. While community interest may be high in building new facilities, the costs of carrying under-performing and antiquated facilities can be significant. Decisions to decommission or re-purpose under-utilized facilities are often best made in combination with the building or renewal projects as part of a community-wide facility strategy.

The identification of facility needs requires a multitude of inputs that measure various factors, such as public engagement, socio-demographic analysis, trends in sport and community recreation facility provision and participation, and facility condition, design, utilization, and distribution. Each of these factors is explored through this Study.

Most notable in any community planning exercise is public engagement, which provides first-hand information on the expressed issues and desires of local residents and organizations. This planning process has built upon a random sample telephone survey aimed at learning more about resident expectations, as well as an open public input
session. Additional opportunities for public input are encouraged as the City continues to explore facility needs and implementation options.

For this Study, information on facility condition and utilization has been provided by the City’s Community Services Department, which has a relatively robust asset management program that identifies levels of deferred maintenance and renewal costs. Much of the City’s indoor recreation infrastructure is decades old and some facilities are holding up better than others – both in terms of design and condition. For example, many of the City’s arenas are single pad facilities with limited multi-sport opportunities; the current trend in arena provision leverages multi-use and operational efficiencies through the provision of multi-pad designs that are accessible to a wide range of activities. However, building condition data should not be interpreted in isolation – it is most powerful when combined with an understanding of design trends, facility utilization, and community input, as this provides a more balanced view of facility rationalization priorities.

The socio-demographic composition of the City of Cambridge, along with local sport and recreation trends, are also critical elements in understanding current and emerging needs. For example, the City (largely prior to amalgamation) responded to the more youthful age profile of the past through the provision of arenas embedded within various neighbourhoods. However, the aging population trend may be shifting usage away from organized sports such as hockey and figure skating to slightly less active and less organized activities such fitness, swimming, social events, and more. This and a wide variety of trends are discussed further in this report, including the use of local participation data where available.

The end product of this Study is a series of considerations relative to indoor recreation needs and options for consideration by the City of Cambridge as it moves forward with major capital projects. Options discussed include facility closures, alternate uses, renewal, expansion, and new development. Being a high level strategy, additional study and consultation will be necessary prior to implementation of the recommended options.
2. Community Profile

Understanding the City’s demographic profile and its anticipated changes over the life of this Study are essential to forecasting recreational demands and providing direction on facility needs. For example, higher proportions of children and youth may drive the need for facilities that support more rigorous and active opportunities, whereas a large older adult population may require less intensive facilities that focus on health, wellness, and socialization.

The 2011 short-form Census contains the most recent figures of Cambridge’s population and age breakdown, while population forecasts over the Study period are based on estimates provided by the Region of Waterloo. The 2011 short-form Census did not collect information regarding immigration, income or place of work, thus the 2011 National Household Survey\(^1\) (NHS) and previous Censuses has been referenced, where applicable.

2.1 Population

The City currently estimates the population of Cambridge to be approximately 133,000 (2013 year-end). Between 1991 and 2006, the City’s population grew by an average of 1,840 persons per year; however, this growth rate slowed to 1,275 persons per year between 2006 and 2011.

The City’s population forecast is prepared by the Region of Waterloo based on the region-wide target established in the provincial “Places to Grow” report (2006). Based on the population data recorded in the 2011 Census (126,748 residents), the City may not currently be meeting the forecasted growth rate; however, it is expected that growth will accelerate in future years to achieve the forecasted target by 2031 (178,000 residents). This represents 45,000 new residents between now and 2031, an average of approximately 2,600 new residents per year, although this will likely fluctuate from year to year.

An interpolation of this forecast is shown in the following graph.

---

\(^1\) The National Household Survey was a voluntary, self-administered survey conducted for the first time in 2011 as a replacement for the long census questionnaire. Due to the survey methodology, the City of Cambridge data has a non-response rate of 23.7%, which may affect data quality.
2.2 Age

The average age of Cambridge’s population is 38 years, which is younger than the Ontario average of 40.4 years, but generally in line with the median age in the Region of Waterloo. In 2001, the City’s median age was 35.2 years, indicative of the aging population that is predominant throughout North America. The following table illustrates how the age of the City’s population changed between 2001 and 2011. Most notably, the 50 to 64 year age cohort (generally synonymous with the baby boom generation) increased by 46% during this timeframe, followed by those ages 65 years and over (27% increase) and those ages 35 to 49 years (17% increase). The number of children and youth ages 5 to 19 – a core market for community recreation activities – increased by only 3% (760 persons) during this ten-year period, while the number of young adults ages 20 to 34 decreased by 1%.

The following table provides a summary of population change by age cohort.
Population Change by Age Group (2001-2011 Census), City of Cambridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4 years</td>
<td>7,230</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7,795</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>24,505</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25,485</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34 years</td>
<td>24,785</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24,250</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49 years</td>
<td>25,198</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64 years</td>
<td>16,488</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20,075</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>12,175</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110,370</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>120,370</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not add due to rounding

Although age cohort forecasts exist for the Region of Waterloo, there are currently no age cohort forecasts specific to the City of Cambridge. However, some broad comparisons can be made from the existing forecasts as the City of Cambridge’s population has a very similar age profile to that of the Region of Waterloo. The following table illustrates age-specific population forecasts for the Region to the year 2036. Most notable is the dramatic increase projected in the 65+ age group – an increase of 147% by 2036. There is also remarkable consistency in the growth rates projected for the youth and young adult groups (ages birth to 34 years) – which are forecasted to increase by an average of 24% – as well as the adult age groups (aged 35 to 64 years) – which are forecasted to increase by an average of 36%.

Population by Age (2011 & 2036), Region of Waterloo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population – 2011 (actual)</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population – 2036 (forecasted)</th>
<th>Forecasted Change in Total Population – 2011 to 2036</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34 years</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>147%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aligning with national aging trends, the “greying” of Cambridge’s population will become more apparent over time. However, the community is also growing and expected to see more modest increases in all age categories. Compared to the Province, Cambridge currently has a larger percentage of children, suggesting continued demands for recreational infrastructure. Key growth areas for the City both currently and over the next number of years include Southeast Galt, Preston, and infill development within existing neighbourhoods. Over the longer-term, more substantial growth can be expected in Southeast Galt, Hespeler West, and a continued emphasis on infill development.

An aging population and new growth areas bring new challenges and opportunities. Recent development applications and population data for the pre-school age category suggests that the demand for recreation opportunities proximate to the City’s northern and southern boundaries are likely in the near term. Over the long-term, infill opportunities may generate additional demands across all parts of the City. The aging demographic also means that expectations for service to older adults are likely to rise; many of these residents currently live in established neighbourhoods closer to the City’s various downtown cores.

2.3 Employment, Income & Education

Studies have shown that income and education are indicators of participation levels in recreation and leisure activities. Generally speaking, the higher the income and education levels, the more likely they are to participate. According to the 2011 National Household Survey,

Cambridge historically has a higher labour participation rates and lower unemployment rate than the Ontario average. As of November 2014, the labour participation rate for the tri-city area was 72.9% (compared to 65.7% in Ontario) and the tri-city unemployment rate was 5.3% (compared to 7.0% in Ontario)².

According to the 2011 National Household Survey, Cambridge’s median family income in 2010 was $81,184, which was very similar to the median figure for the Province ($80,987) and only slightly lower than the median for the Region of Waterloo ($83,928). The median family income in the City has steadily increased over the past several years.

Despite these income levels, the 2011 National Household Survey categorizes 12% of Cambridge residents as “low income”, identical to the percentage of Region of Waterloo residents, but below the Provincial average. Most notable is the finding that 18.2% of children and youth less than 18 years of age live below the low-income cut-off rate in Cambridge.

In terms of levels of educational attainment, the City lags behind the Regional and Provincial averages. For example, 46% of Cambridge residents aged 15 years and over have a post-secondary certificate, diploma or degree, compared to 52% of Waterloo Region residents, and 55% of Ontario residents. Expanded post-secondary opportunities within the City may serve to increase this figure over time.

On the whole, these indicators suggest that recreational participation rates in Cambridge should generally be in line with provincial rates, but that affordability will remain a key objective to ensure participation for all.

2.4 Immigration & Language

Participation in and accessibility of recreation opportunities is often impacted by levels of immigration and diversity. Based on estimates from the 2011 National Household Survey, the City has a lower percentage of immigrants (20%) than the Region (22%) and the Province (29%). 64% of Cambridge’s immigrants arrived before 1991 and 56% of the immigration population is of European descent. Further, data from the 2011 Census indicated that 8% of Cambridge residents speak a non-official language most often at home, most notably Portuguese, Punjabi, Gujarati, Urdu, and Spanish.

These findings suggest a high level of homogeneity in the population and demands for traditional recreation opportunities, although this can be expected to change over time as ethnic diversity increases.
3. Trends in Recreation Participation

Understanding current trends can assist with anticipating shifts in the demand for facility and program requirements. The following trends – based on local, provincial, and national research – may be directly or indirectly related to the potential demand, usage, design, and operation of recreational facilities in the City of Cambridge. Local implications of these trends, as well as the identification of activity-specific and facility design trends, are discussed in greater detail in Section 5: Facility Assessment.

3.1 Physical Inactivity

Research shows increasing rates of physical inactivity in Canada. A lack of free time, largely due to busier lifestyles and a number of socio-economic circumstances (such as lower income or lone-parent households) have traditionally been the primary barriers to participation for both youth and adults. Broadly speaking, a lack of free time has also contributed to other notable trends such as increases in rates of obesity and chronic disease, decreasing levels of volunteerism, and a greater desire for more flexible and convenient program options. Heavier workloads, competing interests, and access to a wide range of sedentary activities have also resulted in less time for physical activity.

In a survey undertaken by ParticipACTION, teens identified that socializing (97%), entertainment (96%), and the internet (93%) were the most important aspects of their daily lives compared to physical activity (84%). While the Canadian Physical Activity Guidelines recommends that teens achieve a minimum of 90 minutes of physical activity each day, ParticipACTION found that only 12% of teens were achieving this minimum and that a majority of teens were attaining less than 60 minutes of activity per day.

3.2 Non-Programmed Activities

Increasingly busy lifestyles have altered the leisure habits of many individuals and prompted a general transition from organized to unorganized recreation activities. Those who experience this “time crunch” are increasingly looking for spontaneous, non-programmed forms of activity that fit into their schedule. This trend has influenced the design of community facilities to be more flexible in accommodating both programmable and non-programmable space. For example, the provision of multi-purpose rooms utilized for structured programming or drop-in activities, open spaces utilized for a variety of outdoor sports, or hard surface courts to facilitate informal basketball or ball-hockey are some examples that respond to an increase in demands for drop-in, spontaneous activities and pick-up sports.

The Canadian Fitness & Lifestyle Research Institute notes the declining trend of active participation. In 2009, the Institute reported that 27% of Canadians participated in sports, which is a lower rate compared to previous years.

While participation rates in organized activities (such as minor sports) remain strong in certain categories (such as soccer and girls hockey), the 2005 Sport Participation in Canada study observed a noticeable decline in other organized activities (such as baseball) as interests change or people try to find activities that fit within their busy schedules.

With the growing emphasis on less competitive and more unstructured activities, many new forms of recreational activities are emerging, such as pickleball, dodge ball, skateboarding, off leash dog walking, and more. Municipalities across Ontario have responded to requests for non-traditional sports through the design of flexible facility templates. Designing sports and recreation facilities that allow a broad range of uses and adaptability to activities that may emerge is essential to meeting future needs of the community as the preferences and socio-economic profile of residents change.

### 3.3 Female Sport Participation

Research demonstrates that sport participation and physical activity is influenced by gender. Historically, gender inequality in sports was prevalent due to the perception of traditional gender norms. This thinking has largely changed, as evidenced by a variety of female minor and international sport opportunities (such as women’s hockey and soccer) in communities across North America. This has had implications on facility design, such as the need for additional change rooms in arenas and recreation centres.

While there has been an evolution of female participation in sports, male participation remains dominant. The Sport Participation in Canada Study identified that between 2005 and 2010, sport participation among males remained stable (36%), while female participation actually declined from 21% to 16%. The type of sports played by each gender also varies. Despite a wide variety of sport opportunities for females, a number of barriers continue to prevent or limit female participation and involvement. The Sport Participation Study reports that the most popular sports among men are hockey, golf, and soccer, while women tend to favour sports such as swimming, golf, soccer, and volleyball.

---


3.4 Inclusive & Barrier-Free Services

Most municipal recreation departments strive to provide all residents with an opportunity to access sports and recreation programs. However, it is recognized that certain opportunities may be inaccessible to vulnerable groups such as low-income households, persons with disabilities, those from diverse cultural or social backgrounds, children and youth, and seniors.

For example, the aging of the population is recognized on a global scale, driven by the large baby boom generation. As a result, communities can expect increasing demands for programs, services, and facilities for this age group. This new generation of older adults are more likely than past generations to seek active and engaging recreation opportunities.

As communities become more diverse, there is also a growing need to ensure that opportunities exist for immigrant and visible minority groups to access sports and recreation activities. Research has shown that cultural groups are less likely to participate in recreational activities due to a number of factors such as lack of skill or knowledge, cultural or religious beliefs or traditions, or income barriers, isolation, fear of discrimination, and community segregation from a wider spectrum of activities.\(^7\)

The 2006 Participation and Activity Limitation Survey identified that approximately 4.4 million Canadians were living with a disability, nearly one-quarter of whom lived in Ontario.\(^8\) Through the design of new facilities and adaption of existing facilities, municipalities are striving to remove physical barriers in order to promote inclusivity and position themselves in advance of requirements associated with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and recent amendments to the Ontario Building Code. In doing so, many communities are implementing universal accessibility standards for new facilities and/or retrofit projects, which commonly address features such as accessible washrooms/change rooms, internal and external access (e.g., ramps, elevators, automated and wider doors, etc.), lower counter levels, accessible viewing areas, and more.

Features such as inclusive program models, financial assistance programs, responsive customer service, transit-supportive development, and barrier-free designs are paramount to enhancing participation from marginalized populations. Through its “Activities for Less” program, the City of Cambridge has recognized the need to provide affordable opportunities by offering a financial subsidy for low income individuals and families.


3.5 Aging Infrastructure

A 2006 study by Parks and Recreation Ontario identified that 30-50% of recreation facilities in Ontario are near the end of their useful life.\(^9\) Many recreation facilities were built between 1956 and 1980, with a number of facilities constructed to celebrate Canada’s Centennial year in 1967. Many of the projects constructed during this time received funding from the Province; however, many of these now require significant repairs and renovations and are generally more costly to maintain due to operational inefficiencies.

There are a number of challenges with older facilities, including (but not limited to) the following:

- many were designed to different construction and design standards and may have antiquated facility components (structural, mechanical, electrical, etc.);
- many lack modern amenities, such as larger (or a sufficient number of) change rooms, heated viewing areas, and multi-use designs;
- many have smaller footprints that are unable to accommodate evolving requirements and standards of play;
- many arenas are single pad designs that cannot offer the convenience and cost savings of multi-pad arenas;
- many may not be barrier-free for persons with disabilities; and
- many are not energy efficient and thus have higher operating costs.

Recognizing this, recent Federal and Provincial funding programs have contributed millions of dollars toward the renewal and construction of recreational infrastructure.

3.6 Multi-Use Facilities

In this era of user convenience and cost recovery, more often municipalities are centralizing multiple recreational facilities on individual sites. Further, there is a growing expectation that facilities contain something for everybody, rather than being designed solely for singular uses. Co-location of complementary facility components often creates convenient, centralized activity centres and generates operating efficiencies. The provision of high quality, multi-use, and multi-generational facilities encourages physical

and social activity among all age groups, while also creating opportunities for sport tourism at a regional scale.

Experience in hundreds of communities across Canada supports the finding that multi-use recreation facilities can provide a great number of benefits. While the specific nature and degree of these benefits will depend on local circumstances, facility design (e.g., barrier-free, more and larger change rooms, walking tracks, etc.), facility operation, and a host of other factors, there is no denying that multi-use recreation facilities have the potential to generate substantial economic, social, and environmental gains for local municipalities. These benefits are most notable in those municipalities that view sport infrastructure as an investment in the community, not simply an expenditure.

Some of the notable benefits of multi-purpose facilities include:

- **One-Stop Shopping:** The creation of a destination where residents can conveniently access recreation and/or other civic and social services (e.g., arenas, libraries, aquatic centres, older adult services, municipal information, etc.), making it particularly attractive for time-pressed individuals and multi-generational households.

- **Sport Development and Tourism:** Arena users may benefit from co-located spaces that allow for dry-land training, tournaments or banquets.

- **Operational Efficiency:** Multi-purpose facilities allow for the efficient use of operational resources through the economies of scale that are generated by sharing overhead costs such as staffing, utilities, maintenance, etc. These facilities are also well suited for the consideration of public-private partnerships.

To build upon the last point, the operational savings of moving from a single pad to a twin pad arena can be significant, due largely to the reduced per pad staffing complement (labour is the predominant cost factor in arena operations) and other economies of scale. Everything else being equal, the net operating deficit for a twin pad arena is typically the same as that for a single pad arena despite offering twice as much ice. The vast majority of recent arena construction across the province has been in the form of multi-pad venues. Single-purpose facilities, such as single pad arenas, are no longer preferred unless justified by need (or lack thereof).

### 3.7 Environmentally-Friendly Facility Design

Today, energy efficiency and environmental sustainability are key considerations in renovation or new construction projects. Certain municipalities have adopted policies that establish specific LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) construction and/or certification levels for particular types of buildings (the City of Cambridge strives for LEED Gold certification). Advances in capturing and reusing
energy have made facilities more efficient and have helped to reduce utility consumption. While these approaches and techniques require additional capital investment during the construction phase of the project, there is normally a payback over time because of cost economies or expenditure avoidance. Consequently there are civic, social and financial benefits of the greening trend.

### 3.8 High Quality Facilities & Design

Today’s consumers expect and demand high quality services, a trend that is applicable to sports and recreation facilities. As the cost of sport participation rises, so too do expectations for higher levels of facility design and access. Recreation facilities are highly visible and desirable community destinations, thus their design is vital to supporting principles of place-making and fostering sense of place. High quality facility design should emphasize (at a minimum) barrier-free access and linkages, sociability, comfort, and activities. New facility design should also respond to the growing demands of users to provide superior and inclusive experiences, including causal and flexible spaces for people to gather and socialize.

### 3.9 Sport Tourism

The Canadian Sports Tourism Alliance (CSTA) identifies sports tourism as one of the fastest growing sectors in Canada’s tourism industry (sports tourism reached $3.6 billion in 2010, an increase of 8.8% from 2008[11]), driven by sporting associations, school sports, investment in recreation infrastructure, and a number of other factors. The provision of high quality sports and recreation facilities, tournaments, and special events are one way to attract visitors and revenue to the community, although municipalities rarely receive direct financial benefits. In addition to providing direct revenue, sport tourism can generate spin-offs for local businesses, foster a sense of local pride and community spirit, and offer residents access to a wider variety of sports and recreation opportunities. The development of high quality facilities can often form the anchor to attracting sport tourism, particularly with respect to hosting competitive regional, provincial, or national sports.

---


3.10 Creative Partnerships

Successful public-private partnerships utilize the resources of each party and can be a beneficial way to increase the amount of publicly accessible facilities. A successful outcome is realized when the public interest is maximized and that partnerships fulfill the desired objectives of each party. For example, many communities provide facility space while operating responsibilities are provided by a partnering community organization. The range of potential partnership arrangements is wide and dependent on the skills, resources, and needs offered by each partner.

3.11 Skill Development and Year-Round Play

In the past, baseball and soccer players played in the summer, hockey players played in the winter and football players played only in the fall. Today, there is a general trend towards year-round participation, which is creating maintenance and operational challenges for facility providers. For example, some municipalities provide year-round ice, while ice is removed at other arenas for arena floor activities, limiting opportunities to undertake repairs or renovations without disrupting service. Further, the demand for indoor turf facilities continues to rise as these venues can host a variety of sports over the winter season.

Ice and field sport governing bodies in Canada are also implementing a Long-Term Athlete Development model that emphasizes athlete growth, maturation, and development. This model identifies the needs of athletes at various stages of their development, including training and competition needs and also addresses the appropriate stages for the introduction and refinement of technical, physical, mental and tactical skills.

As a result of this and other factors (such as the amalgamation of associations and changes to residency requirements that allow for greater player movement), competitive development experiences and opportunities are in high demand. The higher the level of play and the greater the focus on athlete development, the more time that is required for practices, games, and camps. Many organizations are altering their standards of play in order to offer their registrants more facility time during all seasons. Sports academies and other enhanced development experiences (e.g., power skating) are turning hockey, soccer, and other sports into year-round activities. While this model allows for more time on the field of play, it also coincides with demands for dryland training spaces, which are important considerations for facility planning.
4. Guiding Principles

The following Guiding Principles are core directional statements that are intended to guide the development and implementation of this Study and the City’s future decision-making relating to the provision of indoor recreation facilities. The principles are largely complementary, but no one principle takes priority over another – they should be read and interpreted as a set, rather than as separate, isolated statements. Testing and refinement of these principles may occur as part of a public engagement process.

1. Build a healthy community and foster active lifestyles.

2. Provide inclusive, affordable, and accessible recreational opportunities for all Cambridge residents.

3. Ensure that indoor recreation facilities are multi-use, multi-generational, programmable, supportive of sport tourism, and responsive to true needs.

4. Encourage designs and practices that promote energy efficiency and “green” technologies.

5. Foster and support partnerships that create synergies, leverage resources, and allow the City to maintain core services.

6. Make decisions that are financially responsible and sustainable for the City and its residents, both existing and future.

As discussed in the next section, these guiding principles have relevance to the development of future major recreation facilities and the renovation and renewal of existing facilities. Trends support the consolidation of recreation amenities through the provision of multi-use and multi-generational facilities. Locations that accommodate various activities simultaneously are not only more convenient for residents within urban areas, but they also create activity hubs that are critical to the vitality and health of a community. Multi-use recreation centres become local destinations that can revitalize communities, as they generate a critical mass that can encourage greater physical and economic activity. Capital and operational cost efficiencies are also key advantages and the opportunity to incorporate ‘green’ technologies cannot be overlooked.
5. Facility Assessment

This section examines the supply and demand for selected indoor recreation facilities in the City of Cambridge.

5.1 Overview

The City of Cambridge has a number of historic settlement areas, mixed with areas of new growth. As a result, the age of the City’s recreation infrastructure spans a number of decades. While many of the City’s newer facilities have been recently renovated and are in a state of good repair, several older facilities have mounting backlogs of capital repairs and upgrades. Furthermore, the design and delivery of recreation facilities has evolved over time; it is now generally accepted that multi-use facilities that can offer “one-stop shopping” conveniences and economies of scale are preferred over single-use venues. Some of the City’s older venues – due to their age and/or design related to their former use – also lack full barrier-free access and modern amenities such as HVAC systems, storage, and sufficiently-sized program spaces.

The City is not the only provider of recreation facilities in Cambridge, nor do residents only participate locally. Schools and places of worship are commonly used for community activities and sports, particularly school gymnasiums. The YMCA has a 60,000 square foot facility with aquatic centre, fitness centre, gymnasium, and more. Langs is a significant community provider, offering a walking track, gymnasium, exercise studio, and an extensive array of health and wellness services at its Community Health Centre on Concession Road. The private sector offers indoor ice pads, gymnastics facilities, fitness centres, and more.

In terms of new regional projects, the City of Kitchener has recently approved a master plan for the South Kitchener District Park that includes an indoor recreation centre (consisting of a twin pad arena, aquatic centre, and athletic centre possibly comprised of an indoor turf facility), as well as several outdoor amenities. This site is at the southwest corner of Huron and Fischer-Hallman Roads, reasonably accessible for Cambridge residents living near Highway 401. Construction of the South Kitchener indoor recreation components is budgeted for 2022 to 2025.

The following facility assessment considers the following inputs:

- **level of service**, which considers qualitative measures that account for factors such as facility condition, design, etc.

- quantitative **provision targets** that are “Cambridge-specific” based on a blend of industry standards and local utilization data (where available); participant-based provision targets (e.g., 1 ice pad per “x” participants) are generally used for recreational activities that are primarily registration-driven, while population-
based targets (e.g., 1 indoor pool per “y” population) are applied to facilities that serve a broader cross-section of the community and/or are less structured in their use.

- **geographic distribution** and proximity to the population served; it is our experience that most individuals are willing to travel about 15 minutes to access the activities that they participate in the most, with longer travel times tolerated for regular participation in competitive activities and access to regional-level facilities.

It should be recognized that this evaluation is based on the consultant’s experience in undertaking similar assessments in communities throughout Ontario. Further, the assessments of facility condition are based on high level visual inspections rather than detailed engineering audits; the assessments may require revisiting should the City undertake such audits as part of their asset management initiatives or should the facilities be substantially renovated, expanded, or redeveloped.

### 5.2 Arenas

**Inventory**

The City of Cambridge operates seven indoor ice pads at six facilities, as documented in the following table and map.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Arena</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Year Built (renovated)</th>
<th>Facility Size / Ice Pad Size</th>
<th>Capital Renewal Costs (uninflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dickson Centre            | • neighbourhood-level arena located in Dickson Park (floodplain)  
   • bleacher seating for 500  
   • 4 change rooms                                                             | 1967 (2010)             | 32,700sf  
   1 pad: 180'x80'              | $141,617 (2014 to 2021) |
| Duncan McIntosh Arena     | • neighbourhood-level arena located in Churchill Park (floodplain)  
   • bleacher seating for 500  
   • Kinbridge Community Association upstairs  
   • hall / auditorium (formerly indoor skate park)                           | 1971 (2010)             | 45,400sf  
   1 pad: 180'x80'              | $157,286 (2014 to 2019) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Arena</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Year Built (renovated)</th>
<th>Facility Size / Ice Pad Size</th>
<th>Capital Renewal Costs (uninflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galt Arena Gardens</td>
<td>• historic and showcase facility – oldest continually operating arena in the world</td>
<td>1921 (1996, 2010)</td>
<td>76,300sf 1 pad: 180’x80’</td>
<td>$172,754 (2014 to 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 change rooms (+ team room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1,100 seats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler Memorial Arena</td>
<td>• twin pad arena, year-round ice</td>
<td>1990 and 2000 (2010)</td>
<td>83,000sf Both pads: 200’x100’</td>
<td>$1,582,672 (2014 to 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 12 change rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 720 seats (rink 1) and 300 seats (rink 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• banquet hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Arena</td>
<td>General Description</td>
<td>Year Built (renovated)</td>
<td>Facility Size / Ice Pad Size</td>
<td>Capital Renewal Costs (uninflated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• bleacher seating for 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Auditorium</td>
<td>• located across from Karl Homuth Arena and adjacent to works yard and Kinsmen Club Centre</td>
<td>1972 (2010)</td>
<td>42,300sf 1 pad: 180’x80’</td>
<td>$150,034 (2014 to 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1,000 seats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 6 change rooms (+ 2 team rooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• banquet hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, there are presently two private arena operators in the City:

- **Cambridge Sports Park** – twin pad facility operated by Buckingham Sports Properties Co.; focuses largely on adult leagues and tournaments (the City has an agreement with this operator to enable its affiliated groups to access 28 hours of ice per week, or the equivalent of 0.5 ice pads)

- **Cambridge Centre** – single ice pad contained with a mall food court; offers adult hockey leagues, public skating, shinny, and ticket ice

Including the municipality’s agreement with Cambridge Sports Park for 28 hours of prime time ice, the City has an effective supply of 7.5 indoor ice pads.

The City has been fortunate to leverage a number of recent provincial and federal grants to assist in renovating its arenas. About $16 million was invested in the City’s arenas within the past five years, extending their lifespans.

Given their era of construction (the City’s newest arena – Hespeler Memorial Arena – was built in 1990 and expanded in 2000), it is not surprising that many of the City’s arenas lack attributes that are common in modern facility design, such as:

- multi-pad facilities
- appropriately-sized ice surfaces (e.g., 200 by 85 feet)
- appropriately-sized and sufficient number of change rooms with dedicated showers and washrooms for each
- full barrier-free access (e.g., change rooms, viewing areas, washrooms, etc.)
- energy-efficient structures and/or systems
- expansion potential (most notably, both Dickson and Duncan McIntosh Arenas are built within floodplains and cannot be expanded)
- true multi-use designs (e.g., joint facility development with community recreation spaces)

There is a particularly strong need to expand the number of non-dedicated change rooms within existing arenas as a result of the increase in girls and co-ed hockey. There has been ongoing investment in maintaining and repairing existing facilities, but a substantial level of capital funding will be required to upgrade the current inventory of arenas. It is anticipated that the Department will continue to seek grant opportunities to further expedite capital renewal of arenas and other leisure infrastructure.
Furthermore, with 5 single pad arenas and only one multi-pad facility, Cambridge has very arenas capable of efficiently hosting tournaments. Hespeler Arena is the only twin pad facility in the City and does provide the infrastructure required to host a successful competitive event, however most large scale events require multiple pads of ice. An additional multi-pad facility would enhance the City’s ability to host and attract large scale competitive events.

In 2012, the City’s arenas recovered 61% of their costs, which is slightly below the average seen in other municipal arena operations that the consultant has experience with. This is indicative of one or more of the following: unused capacity, low ice rates, and high operating costs. A quick examination of Cambridge budget figures and the consultant’s database of arena operations in other jurisdictions suggest that it is predominantly the former – unused capacity – that is affecting the City’s ability to achieve higher cost recovery rates in its arenas.

### Financial Analysis – City of Cambridge Arenas (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arena</th>
<th>Cost Recovery Rate</th>
<th>Net Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McIntosh</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$343,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler (2)*</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Homuth</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$196,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,208,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Year-round ice  
Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

### Key Trends

Across Canada, many older ice pads are smaller templates measuring 185 feet by 85 feet or less, while more modern facilities have adopted the NHL-regulation ice pad as a standard template, which measures 200 feet by 85 feet. Larger ice pads generally provide a safer experience than smaller rinks given that players tend to be larger and faster than compared to past generations. Some municipalities provide Olympic-size ice pads (200 feet by 100 feet), although these are generally viewed as niche facilities to facilitate recreational skating and figure skating programs. The modern facility model often consists of multiple ice pads (two or more) to achieve a number of benefits, including simultaneous programming opportunities, economies of scale, and operating efficiencies.

Over the course of the last few decades, several organized sports have witnessed declines in participation. Changes in hockey registration are notable:
• Approximately 9% of Canadian children and youth play hockey, half the percentage that played 20 years ago. The size of Ontario’s 5 to 19 age group increased by only 0.4% between 2001 and 2011, despite the entire population growing by 12.6%.

• Hockey Canada and the Ontario Hockey Federation experienced peaks in youth registration for the 2008-2009 season. Youth registration has declined by 13% in Ontario since this time, a time period that coincides with the economic downturn and very slow youth population growth. Registration remains strongest in the younger age groups (Initiation, Tyke, Novice), while the Atom to Midget age groups have seen the greatest declines.

• Female hockey participation in Ontario also peaked in 2008/09. In the ten years prior to 2008/09, female hockey registration increased nearly four-fold and made-up for a reduction in male registration. Female hockey participation has declined slightly since, suggesting that the market has reached equilibrium. In 2013/14, females comprised nearly one-third of all youth hockey registrants in Ontario.

Similarly, Skate Canada (the national governing body for figure skating) has also experienced a slow decline in registration, with the number of associate members declining by 9% between 2006/07 and 2012/13 (source 2013 Skate Canada Annual Report). Synchronized skating and power skating programs have seen the greatest increases.

![Youth Registration in Hockey Canada (Initiation to Juvenile), last 6 seasons](image-url)
Despite declining registration levels and ice rentals, the most desirable prime time hours consistently remain in high demand in most municipalities; these times are usually between 5pm and 10pm on weekdays and all day on weekends, with a focus on youth-serving organizations. However, with more households facing time constraints, there is evidence of a shrinking “window” of desirable ice times and more competition for prime time rental slots. In some communities, declining registrations have adversely affected bookings during “shoulder” hours that fall just outside of the prime times (e.g., 7 to 8am, 4 to 5pm, and 10pm to 12am).

Daytime (weekday) usage during non-prime hours has traditionally been difficult for most municipalities to sell. Most communities undertake ice maintenance during this time, offer a variety of public skating programs, rent ice to local schools, and pick-up the occasional adult group rental. However, many communities are experiencing declining school board utilization due to rising busing costs and changes to the physical education curriculum. As such, some municipalities are choosing not to staff stand-alone arenas during the daytime, instead opening them up at 4pm or 5pm on weekdays.

**Usage & Demand Analysis**

Public input into the Community Services Master Plan to date indicates that arena investment is a moderate priority, with 43% of household survey respondents supporting additional spending on arenas, behind indoor pools and 50+ recreation centres, but ahead of gymnasiums and indoor soccer facilities. According to the 2013 household survey, approximately 27% of Cambridge households have at least one member that participates in hockey, figure skating, or ringette. 57% of Cambridge residents are satisfied with the City’s arenas.

Despite recent improvements, the Campaign for Cambridge Community Complex has indicated that several minor hockey organizations support the building of a new complex that can offer more and improved ice facilities. The organizations indicate that the City’s existing areas are “significantly inferior” to those in most other communities and are a “source of embarrassment” to the parents and children of the City. To address these concerns, to plan for future growth, and to host major tournaments, hockey organizations are recommending that the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility include a quad pad arena, with one pad containing bowl seating and a circular running/walking track.

The City has been actively monitoring and studying ice usage and demand for many years through its Master Plans and facility-specific studies such as the 1999 Arena Feasibility and Life Cycle Study and 2011 Multi-Purpose Sport and Entertainment Feasibility Study. The latter study concluded that Cambridge had a sufficient supply of ice, but that three to five additional ice pads could be required to serve local growth to the year 2036; we will re-examine this statement later in this section.
Arena usage and registration trends are two key factors in assessing local demand for arenas. The following table illustrates the number of hours booked at all City arenas from 2011 to 2013 (calendar years), including both prime and non-prime hours. It should be noted that usage data for the hours under agreement at the Cambridge Sports Park are excluded from this and subsequent analyses.

Between 2011 and 2013, ice rentals declined by 4% (660 hours). All rinks experienced declines, most notably Hespeler (7%) and Preston (6%) arenas. Hespeler and Galt arenas (and to a lesser extent, Preston) receive the highest levels of ice rentals year after year, while Karl Homuth, Dickson, and Duncan McIntosh Arenas receive the lowest levels of use. The City’s arena usage rates are generally in line with those in other communities in which we have undertaken similar assessments, suggesting that local usage levels are neither exceptionally high, nor low, but rather in an acceptable range.

**Usage Analysis – City of Cambridge Arenas (2011 to 2013), total hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arena</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McIntosh</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>2,233</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler (2)*</td>
<td>6,355</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>5,896</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Homuth</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,134</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,857</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Year-round ice
Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

The following table illustrates usage rates for the City’s arenas in 2012/13; data for 2013/14 is not available at the time of publishing. These calculations show that 73% of all prime time ice (defined by the City as 6 to 11pm on weekdays and 9am to 11pm on weekends) and 24% of all non-prime time ice was used. During the off-season, the arena floors are used 15% of the time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arena</th>
<th>Prime Time Usage Rate (City defined)</th>
<th>Non-Prime Usage Rate (City defined)</th>
<th>Summer Floor Usage Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McIntosh</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler (2)*</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Homuth</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Year-round ice

Prime time is defined by the City as 6 to 11pm on weekdays and 9am to 11pm on weekends

Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

It should be noted that the in-season ice usage rates tend to be softer at the beginning and end of the season (e.g., September and late March), as well as during the December holidays. Most City arenas are available for ice bookings from September/October to March/April, although this varies from rink to rink and year to year (some arenas open early/late or close early/late, and some are open year-round). Further, it is acknowledged that the City accommodates a variety of local and regional users during the spring/summer at selected arenas and that this is likely to continue. The summer ice usage at Hespeler Memorial Arena is included in these figures, which also further softens this figure due to slightly lower usage. It also bears noting that the City’s definition for prime time is not necessarily synonymous with the times most coveted by youth-serving organizations, which are often on the ice at 5pm on weekdays (or earlier for figure skaters) or 7am to 8am on weekends, and off the ice no later than 10pm. For these reasons, the 73% prime time usage rate is not fully reflective of peak time usage.

To establish a more reliable measure of prime time demand, we have examined the City’s ice schedules for a week in November 2014, a time when demand for ice sports is the greatest with no interference from program start-up, playoffs, or major holidays. We have also altered the prime time window to better reflect the true demand for youth-serving organizations (5 to 10pm on weekdays and 7am to 10pm on weekends) and examined how many of these hours are booked by adults. While booking data is not necessarily synonymous with actual utilization rates due to cancellations and unforeseen maintenance issues or other conflicts, it is a valid indicator of true demand. Actual usage rates during peak times are typically around 95% in communities that are experiencing strong demand for ice time.
Peak Time Booking Analysis – City of Cambridge Arenas (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arena</th>
<th>Prime Time Booking Rate (Consultant defined)</th>
<th>Non-Prime Usage Rate (Consultant defined)</th>
<th>Prime Time Usage Rate – Adult only (Consultant defined)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McIntosh</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler (2)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Homuth</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prime time is defined by the Consultant as 5 to 10pm on weekdays and 7am to 10pm on weekends
Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

Key findings from this analysis indicate that:

- 97% of prime time hours (consultant-defined) across all City rinks during peak times of the current ice season are booked. Prime time bookings are very consistent across all six arenas. Prime time bookings are 100% during weekdays and 95% during weekends. These rates are indicative of an arena system that is well used during prime hours.

- 18% of non-prime time hours across all City rinks during peak times of the current ice season are booked. Non-prime time bookings are highest at Galt (31%) and Preston (27%) Arenas – due largely to the public skating / shinny / and City program activities – and lowest at Dickson (6%) and Karl Homuth (7%) Arenas. This figure suggests that there is substantial capacity during non-prime hours, not unlike most arena operations in other communities.

- Adult bookings during prime time is indicative of softer demand for youth activity, as youth are generally given priority during prime time hours. 9% of prime time hours (consultant-defined) across all City rinks during peak times of the current ice season are booked by adults (representing 71% of all adult rentals). Adult prime time bookings are highest at Dickson Arena (20%) and lowest at Hespeler Memorial Arena (1%).

- On a weekly basis, only five hours across all seven ice pads are typically rented after 11pm at night (14% usage rate). Further, less than one-half of early morning hours (7 to 8am, on weekdays and 7 to 9am on weekends) are typically booked. There is additional capacity during the less desirable times should arena demand increase.
The City’s arenas are generally available for booking between 7 am and 12 am, although there are few early morning and late night rentals. While demand remains high for prime time ice, usage is eroding during the shoulder times (being those times immediately before and after prime times). The shrinking prime time window is a trend that is not limited to just Cambridge. User groups in many communities are increasingly reluctant to utilize hours at the edges of prime time. Nevertheless, usage of these shoulder hours – which was more common in years past – is prevalent in those communities that are experiencing strong arena demand, something that does not appear to be the case in Cambridge.

In addition to hours rented, another indicator of demand is the number of participants registered in ice sports. Between 2007/08 and 2013/14, the number of youth registered in Cambridge’s three minor hockey, ringette, and three figure skating associations declined by 6% (217 players); similar declines have been witnessed in hours booked at municipal rinks.

### Registrants and Hours Booked – Cambridge Minor Hockey, Ringette, and Figure Skating Associations (2007/08 – 2013/14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Registrants</th>
<th>Hours Booked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>3,825</td>
<td>9,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>9,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>8,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>8,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>3,608</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

With an estimated 25,265 residents in Cambridge’s 5-19 age cohort (2013 estimate) and 3,608 registrants, this means that about **14.3% of children and youth participate in organized ice sports**; this is near the bottom end of the common range that we have observed in similar communities (typically between 15% and 20% or more), although the national average is closer to 9%. On the whole, this suggests that Cambridge’s youth are interested in ice sports, but not to an uncommon degree. Reliable registration data for adult users is more difficult to collect and that many adult groups are quite mobile and are willing to rent time at other arenas in the area based on ice availability and rates (including private rinks).

The next step is to translate these various factors and findings into a demand projection for municipal arenas. To provide a basis for comparison, we have examined per capita ice pad provision rates in the City and those of several benchmark communities. While it is recognized that every community has a slightly different socio-demographic composition and different sport participation rates, requests are often made to
understand how one community compares to others. Comparator communities with similar populations and regional markets were chosen.

**Market Research – Arena Provision in Comparator Municipalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2011 Population</th>
<th>Number (Municipal*)</th>
<th>Population per Ice Pad (total)</th>
<th>Population per Ice Pad (ages 5-19)</th>
<th>Non-municipal Ice Pads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>219,153</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19,923</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>175,779</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15,980</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>149,607</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12,467</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>122,022</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,202</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>121,688</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15,211</td>
<td>2,768</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>98,780</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,348</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>147,838</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14,689</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>133,000 (2013)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17,733</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes ice pads operated by outside partners, under agreement with the municipality

In terms of total population per ice pad, there is currently one municipal rink per 17,733 residents in Cambridge. This rate is slightly less favourable than that of the comparator communities, which are currently providing ice pads at an average of one per 14,689 residents. Non-municipal ice pads have been noted but not included in the analysis as many have different markets and operating profiles than municipal rinks.

These population-based standards, however, do not necessarily capture market-based demand considerations (such as changing participation rates, aging and diversity characteristics, geographic inequities, etc.). It is widely accepted that children and youth are the primary user of municipal arenas. Looking only at youth ages 5 to 19, the City’s level of provision is also less favourable than the benchmark average (one pad per 3,368 youth). Based purely on these per capita measures, the City of Cambridge has fewer ice pads per population than five of the six comparator communities.

The City’s 2002 Master Plan for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space recommended a general provision rate of one ice pad per 15,000 residents; however, the City’s population was much younger at this time and a new approach to assessing demand is recommended. A market-specific target is the preferred approach because it is able to consider the impact of participation trends, usage rates, population growth, and demographic factors. It can also be set at a level that is consistent with local circumstances and public expectations, making it responsive to the specific needs of the City of Cambridge.
The current estimated level of provision in the City of Cambridge is approximately 1 ice pad per 481 youth participants (based on 3,608 players for 7.5 ice pads). From our experience, this ratio of youth participants per ice pad is satisfactory. Depending on the nature of the programming (most notably rep/travel hockey, which requires more ice time), a range of 400 to 600 youth per pad is common in most urban communities.

**Based on the aforementioned factors – including the finding that there is modest capacity within the City’s arenas – it is recommended that a provision target of 1 ice pad per 500 youth registrants (ages 5 to 19) be utilized for assessing City-wide ice pad needs. This equates to a current demand for 7.2 rinks, indicating a small surplus (0.3 rinks).** This target assumes that:

- youth will continue to use the large majority of prime time hours and that the current participation rate will remain steady into the foreseeable future;
- prime time demand from other groups (e.g., adults) will continue to persist in generally the same ratios over time;
- the City will attempt to accommodate the majority of adult ice groups in shoulder and non-prime times (as well as private sector operations), recognizing that certain prime hours not conducive to youth may be used for adult rentals;
- in-season tournaments will continue to be accommodated in generally the same proportion, year over year;
- the intent is to accommodate the needs of all local groups within City (i.e., not regularly renting time outside of the municipality); and
- groups will be willing and able to pay for the entirety of their ice needs and that they will exercise discretion in their scheduling so as to maximize the ice supply.

To identify future demand, the projected number of ice participants is calculated by applying the current participation rate to the forecasted population of the identified age groups. In doing so, the needs assessment model assumes that the City will grow at the rates identified earlier in this Study. Changes in the population forecasts could impact the estimated ice demand for Cambridge; therefore, it is recommended that the population projections and their impact on the needs assessment be closely monitored over the coming years.

The recommended provision target is applied in the following table, assuming that the existing rate of participation is maintained (i.e., at 14.3%) and that the youth market segment (age 5 to 19) changes at the rate forecasted for the Region as whole.
Projection of Ice Pad Needs, City of Cambridge (2014/15 to 2031)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forecasted Number of Youth Registrants</td>
<td>3,608</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>4,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.3% of youth residents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Ice Pads Required</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(based a provision target of 1 ice pad per 500 youth registrants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Ice Pads Needs (Surplus)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(based on a current supply of 7.5 ice pads)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis identifies a small surplus of ice pads at present, growing to a need for 1.2 additional ice pads by 2031. Assuming that the agreement with Cambridge Sports Park (equivalent to 0.5 ice pads) will cease to be in effect sometime prior to 2031 given the age of the facility, the adjusted long-term demand is equivalent to 1.7 additional ice pads. For the purposes of this approach, it is reasonable to round this demand calculation up to **2 additional ice pads by 2031**.

Based on this assessment, there is no latent demand for additional ice surfaces at this time and the current inventory should be sufficient to accommodate the needs of minor sports groups and most adult uses, despite potential requests for group’s seeking alternative times or facilities. However, as the City’s population grows, there will be a need for additional indoor ice pads. **The current supply should be sufficient to around 2020, when pressure for an additional ice pad can be expected (0.5 threshold).** The timing of new arena development will depend on a number of factors, such as population growth, continued access to existing facilities (including the Cambridge Sports Park), sport trends, and new partnership / facility development opportunities.

**Future Considerations**

With a current arena demand that generally matches the supply, the City’s immediate decisions surrounding its arenas will relate more to quality than to quantity. The limitations of the City’s rinks are well documented and, despite recent renovations, some facilities are unable to be expanded to meet the growing need for space (e.g., larger and more change rooms, accessibility requirements, community functions, etc.). In the short and medium-term, the decommissioning and/or re-purposing of select arenas should be given strong consideration in concert with a strategy for replacement ice pads.

It is important to note that the City’s 2002 Master Plan for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space recommended that the City continue to maintain a total of seven indoor ice pads.
to 2022 and that it seek to replace two neighbourhood arenas prior to 2022 (possibly through the decommissioning of Karl Homuth and Dickson Arenas and the development of a new twin pad arena). This direction continues to be supported by the updated analysis in this report.

Karl Homuth, Dickson, and Duncan McIntosh Arenas are three neighbourhood-level rinks that have the most significant shortcomings. All three have lower levels of utilization, are located within a five minute drive of another arena (Karl Homuth is across the road from Preston Auditorium), and lack modern amenities, as well as the ability to expand (both Dickson and Duncan McIntosh Arenas are situated within floodplains). Many of these rinks also serve (or have the potential to serve) as valuable venues for community associations and local non-ice activities; any change to these arenas must take these functions into account. All three of these arenas would be potential candidates for decommissioning and/or re-purposing and should be considered as part of the next phase of public consultation.

Arena closure should be accompanied by new development in equal amounts. There is little debate that multi-pad arenas hold several advantages over single pad arenas, such as greater support to sport development and tourism, as well as operational efficiencies (the net operating deficit for a twin pad arena is similar to that of a single pad arena despite offering twice as much ice). The City’s existing stock of single pad arenas assists in addressing distributional gaps, although it is understood that this level of decentralization comes at a cost.

Any future arena construction should be in the form of multi-pad designs in multiples of two, where supported by demand. Given current demands and profiles of existing facilities, there is insufficient justification for a new quad pad arena development. This is supported by the City’s 2011 Multi-Purpose Sport and Entertainment Feasibility Study, which established that future arena development (which may not be required for several years and should consider the decommissioning of older facilities) should come in the form of a twin pad facility with seating for approximately 750 persons and additional amenities, such as a gymnasium and leisure pool. The study indicated that, without a major tenant, there is no business case to support a spectator facility of 6,000 seats; based on our understanding of the local market, this direction remains appropriate. From our experience, the added costs of arenas in the range of 2,000 to 3,000 seats can also be significant due to the need to move toward a bowl seating arrangement with wider roof spans, more washrooms, additional circulation space, concessions, and more. Arenas with spectator capacity of 1,000 or less are typical in today’s community rink designs and should be considered as a maximum for future development in Cambridge.

Looking to the future, there is a projected demand for up to 2 additional municipal rinks (for a total of 9) by 2031 or slightly beyond. This may come in the form of a new twin pad arena or expansion to an existing facility, such as the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility. As a long-term need, monitoring of demand and facility
provision opportunities is recommended to assist in identifying a preferred course of action.

Based on the foregoing, the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:

1. Begin the process of decommissioning and/or re-purposing two of the following three single pad arenas: Karl Homuth, Dickson, and/or Duncan McIntosh Arenas. Seek public input and proposals for alternate uses for the surplus sites.

2. Replace the two decommissioned arenas with a twin pad arena as part of the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility. A quad pad arena cannot be justified at this time; however, the City should ensure that the facility has the potential to expand to four ice pads as part of a potential future development phase, should there be sufficient demand. Capacity of the signature rink should not exceed 1,000 seats. Other design features should include six change rooms per ice pad, barrier-free amenities, community activity spaces, and more.

3. As demand increases, a more robust ice allocation policy incorporating standards of play and guidelines addressing home rink scheduling may also be required.

Note: A proposal for a multi-sport oval containing an indoor long-track speed skating course in Hespeler has recently been presented to City Council. A business plan has yet to be developed for this proposal and the operating profile has not been determined, although the proposal suggests that the City would be responsible for its operation and maintenance. The capital and operating costs of the project have also yet to be identified, but are likely to be substantial given the facility’s large size (145,000 square feet) and unique nature. Such a facility would be the only one in Canada east of Alberta (and the third in Canada) and is touted a provincial-level facility that would benefit from Cambridge’s location in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. As long-track indoor speed skating ovals are not an established level of service in Cambridge (or any Ontario community for that matter), the City’s participation in this proposal would require additional investigation, with the onus being put on the proponent to “make the case” and satisfy any outstanding concerns the City may have. A process for evaluating unsolicited proposals is identified in Section 5.10 (Other Indoor Recreation Facilities).
5.3 Indoor Aquatics

Inventory

There are currently two municipal indoor aquatic facilities in the City, located at the John Dolson Centre and W.G. Johnson Centre (see descriptions below), in addition to two outdoor municipal pools (Edward Newland and Kinsmen-Soper). Indoor aquatic services in Cambridge operate under a mixed delivery system as there is another indoor pool facility that is operated by the YMCA under an agreement with the City that began in 1996; this arrangement has been successful and generally cost effective. The YMCA aquatic facility contains a 25-metre, 6 lane pool with slide, play pool, and whirlpool.

While not affiliated with the City, there is also a small warm water therapy pool (600sf) located at the Fairview Mennonite Home that offers a range of therapeutic, aquafit, and recreational swimming programs to the general public through various passes and memberships. Indoor pools may existing at local hotels and residences.

W.G. Johnson Centre

- The W.G. Johnson Centre pool (Hespeler) contains an accessible 23m by 12m pool (25-yard, 4 lane), with small hot tub, giant water slide, and 1 metre diving board.
- The Centre also contains a gymnasium, conditioning centre, and 50+ recreation centre.
- The Centre was built in phases in 1968, 1987, and 1999, with major renovations in 2010. It is fully accessible with off-street parking.
- The City has identified $595,301 in capital renewal costs (uninflated) between 2014 and 2023; this figure includes the entirety of the W.G. Johnson Centre.
John Dolson Centre

- The John Dolson Centre pool is located in St. Ambrose Catholic Elementary School, which is slated for closure (timing tbd).

- The facility contains a 25-metre 6-lane indoor pool with 1m springboard, starter blocks, movable bleachers, dry sauna, and change rooms. The City also has access to the shared gymnasium.

- The facility was built in 1974 and renovated in 2008 and 2010. It is not fully accessible (lacks a pool ramp or accessible lift) and lacks a family change room. Off-street parking is available.

- The City has identified $428,131 in capital renewal costs (uninflated) between 2014 and 2023.

Key Trends

Touted as one of the most popular leisure activities in Canada and a “cradle to the grave” activity, swimming is an essential life skill that all residents can benefit from. While private backyard pools provide similar leisure activities, public pools offer a range of recreational and competitive programming opportunities and also serve as a venue for residents to gather and form community ties. Pool design and associated amenities are key determinants of the type of activities that the facility is capable of accommodating. Research suggests that many residents are interested in aquatic facilities that offer high quality recreational swimming opportunities through traditional rectangular pools but more recently are seeking warm water pools and leisure pool formats.

Competitive swimmers prefer rectangular lane pools, ideally with spectator galleries and spacious decks. Swim Ontario indicates that enrolment has been increasing in recent
years, with over 11,000 competitive swimmers registered in approximately 130 affiliated clubs across the Province.

While competitive swimming remains popular, the introduction of warm-water and leisure pool designs has revolutionized the aquatics industry, particularly for recreational swimmers and programming. Although indoor pool use traditionally peaks during the winter months, the emergence of the leisure pool concept has helped to increase the use of aquatic facilities year-round. Key attributes of the leisure pool are its ability to accommodate a larger number of bathers (and programs) than a rectangular pool, its varied depth, its warmer water, and its “fun” elements (e.g., slides, climbing walls, sprayers, etc.). Leisure pools can be particularly well suited to recreational swimming and learn to swim programs (particularly for younger children) and aquatic therapy to some degree, but are not conducive to extended use by competitive aquatic clubs. Recent trends in pool design reflect a growing diversity of users, along with a need for family or universal change rooms.

In addition, many municipalities are also providing warm water tanks for therapeutic activities. Therapeutic pools are generally smaller warm water tanks (33 to 35 degrees Celsius) that are predominantly used for rehabilitation or therapeutic purposes (e.g., people with disabilities or injuries), but they are also available to toddlers and seniors as well as those less comfortable in water. Therapeutic pools vary in size and shape, but most have shallow depths and feature a range of supporting amenities and assisting devices including, but not limited to massage jets, benches, handles, ladders, chair lifts, and resistance machines. Generally speaking, aquatic therapy provides a medium for individuals to improve mobility and increase blood flow throughout the body, thereby relaxing muscles and decreasing tension. Some municipalities, such as Mississauga, have partnered with local health providers and hospitals to deliver therapeutic programs out of their aquatic centres.

Usage & Demand Analysis

According to the household survey, approximately 47% of Cambridge households have at least one member that participates in indoor swimming activities, even though 63% of Cambridge residents are satisfied with the City’s indoor pools, 63% of residents also support additional municipal spending on indoor pools, with only libraries and youth centres being higher priorities.

An understanding of current municipal pool utilization is helpful in evaluating current and long-term facility needs. Recreational swimming and instructional programs are the predominant uses at Cambridge pools, followed by aquafit, swim clubs, schools, and rentals. In 2013, the City’s indoor pools accommodated over 75,000 drop-in swim visits (along with nearly 4,000 aquatic memberships; data from 2012). Over the three-year period for which data is currently available, aquatic membership, drop-in swim visits, 12 The perceived benefits of aquatic therapy as an intervention tool. 2010. Retrieved from http://lightner.keuka.edu/files/2010/08/First_Final_paper_ch1-5.pdf
and aquatic lesson registrations were relatively steady. The following tables illustrate pool usage for the years 2010/11 to 2012/13.

### Aquatic Memberships – City of Cambridge Indoor & Outdoor Pools (2010 to 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>3,994</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: includes passes, monthly, and annual
Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

### Drop-in Swims (incl. Member drop-in) – City of Cambridge Indoor Pools (2011 to 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pool / Activity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolson - Rec Swim</td>
<td>23,942</td>
<td>25,364</td>
<td>23,726</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolson - Aquafit</td>
<td>15,880</td>
<td>18,343</td>
<td>17,480</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Johnson - Rec Swim</td>
<td>25,374</td>
<td>25,843</td>
<td>22,812</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Johnson - Aquafit</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>10,578</td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75,492</td>
<td>80,128</td>
<td>75,117</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

### Lesson Registrations – City of Cambridge Indoor Pools (2011 to 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolson</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Johnson</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>4,535</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,957</td>
<td>8,353</td>
<td>8,284</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each registration should be multiplied by 8.5 to determine total visits.
Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

### Hours Used – City of Cambridge Indoor Pools (2011 to 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolson</td>
<td>6,461</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Johnson</td>
<td>11,499</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>11,596</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17,960</td>
<td>18,607</td>
<td>17,375</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Cambridge, 2014
Calculating the utilization of indoor pools can be done through the use of a capacity formula that measures the water surface area (with a factor applied for varying depths) that is then applied against usage data. A full analysis using this approach (or an assessment of pool schedules) is beyond the scope of this Study, but this methodology does allow for some high level comparisons between Cambridge pools and those in other communities.

Between 2011 and 2013, Cambridge’s municipal indoor pools have averaged about 73,000 annual swims each (excluding rentals), with each pool having nearly the same number of annual users. Based on an assumption of the reasonable capacity of the City’s pools (which are lower than maximum capacities, which are rarely attainable), this data suggests that the City’s pools are operating generally at capacity. Future changes to the supply of non-municipal pools and outdoor pools may impact this capacity and should be monitored.

Another indicator of demand is the number of swims per capita in municipal pool. Cambridge averages about 1.1 swims per capita at its indoor pools, which is at the low end of the typical range, although it does exclude the YMCA pool (data unavailable). This suggests that there may be modest barriers to pool usage in Cambridge, likely related to pool supply/design and/or programming factors.

Capacities and costs must be taken into account when projecting current and future needs. In comparison to many smaller scale facilities, indoor pools are capital intensive and carry significant operating expenses. Municipal indoor aquatic centres are virtually assured of running operational deficits from year to year, even in the largest of markets. In 2013, the City of Cambridge’s municipal indoor pools recovered approximately 44% of their direct capital and operating cost through revenues.

The foregoing analysis of usage suggests that the City’s pools are well utilized and that there is modest latent demand for additional aquatic opportunities. This finding helps to form the basis for setting a provision target for indoor aquatic facilities that is responsive to the specific needs in Cambridge. As a starting point, the City’s 2002 Master Plan for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space recommended a general provision rate of one indoor pool per 35,000 residents (the current supply is one indoor pool per 44,333 residents). Based on research and service levels in other communities, this recommended provision target remains reasonable for projecting long-term needs in the City. This provision target is applied in the following table, which illustrates that there will be a deficit of one pool by 2016, growing to a need for two additional indoor pool tanks by approximately 2031. Growing demand for indoor pool facilities is fueled by a number of factors, including a continued need for instructional swimming, an aging population that has a strong interest in aquafit and recreational swimming, and increasing demands for competitive swim opportunities.
### Projection of City-wide Aquatic Facility Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>140,500</td>
<td>152,200</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 indoor pool per 35,000 population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pools Required</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Supply (City &amp; YMCA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Small play pools, whirlpools, etc. excluded.

### Future Considerations

With a demand for one additional pool in the short-term and another in the long-term, the question arises of how best to deliver and design these facilities. There are a number of issues and opportunities that must be considered as part of this decision-making process.

First, the City’s only municipal 25-metre indoor pool (Dolson) is attached to St. Ambrose Catholic Elementary School, which the school board has committed to closing upon the completion of the renovation to St. Anne Catholic Elementary School. A date for closure has not yet been set as St. Ambrose will be used as a holding school for St. Anne in the interim. The loss of the school and eventual sale of the building will have an as yet undefined impact on Dolson Pool, which is heavily used by the Cambridge AquaJets and others in Southeast Galt and the broader community. As it stands, Dolson Pool requires substantial upgrades resulting from its age and connection to the school, including (but not limited to) larger change rooms (as well as a family change room), office space, roof replacement, and physical plant upgrades. A decision needs to be made to either re-invest in the John Dolson Centre or to shutter its doors along with the school. This decision will impact how the City approaches potential indoor aquatic components in the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre and Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility.

In terms of geographic distribution, the location of the John Dolson Centre within an established neighbourhood in relatively close proximity to the growing community of Southeast Galt suggests that there is a need for only one aquatic facility to serve this portion of the City. Following this thinking, the continued operation of the John Dolson Centre would preclude the inclusion of an indoor aquatic complex as part of the proposed Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre, while the closure of the John Dolson Centre pool would suggest the need for a replacement pool of some form at the new Southeast facility.

Although substantial renovations are required to modernize the John Dolson pool, there is something to be said for retaining public facilities within existing neighbourhoods,
particularly ones that are in higher need for accessible recreation opportunities. With the school expected to be declared surplus, the City may be presented with an opportunity to purchase the entire building and to create a larger, more vibrant community hub to serve the immediate area as well as the future growth areas to the southeast. A greater municipal presence at this site will help to strengthen the neighbourhood and offer many new opportunities for physical activity and social cohesion.

Further, residential development in Southeast Galt has been delayed for a number of years, causing the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre to not move forward within the intended timeframe; there remains no definitive timetable for its development. Although the City currently owns a 13-hectare parcel of land east of Dundas Street and south of Main Street for the proposed Southeast Galt facility (along with a library branch, co-located with proposed schools), the City is under no obligation to build the facility here and could seek a land swap or sale, with the proceeds going toward purchasing and renovating portions of the St. Ambrose School site.

Only one aquatic centre is required to serve the Southeast Galt area, either the John Dolson pool or the one proposed for the future Community Recreation Centre. As a first priority, the City should examine opportunities to retain and upgrade the John Dolson Centre and re-purpose all or a portion of St. Ambrose School into a Community Recreation Centre to collectively serve the immediate community and Southeast Galt. This direction would render the municipally-owned land east of Dundas Street and south of Main Street surplus. If long-term access to the Dolson / St. Ambrose facility cannot be assured, or if the project is found to be not viable, then the City should continue to move forward with the Community Recreation Centre at the proposed greenfield site in Southeast Galt, which would include an aquatic complex, along with other amenities.

A second issue relating to local indoor aquatic infrastructure is that the City’s existing indoor pools are relatively one-dimensional – they are traditional lane pools with deep water and only one can accommodate competitive training and meets (Dolson). The pools do not contain modern design elements and are becoming increasingly costly to operate and maintain due to their advanced age. Most notably, there are no public indoor leisure or therapeutic pools in the City, although the YMCA pool contains similar elements and there is a small therapeutic pool located at the Fairview Mennonite Home. In particular, the development of a therapeutic pool in the community has been identified as a priority by staff and is consistent with aquatic designs being pursued in many other communities. Such a facility could serve the aging population, infants/young children, persons with disabilities, and those recovering from injuries or other health conditions. Other than the YMCA facility, there are no public leisure pools, which are characterized by shallower water, irregular shapes, and waterplay elements such as slides and sprayers. In this light, the pursuit of a leisure / therapeutic pool can be supported in the short-term.
As mentioned earlier, there is expected to be demand for one additional pool in the short-term and another in the long-term. **An indoor aquatic complex would be an excellent fit with the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility**; however, the decision surrounding the John Dolson pool and the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre may have an impact on the scale and design of the indoor aquatic complex at the Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility. A multi-tank complex is the most likely scenario, with some combination of a 25-metre tank and leisure / therapeutic pool.

The third related matter is that, through the SportsPlex4Cambridge Campaign, the Cambridge Aquajets are seeking a 50-metre pool (8 to 10 lanes) with 500+ seat spectator capacity to enable competitive swimmers in the City and Region to train long course and to host major competitions. Facilities of this calibre are notoriously expensive to operate and difficult to program. The size, depth, and colder water of a 50-metre pool are not the best fit with an aging community that is seeking additional aquafit and therapeutic opportunities. Primary local demands are for recreational swims (e.g. lessons, leadership programs, therapeutic programs, etc.), which point to a need for a leisure tank of some form to ensure warmer temperatures, shallower depths, and integration of barrier-free and waterplay components.

Although the community is in need of additional indoor aquatic facilities, there are currently nine municipally owned 50-metre pools in Ontario (plus 9 at Ontario universities), two of which are in close proximity to Cambridge (Guelph and Brantford) and have capacity to assume additional competitive swimmers. The distribution of 50-metre pools around Cambridge suggest that the competitive swim meet market is generally well served in the region. A pool of this nature would be an ambitious project for a city the size of Cambridge and could be impacted by other major aquatic building projects in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, such as the three new 50-metre pools being built (with considerable funding from senior levels government) for the 2015 Pan Am and Parapan Am Games in Toronto and Markham.

Programming is a significant challenge for 50-metre pools and the existence of a local swim club alone is not enough to sustain such a facility. Not only would the local swim club be required to substantially increase its membership, so too would host of other users such as (but not limited to) learn to swim lessons, recreational swimming, synchronized swimming, masters swimming, water polo, diving, schools, meets / competitions, and outside rentals. A new facility of this type would also be create a loss of rental hours and income at existing City pools.

Due to their large size, spectator seating requirements, and technical construction standards, the cost to construct a 50-metre pool complex (without separate warm-up tank) is very high and can be estimated at $20 million or more. Annual net operating costs for 50-metre pools are also substantially higher than traditional pool designs and can exceed $1 million per year based on experiences in other communities. Several communities in Ontario have explored the feasibility of building 50-metre pools in the
past decade, with most municipalities concluding that a traditional 25-metre rectangular pool or leisure tank would be best to serve community-level recreational needs.

Based on the aforementioned factors, an elite-level competition tank (e.g., 50-metre pool) is not recommended to be built and operated by the City of Cambridge, particularly without the support of regional municipal partners and/or other significant partnership.

Based on the foregoing, the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:

4. Only one aquatic centre is required to serve the Southeast Galt area, either the John Dolson pool or the one proposed for the future Community Recreation Centre. As a first priority, the City should examine the viability of retaining and upgrading the John Dolson Centre and re-purposing all or a portion of St. Ambrose School into a Community Recreation Centre to collectively serve the immediate community and Southeast Galt. This direction would render the municipally-owned land east of Dundas Street and south of Main Street surplus. If long-term access to the Dolson / St. Ambrose facility cannot be assured, or if the project is found to be not viable, then the City should continue to move forward with the Community Recreation Centre at the proposed greenfield site in Southeast Galt, which would include an aquatic complex, along with other amenities.

5. Include an indoor aquatic complex as part of the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility. The scale and design of this indoor aquatic complex should be examined following the decision surrounding the John Dolson pool and the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre, although a multi-tank complex is the most likely scenario, with some combination of a 25-metre tank and leisure / therapeutic pool.

6. An elite-level competition tank (e.g., 50-metre pool) is not recommended to be built and operated by the City of Cambridge.

5.4 Indoor Turf

Inventory

The Com Dev Indoor Soccer Park – the City’s first indoor turf facility – opened in 2008 through a partnership between the City of Cambridge and Cambridge Youth Soccer. The facility is operated by Cambridge Youth Soccer as part of a 15-year lease agreement with the City; the City owns the land and contributed the majority of the capital funding, while the Club is responsible for operational costs and an annual contribution to a capital replacement reserve. The air supported dome consists of 3 indoor turf fields (each about 66 x 110 feet) plus a smaller developmental space, as well
as change rooms and administrative offices. The dome is situated north of Highway 401 and has excellent visibility and accessibility within Region.

ComDev Soccer Dome

Key Trends

Soccer in Canada underwent enormous growth in the 1990s (replacing baseball and hockey as the most popular team sports among Canada’s youth) and has been sustained by high registration in the past decade. This rise can be attributed to the gender neutrality of soccer, its affordability, its relevance to a wide range of ethnocultural groups, and increased exposure at all levels. The sport’s popularity continues today, however, its growth appears to be slowing across the province, including players in younger age cohorts. According to the Ontario Soccer Association (OSA), enrolment in outdoor soccer activities peaked in 2007 and has seen small declines each year since, most notably at the youth level.
In terms of indoor turf sports, the demand for indoor facilities has been largely driven by an increased emphasis on year-round training and competition. Provincially, the number of indoor soccer players registered by the OSA has increased by 24% since 2006 (compared to a 5% decline in outdoor registration in the same time period), although has been relatively steady over the past five seasons. Indoor soccer pertains to a much smaller segment of market compared to outdoor soccer. As of 2013, the ratio of outdoor to indoor soccer players is 4 to 1 in Ontario (in 2002, the ratio of outdoor to indoor players across Ontario was 6.25 to 1). Participation in indoor soccer is largely dependent on the availability, quality, and cost of appropriate facilities.

The development of indoor turf facilities is a widespread trend across Canada. The following points provide a brief overview of some of the key drivers behind this:

- The capacity of many soccer organizations is maturing, resulting in a greater emphasis on year-round player development and training excellence.

- Sports other than soccer are also emerging and seeing the benefit of year-round play and training opportunities. Depending on their design, indoor turf facilities can be utilized for a number of sports in addition to soccer; including lacrosse, football, rugby, field lacrosse, ultimate frisbee, baseball training, lawn bowling, special events, and party rentals.

- The design of indoor sports facilities is improving. For example:
  - the introduction of “field turf” technology provides a more natural, grass-like surface;
  - numerous construction options and facility components are available, including air supported domes (which are more affordable than pre-engineered structures and are gaining support in several communities), permanent buildings, or converted facilities (such as a re-purposed arena); and
  - many communities are building them as part of complexes to make use of economies of scale and to accommodate cross-programming opportunities.

- With sufficient demand levels, most indoor turf facilities generate strong cash flows, but can be challenged to maximize usage during the summer and daytime hours.

- In some communities, indoor turf facilities are operated in partnership with municipalities, local soccer clubs, school boards and/or private organizations to reduce construction and/or operating costs and to maximize usage. Relationships between municipal governments, other public agencies, and
community organizations have represented valuable ways to offer service delivery benefits for years.

**Usage & Demand Analysis**

According to the household survey, approximately 10% of Cambridge households have at least one member that participates in indoor soccer activities. 37% of residents support additional municipal spending on indoor soccer facilities, making them the lowest of the capital priorities that were polled. While indoor turf facilities are not as mainstream in their use as arenas and indoor pools, evidence from Cambridge and other communities suggests that the demand for indoor turf continues to be strong, despite waning registration levels in outdoor soccer.

The Com Dev Indoor Soccer Park is heavily used by local and regional sports organizations during the cold weather months, especially the 1,100 youth enrolled in Cambridge Youth Soccer’s indoor programs. According to soccer club, the dome is operating at capacity every weekday between 6pm to 11pm or later and from 9am to 11pm on weekends from mid-October to April. **The usage rate for a typical week during this time is approximately 92% (excluding the smaller developmental field), suggesting that the facility is near capacity** Usage during non-prime is much harder to generate and represents approximately 12% of the dome’s total usage.

For benchmarking purposes, we have examined indoor turf facility provision in relation to population, using the same listing the arena analysis. The benchmarking exercise includes facilities that are operated by municipalities and non-profit interests as the operating model for indoor turf facilities varies from community to community – some are operated by the municipality, some by local soccer clubs (as is the case in Cambridge), and some by private organizations (or some combination of the above). Relationships between municipal governments, other public agencies, and community organizations have represented valuable ways to offer service delivery benefits for years.
## Market Research – Indoor Turf Facility Provision in Comparator Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2011 Population</th>
<th>Number of Fields (small-sided)</th>
<th>Population per Field (total)</th>
<th>Population per Field (ages 5-19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>219,153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109,577</td>
<td>19,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>175,779</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35,156</td>
<td>6,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>149,607</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37,402</td>
<td>6,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>122,022</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61,011</td>
<td>13,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>121,688</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40,563</td>
<td>7,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>98,780</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16,463</td>
<td>3,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>147,838</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,029</td>
<td>9,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>133,000 (2013)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44,333</td>
<td>8,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of total population per indoor turf field, the current average of the benchmarked communities is one small-sided field per 50,029 residents or 9,447 youth (ages 5 to 19). Currently, the level of provision of indoor turf fields in Cambridge is marginally higher than that of the comparator group, with one small-sided field per 44,333 residents or 8,422 youth. **As such, the City is generally keeping pace with provision levels in other communities.**

From the consultants’ experience, we have found that nearly every urban community in Ontario with a population over 100,000 has at least one indoor sports field and some communities less than half this size are beginning to provide or consider such facilities. The decision to provide an indoor turf facility is driven by a variety of factors that may be unique to each community, including strength of local organizations, activity interests, socio-demographic profiles, willingness to travel, regional supplies, construction and operating cost, etc. As a result, a per capita provision target is not the recommended approach for determining indoor sports field needs; rather, it is more appropriate to look at the usage potential from local sports organizations.

One measure of demand is the number of youth participants currently registered in both indoor and outdoor field sports, most notably soccer activities which have the greatest ability to use turf fields for the duration of the winter season. According to Cambridge Youth Soccer, there are over 4,000 youth playing outdoor soccer in Cambridge. With an estimated 25,265 residents in Cambridge’s 5-19 age cohort (2014 estimate) and 4,000+ registrants, this means that at least 16% of the City’s children and youth participate in organized outdoor soccer, a rate that is similar to the provincial average. **There are approximately 1,100 youth playing indoor soccer in Cambridge, plus an additional 100 on a waiting list.** For every 3.3 outdoor soccer players, one is playing indoor soccer in the City, a ratio that is generally in line with trends seen across the province,
suggested that local supply and demand factors are generally well balanced at this time.

Complete participation data for adult soccer and other sports (e.g., baseball, football, lacrosse, etc.) is not currently available, nor is it necessary to project indoor demand as many of these sports tend to be secondary users of indoor turf facilities, with usage heaviest in the spring.

Each indoor turf field has the capacity to offer 53 prime time hours per week (Monday to Friday from 6 to 11 pm and Saturday to Sunday from 9 am to 11 pm), in addition to non-prime hours. It is reasonable to expect each indoor field could be used for well over 60 hours per week, including shoulder times.

Profiles of high-performing indoor turf facilities (with strong local soccer leagues) suggest that for approximately every 1.5 youth indoor soccer players, one adult will also play indoor soccer where the facilities are available. In Cambridge, this would translate into approximately 800 adults playing the sport. Further, the average indoor soccer program requires 1 hour per week on an indoor field for approximately every 20 players; this ratio can vary depending on the age of the participant, the level of competition (e.g., rep/travel teams require more practice time), and the type of activity (e.g., skills training, game, etc.).

Application of these ratios finds a demand for approximately 100 hours per week for local indoor soccer activities (equivalent to approximately 2 small-sided fields). This calculation does not account for access by other sports or by non-resident groups. Profiles from other indoor facilities suggest that soccer will be far and away the predominant use. Unless there is a unique non-soccer group that requires significant access, the proportion of non-soccer usage is likely to be close to 10% or 15%.

Based on this demand methodology, the current demand for indoor turf facilities (for all local indoor field sport uses) in the City of Cambridge is approximately 2 indoor fields. An examination of facility schedules identifies several rentals from out-of-town soccer groups, soccer organizations with region-wide memberships, and non-soccer groups (e.g., rugby, cricket, etc.) which are sufficient to utilize the remaining prime time capacity in the 3-field Com Dev Indoor Soccer Park.

**Future Considerations**

Looking toward the future, the demand for indoor turf space is likely to increase. Assuming that demand will rise in proportion to the increases in the City’s youth and adult population, an additional 20% growth can be anticipated by 2031. Looking at locally generated needs only, this would translate into a need for approximately 2.5 total indoor fields by 2031. This can be satisfied by the current supply, but would necessitate the use of additional non-prime hours or the reallocation of time away from non-resident groups. A facility allocation policy may be helpful in making this transition.
Alternately, should the City wish to continue to capture a portion of regional demand, including users from outside Cambridge, it is possible that additional facility development could be required. The development of a new indoor turf facility should be accompanied by a business case and give proper consideration to the supply and demand factors across the Region of Waterloo and beyond. The financial viability of an indoor turf facility is heavily influenced by its size, type of construction, operating model, and market.

Based on the assumption that the emphasis on indoor turf facility provision should be on local needs first and foremost, the development of an additional indoor facility is not recommended at this time. Future local demand should be generally well accommodated within the existing indoor turf facility, as well as proposed outdoor turf fields and gymnasiums (e.g., futsal, and other field sports).

**Based on the foregoing, the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:**

7. **Continue to maintain the current supply of three small-sided indoor turf fields.** To accommodate growing demand from local organizations, usage during non-prime hours or the reallocation of time away from non-resident groups may be required. A facility allocation policy may be helpful in making this transition.

### 5.5 Gymnasiums

There is one municipally-owned and operated gymnasium in the City of Cambridge (W.G. Johnson Centre). The Chaplin Family YMCA Cambridge, which is operated in partnership with the City, also contains a gymnasium.

In addition, there are numerous local school gymnasiums that are used by the City and community organizations for leisure programming (including St. Ambrose School, which is associated with the John Dolson Pool). Community Use of School initiatives and joint use agreements are in place to provide the City and not-for-profit groups with affordable access to school board facilities, including gymnasiums, auditoriums, classrooms, sports fields, etc. Nevertheless, there continue to be challenges (e.g., scheduling, priority allocation, cancellations, costs, etc.) in maximizing community access to school gymnasiums and similar spaces. In addition, changing school board policies make it difficult for community programs to be established and flourish.

Gymnasiums are typically designed with adaptability and flexibility in mind as they are able to accommodate a wide variety of formal and drop-in sports and recreation opportunities that require a hard surface and a large open space. Common activities include basketball, volleyball, badminton, pickleball, general fitness, and other active programs. Gymnasiums can also be used for a variety of non-recreational activities.
such as trade shows, large gatherings and other events, although they are generally restricted so as not to damage the flooring or interfere with core bookings.

Due to their versatility, municipalities across Ontario are increasingly including gymnasiums within recreation centres. While there is no standard template, gymnasiums are typically influenced by community needs, although the minimum size should be large enough to accommodate a school-sized basketball court measuring approximately 23 metres by 13 metres (74 feet by 42 feet) with high ceilings. It is common for larger communities to provide gymnasiums large enough for multiple basketball courts, with curtains to facilitate simultaneous programming.

According to the household survey, approximately 20% of Cambridge households have at least one member that participates in gymnasium sports. Only 39% of residents support additional municipal spending on gymnasiums, making them a lower priority for the public, who may not be fully aware of the challenges in gaining reliable access to school gymnasiums.

Gymnasium space within Cambridge is scarce and – like in most communities – the demand is strong. Indoor court sports (e.g., basketball, volleyball, etc.) continue to be popular and others, such as pickleball, are emerging. Gymnasiums are a good fit with other recreation facilities (particularly fitness centres and indoor pools) and their versatility enables these spaces to also accommodate rising demand for non-structured activities and drop-in programs, such as day camps, dry land training, teen programs, and much more.

Gymnasiums should be core components of both the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre, although their size (e.g., double, triple, etc.) and design (e.g., spectator seating, stage, etc.) should be appropriate to the scale of the facility and intended scope of services. Ideally, the gymnasiums should have associated change rooms and be divisible into two or more smaller courts with a drop-down partition to accommodate simultaneous program options. Consultation with key stakeholders and potential partners is necessary to better define the size and design of the proposed gymnasiums.

In addition, meeting and activity rooms are mandatory amenities within any modern recreation centre as they take advantage to economies of scale associated with operation and maintenance and to maximize rental and cross-programming opportunities. In order to meet a variety of recreation and community needs, meeting and multi-purpose spaces should form important parts of any new recreation centre in Cambridge. These spaces should be suitable for a wide range of community programming and rentals, such as introductory dance, martial arts, aerobics, after-school programs, arts and crafts, birthday parties, meetings, dinners, etc.
Based on the foregoing, the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:

8. Incorporate gymnasiums within all new major recreation facilities, ideally divisible into two or more courts and with associated change rooms.

9. Incorporate meeting and activity rooms within all new major recreation facilities to allow for community activities, 50+ programming, and rentals.

10. Consultation with key stakeholders and potential partners is necessary to better define the size and design of the proposed gymnasiums and meeting/activity rooms.

5.6 Indoor Walking Track

The City of Cambridge does not currently have a purpose-built indoor walking or jogging track within any of its municipal recreational facilities; however, the YMCA and Langs both contain small indoor tracks.

Walking is the most common recreational activity for the large majority of the population. This is particularly true for older adults and seniors; parents with young children and rehab patients are also a primary market due to the social and therapeutic benefits. Indoor tracks are particularly useful for promoting year-round activity, especially during the winter season and times of inclement weather. As a result, indoor walking tracks are becoming more common, particularly those encircling ice pads, gymnasiums, indoor turf fields, and fitness centres. Beyond access during inclement weather, indoor tracks also provide an appropriate surface for walking and/or running, enhanced safety and security, and access to other amenities within the broader facility.

Many multi-use recreation facilities are now including indoor walking tracks in response to high levels of demand. Indoor walking tracks then to have two to three lanes with a rubberized surface; their length is usually dependent upon the design and intended use (e.g., a running track may be 200 metres or more whereas a track geared towards walking may be smaller). Most municipal walking tracks are provided free of charge, although some require a nominal admission charge. The steady volume of use is typically viewed as achieving the intent of promoting physical activity while increasing the “foot traffic” of a community centre as a whole. Morning and daytime use is common amongst young parents and older adults.

An indoor walking track can be a lower cost facility option in terms of capital and operating costs (although it is not likely to be revenue-generating). This amenity has been found in other communities to be well used in the winter season (and also year-round) and would assist in improving physical activity levels for many residents, particularly the aging population that is seeking more recreational opportunities. Indoor tracks are also a good fit with objectives supporting the expansion of casual,
unorganized, and affordable opportunities for all ages. As such, an indoor track should be considered in plans for any and all future multi-purpose community facilities within the City.

**Based on the foregoing the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:**

11. Incorporate indoor walking opportunities (e.g. indoor track or route) within all new major recreation facilities.

### 5.7 Fitness and Wellness Centres

The City of Cambridge operates four conditioning rooms, each of which is associated with a 50+ Recreation Centre: Allan Reuter Centre, David Durward Centre, W.G. Johnson Centre, and William E. Pautler Centre. The City’s membership fees are slightly higher for the conditioning centre at the W.G. Johnson Centre than for those at the other 50+ Recreation Centres due to its broader target market. However, compared to private sector fitness centres, the City's conditioning rooms are quite small and their fees are much lower. Most of the City's conditioning rooms were not initially designed for such purposes and, as they are converted spaces, many lack the space and amenities common in purpose-built facilities (e.g., showers, studios, etc.).

While some fitness services may be similar to those offered by other providers, the City’s focus is largely on providing affordable physical activity to its residents within facilities that offer fewer amenities than generally offered by the private sector. Providing affordable recreation opportunities that encourage greater levels of physical activity is a key objective for the City and its conditioning rooms contribute toward this goal.

In addition to private sector fitness facilities, the Chaplin Family YMCA Cambridge has a large fitness centre with associated amenities (e.g., indoor pool, gymnasium, racquetball courts, etc.) that is operated through a partnership with the City. As stated earlier, this arrangement has been successful and is generally cost effective. It is not the City’s intent to directly compete with the YMCA or private sector operations and the provision of a full-scale municipally-operated fitness centre is not considered to be a core City service.

Nevertheless, fitness centres are well used and in demand. The 2013 household survey found that approximately 47% of Cambridge households have at least one member that participates in aerobics, fitness, or weight-training activities. The survey also found that 45% of residents supported additional spending on fitness centres, placing it is a moderate priority.

While most larger Ontario urban municipalities offer some form of studio-based active living programs, not all municipalities choose to provide equipment-based facilities due
to the cost of entry/operation and competition with the private sector. For those municipalities that operate municipal fitness facilities, most are oriented to introductory users, including older adults. Fitness facilities can help generate the foot traffic needed to enhance community centre utilization rates, while providing an added revenue stream to offset other subsidized components, such as an aquatic centre. On the other hand, large format municipal fitness centres tend to require higher capital and operating investments (notably, collective bargaining agreements often influence staffing costs to a greater degree than the private sector), and are often hindered by the municipal budgeting process (e.g., new equipment and amenities have to be approved through annual capital plans whereas the private sector can upgrade its services almost instantly).

There is a renewed interest in physical fitness activities across Ontario, which is creating new demands within the private and public fitness sectors. Active living programming centred on cardiovascular and stretching activities (e.g., aerobics, yoga, zumba, spin classes, etc.) is particularly in high demand at the moment. Fitness trends can change from year to year, although the primary goal of self-improvement and leading an active, healthy lifestyle remains the same. Some key trends in fitness for 2014 are small group fitness programs, high-intensity interval training, strength training, and fitness programs for children, older adults, and seniors.¹³

Fitness centres enjoy a symbiotic relationship with other activity spaces, such as indoor pools, gymnasiums, older adult space, and activity rooms – these types of amenities tend to succeed when clustered together. As such, future municipal recreation facility development should consider including fitness and wellness space (equipment and/or studio-based). To be successful, these spaces must be large enough to respond to local needs and attain prescribed financial goals. This is suggestive of larger spaces than what the City currently provides. As such, it is recommended that the City seek partnerships in the operation of fitness and wellness facilities within new recreation facilities, including the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre.

In terms of programs and services, national trends indicate that there is increasing interest in a broad range of holistic, health-based, and specialized active living programs and activities. “Active living” programs and services that seek to integrate physical activities into one’s daily routine are also an increasing focus of municipal recreation departments, especially as the number of older adults increases. The City has a variety of spaces (e.g., conditioning rooms, gymnasiums, and multi-use rooms) that can accommodate these activities. Opportunities to enhance and/or increase active living programming within existing and future community facilities should be explored.

Based on the foregoing, the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:

12. Seek partnerships in the operation of fitness and wellness facilities within new recreation facilities, including the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre. Consider providing larger-scale municipal conditioning centres should a third-party partnership not be viable.

13. Continue to explore opportunities to enhance and/or increase active living (health and wellness) programming within existing and future community facilities.

5.8 50+ Centres (Older Adult Centres)

The City of Cambridge operates four 50+ Recreation Centres, as described below and identified on the following map (along with other notable municipal recreation facilities).

Allan Reuter Centre

- The Allen Reuter Centre is located in Preston and offers a lunch program for its members, in addition to the wide range of programming offered including a caregiver support program.
- The Centre is co-located with a fire hall, with portions of the 32,506sf building built in 1890, 1967, and 1994.
- The facility is partially accessible, but lacks an elevator on one side, which restricts access to the basement.
- Staff have reported that some rooms are too small and that parking can sometimes be problematic (primarily on-street).

- The City has identified $643,000 in capital renewal costs (uninflated) between 2014 and 2023; this includes the fire hall.

**David Durward Centre**

- The David Durward Centre is located in downtown Galt and offers a variety of fitness, computer, craft, special interest, support, and cooking programs.

- The Centre is a 3-storey heritage building that is co-located with the Cambridge Arts Centre.

- Portions of 34,701sf building (including arts centre) were built in 1921 and the 1950s. Notable renovations occurred in 1993 and 2000.

- The facility is partially accessible, but lacks an elevator to the basement, which restricts access to the conditioning room.

- The City has identified $10,133 in capital renewal costs (uninflated) between 2014 and 2023; this includes the arts centre.
W.G. Johnson Centre (Ted Wake)

- The Ted Wake Lounge, located in Hespeler, offers similar programs as the David Durward and Allen Reuter Centres, and boasts an outdoor garden patio.
- The facility is co-located with the W.G. Johnson Centre, which offers a large complement of recreational opportunities.
- The facility is fully accessible with off-street parking.
- The City has identified $595,301 in capital renewal costs (uninflated) between 2014 and 2023; this figure includes the entirety of the W.G. Johnson Centre.

William E. Pautler Centre

- The William E. Pautler Centre opened in 2012 through a partnership with Langs and features a new walking track, gymnasium, and exercise studio.
- This facility is popular amongst the City’s more elderly 50+ Centre members due to its health centre partnership model.
• The facility is fully accessible with off-street parking, although staff have reported that parking can sometimes be a challenge.

• Capital renewal costs have not been identified for this facility as it opened in 2012.

Membership at any of the centres allows users the flexibility to participate in any of the four centres drop-in programs. While most of the programs are for people over 50, many of the evening registered programs are open to anyone 18 and over. There were a total of 11,283 participants at the 4 centres in 2012. The following table indicates that there are over 2,000 members across the four centres, with the David Durward Centre being the home facility for more than half of all members. Membership declined by 4% between 2011 and 2013.

Membership – City of Cambridge 50+ Centres (2011 to 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50+ Centre</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan Reuter</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Durward</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Wake</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.E. Pautler</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Cambridge, 2014

Older adults are increasingly remaining active longer in life than past generations, as well as continuing to work later in life, which has caused a shift in the type and intensity of recreation activities pursued by the different age cohorts within this population. The Baby Boomers, as a group, are more active and fit than those that came before them. This will continue to be of interest as they age, and is expected to result in an increase in drop-in, fitness, and education activities, as well as specialized programs tailored to niche interests. However, there will also still be older adults that are interested in traditional pursuits, which will require the continued provision of a broad range of opportunities. The continued aging of the population will create expanded and new demands on the recreation sector for decades to come.

Few communities are establishing new stand-alone older adults centres, instead opting to integrate older adult spaces and programming within multi-use community centres that offer a wider variety of options and efficiencies (e.g., fitness centres, pools, and gymnasiums, etc.). Older adult centres are generally regarded as an important part of the health care and recreation sectors due to their many physical and social benefits, although only about 10% of Ontario’s older adult population are active members. The primary market for most older adult centres is the 65-plus age group, although membership tends to be available to those 50 or 55 years of age and older. In general, older adult centres have been most successful in attracting individuals from lower or middle income brackets, including a high portion of single women.

A Seniors’ Community Needs Assessment completed by the Social Planning Council of Cambridge and North Dumfries in 2011 found good satisfaction levels with the community buildings within these municipalities, as most facilities were seen as being generally accessible and well kept (this finding was also supported by the Community Services Master Plan survey). Priority recommendations emerging from this study focused less on facilities and more on aspects such as coordination and support services.

Dedicated space and services for both seniors are vital to a healthy community. These spaces and service providers take several different forms across the City, from stand-alone centres to shared facilities and from City-provided to community-provided. Access, affordability, and responsive services are key principles that all of these spaces strive to provide. In the community survey undertaken in support of the Community Services Master Plan, 57% of residents supported additional spending on 50+ recreation centres, ranking it as a moderate priority.

Previous community engagement efforts have indicated that Cambridge older adults prefer a decentralized model with multiple satellite facilities over one centrally-located facility. While this may still hold true, there appears to be growing support for integrated facilities – 61% of respondents agreed with the statement that “Seniors’ recreational needs should be met at multi-use facilities rather than providing stand-alone facilities exclusively for seniors”. From both a customer service and operational perspective,
these types of spaces should be integrated with other community facilities wherever possible, which generally describes the model followed in Cambridge.

There is little doubt that the provision of older adult facilities and services will require greater attention into the future. The City’s 50 and over age cohort increased by 38% between 2001 and 2011, while the rest of Cambridge’s population increased by only 7%. Age cohort projections for the Region suggest that the 50+ age group will continue to increase at a greater rate than the rest of the population, most notably the 65+ age group, which could increase nearly 150% times by 2036. As was noted earlier, many of the City’s older adult residents currently live in established neighbourhoods closer to the City’s various downtown cores; therefore, maintaining accessible satellite locations will continue to be a priority. Accessibility within these centres – many of which are multi-level – was raised as a concern and it is recommended that the City undertake accessibility audits to address deficiencies in a prioritized manner.

Traditionally, seniors have tended to participate in less physically rigorous activities, such as card playing, crafts, trips, socialization, etc. Although these pursuits will remain an important aspect of seniors' services, the aging baby boomers are more fit and focussed than previous generations on maintaining an active lifestyle. This is expected to translate into increased participation in active recreation pursuits (albeit at a gentler pace), particularly those that are health and fitness related. In this way, the leisure demands of the new senior will closely mirror the needs of older adults, which include activities such as fitness and swimming. As such, if the City establishes new seniors' spaces, strong consideration should be given to co-locating centres/clubs with community centres, rather than creating new stand-alone facilities.

Now that the boomers are reaching their senior years, the amount of segmentation within the 50+ group is growing based not just on age, but also on ability, income, culture, etc. This has substantial implications on seniors' facilities and programming. For example, many of the older senior centres are ill-equipped to meet the wide range of needs of those ranging in age from 50 to over 90+ years old, nor are program options available to all interests amongst this age range (e.g., mixture of daytime and evening programming). It is anticipated that most existing 50+ centres will continue to cater toward the more social interests typical of the "traditional senior", while new facilities will offer opportunities to cater toward the more active recreational interests more typically associated with the baby boom generation. The latter need not take the form of dedicated space for older adults, but rather requires an emphasis on drop-in and registered programs for older adults.

**Based on the foregoing, the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:**

14. **Maintain the City’s existing 50+ Recreation Centres as primary hubs for local older adult services, particularly those that emphasize social connections and healthy living and that cater to an older demographic.**
15. Undertake accessibility audits of the 50+ Recreation Centres and develop a plan to address deficiencies as well as modern upgrades in a prioritized manner.

16. As part of the broader mix of services, provide older adult programming at the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and/or the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre to accommodate a greater range of active recreational and inclusive opportunities for older adults.

5.9 Gymnastics

While the City does not operate any gymnastics facilities, it does have a partnership agreement whereby it provides space to the Cambridge Kips Gymnastics Club. The Club currently operates out of two facilities – a 10,000sf Main Campus (owned by the City) and a 7,400sf custom-built North Campus that collectively accommodate nearly 2,000 recreational participants and 60 competitive gymnasts. The Kips are one of two gymnastics organizations within the City, the other being Dynamo Gymnastics, which is based within a 15,000sf facility that they independently manage.

A number of years ago, the City of Cambridge committed to providing the group with a new purpose-built facility to replace its Main Campus building. One option that has been identified is a co-location partnership at the proposed Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre. The SportsPlex4Cambridge Campaign has indicated that the club is interested in integrating their gymnastics facility into the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and have submitted a proposal for a 26,400sf facility capable of hosting national and provincial meets.

While the provision of gymnastics facilities is not considered a core municipal service, the longstanding agreement with the Kips has led the City to consider extending this partnership to a new facility. There are several examples of independently-operated gymnastics facilities within municipal recreation centres, including Milton, Oakville, and Orangeville to name a few. Continuation of this partnership, with terms that adequately protect the City’s investment, would assist in maintaining this service to the community over the long-term. A location that best serves the needs of both parties – whether the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility or the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre – should be the subject of further negotiations and may depend on the specific sites that are chosen and their ability to accommodate the desired building programme, as well as their proximity to the target market.

Based on the foregoing, the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:

17. Work with the Cambridge Kips Gymnastics Club to establish the terms of a partnership for the lease of space within either the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility or the Southeast Galt Community Recreation
Centre; this is replacement space for the City-owned facility that the Club currently occupies.

5.10 Other Indoor Recreation Facilities

A subsequent step in this planning process involves additional public consultation. Through this consultation, it is possible that the City will receive several unsolicited requests from local organizations for new or expanded community recreation facilities, many of which may not be core municipal services (e.g., 50-metre pool, long-track indoor speed skating oval, indoor tennis centre, etc.). It may even be possible for some proposed activities to be accommodated within under-utilized or re-purposed municipal facilities, such as decommissioned arenas.

While new recreational activities may offer significant benefit to area residents, difficult decisions will need to be made as to both the level of demand and the role of various partners in their funding and operation. Not all facilities need to be provided by the City – the non-profit, education, and private sectors each offer varying levels of opportunity to be involved in facility development, funding, and operation.

Nevertheless, it is good practice for municipalities to remain open to discussion from emerging and growing community recreation groups. Unsolicited proposals should be evaluated through a formal partnership framework, with consideration to the City's ability and interest in participating in such projects. A partnership framework should place the onus on the proponent to provide the following items at minimum:

- a comprehensive needs analysis
- a comprehensive business plan
- the organization’s financial capacity
- a demonstration of the sustainability of the project
- detailed evidence of community benefits
- full risk analysis

Based on the foregoing, the following preliminary directions are presented for consideration:

18. Other ancillary uses within the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and/or Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre may be considered, such as office and storage space for local organizations, food services, accessory retail, health practitioners, and more.

19. Establish a partnership framework to assist in evaluating unsolicited proposals for new or expanded community recreation facilities.
6. Vision & Options

This section contains a summary of the identified needs and options for future consideration as the City moves forward in its planning for the development of the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre and Multi-Use Sports and Recreation Complex, as well as key directions for existing indoor recreation facilities.

6.1 Summary of Preliminary Directions

The following preliminary directions were identified in Section 5:

1. Begin the process of decommissioning and/or re-purposing two of the following three single pad arenas: Karl Homuth, Dickson, and/or Duncan McIntosh Arenas. Seek public input and proposals for alternate uses for the surplus sites.

2. Replace the two decommissioned arenas with a twin pad arena as part of the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility. A quad pad arena cannot be justified at this time; however, the City should ensure that the facility has the potential to expand to four ice pads as part of a potential future development phase, should there be sufficient demand. Capacity of the signature rink should not exceed 1,000 seats. Other design features should include six change rooms per ice pad, barrier-free amenities, community activity spaces, and more.

3. As demand increases, a more robust ice allocation policy incorporating standards of play and guidelines addressing home rink scheduling may also be required.

4. Only one aquatic centre is required to serve the Southeast Galt area, either the John Dolson pool or the one proposed for the future Community Recreation Centre. As a first priority, the City should examine the viability of retaining and upgrading the John Dolson Centre and re-purposing all or a portion of St. Ambrose School into a Community Recreation Centre to collectively serve the immediate community and Southeast Galt. This direction would render the municipally-owned land east of Dundas Street and south of Main Street surplus. If long-term access to the Dolson / St. Ambrose facility cannot be assured, or if the project is found to be not viable, then the City should continue to move forward with the Community Recreation Centre at the proposed greenfield site in Southeast Galt, which would include an aquatic complex, along with other amenities.

5. Include an indoor aquatic complex as part of the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility. The scale and design of this indoor aquatic complex should be examined following the decision surrounding the John Dolson
pool and the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre, although a multi-tank complex is the most likely scenario, with some combination of a 25-metre tank and leisure / therapeutic pool.

6. An elite-level competition tank (e.g., 50-metre pool) is not recommended to be built and operated by the City of Cambridge.

7. Continue to maintain the current supply of three small-sided indoor turf fields. To accommodate growing demand from local organizations, usage during non-prime hours or the reallocation of time away from non-resident groups may be required. A facility allocation policy may be helpful in making this transition.

8. Incorporate gymnasiums within all new major recreation facilities, ideally divisible into two or more courts and with associated change rooms.

9. Incorporate meeting and activity rooms within all new major recreation facilities to allow for community activities, 50+ programming, and rentals.

10. Consultation with key stakeholders and potential partners is necessary to better define the size and design of the proposed gymnasiums and meeting/activity rooms.

11. Incorporate indoor walking opportunities (e.g. indoor track or route) within all new major recreation facilities.

12. Seek partnerships in the operation of fitness and wellness facilities within new recreation facilities, including the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre. Consider providing larger-scale municipal conditioning centres should a third-party partnership not be viable.

13. Continue to explore opportunities to enhance and/or increase active living (health and wellness) programming within existing and future community facilities.

14. Maintain the City’s existing 50+ Recreation Centres as primary hubs for local older adult services, particularly those that emphasize social connections and healthy living and that cater to an older demographic.

15. Undertake accessibility audits of the 50+ Recreation Centres and develop a plan to address deficiencies as well as modern upgrades in a prioritized manner.

16. As part of the broader mix of services, provide older adult programming at the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and/or the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre to accommodate a greater range of active recreational and inclusive opportunities for older adults.
17. Work with the Cambridge Kips Gymnastics Club to establish the terms of a partnership for the lease of space within either the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility or the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre; this is replacement space for the City-owned facility that the Club currently occupies.

18. Other ancillary uses within the proposed Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and/or Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre may be considered, such as office and storage space for local organizations, food services, accessory retail, health practitioners, and more.

19. Establish a partnership framework to assist in evaluating unsolicited proposals for new or expanded community recreation facilities.

6.2 Draft Vision for the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre

The Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre is proposed to be a community-level facility serving multiple neighbourhoods in the Southeast Galt area. Municipal operation is likely, possibly with partner-operated sub-components. The construction cost is currently estimated at approximately $11.1 million. The first step towards achieving the vision for this facility is to decide on the preferred site and development approach (i.e., Greenfield construction or re-purposing of the Dolson Pool / St. Ambrose Elementary School).

Pending public input and expressed partners/stakeholder interests, the following components and associated programming should be considered for the proposed Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre:

- indoor aquatic complex (design may be site dependent); 50-metre pool is not recommended
- gymnasium (divisible)
- meeting and activity rooms
- indoor walking track or route
- fitness and wellness facilities (possible third-party partnership) or municipal conditioning centre
- Cambridge Kips gymnastics facility (to be determined)
6.3 Draft Vision for the Multi-Use Sports and Recreation Complex

The Multi-Use Sports and Recreation Complex is proposed to be a City-wide facility serving the entire City of Cambridge, with regional/provincial sport tourism potential. The detailed management approach is to be determined, but may include a third-party partnership. The total project cost is currently estimated at approximately $53 million.

Pending public input and expressed partner/stakeholder interest, the following components and associated programming should be considered for the proposed Multi-Use Sports and Recreation Complex:

- twin pad (with expansion potential to four pads in a future phase); capacity of the signature rink should not exceed 1,000 seats
- indoor aquatic complex with some combination of a 25-metre tank and leisure / therapeutic pool (design may be dependent on decision surrounding the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre);
- gymnasium (divisible); size may be dependent on stakeholder and/or partner needs
- meeting and activity rooms
- indoor walking track
- fitness and wellness facilities (possible third-party partnership) or municipal conditioning centre

6.4 Partnership Considerations

68% of community survey respondents agreed that “The City should consider partnerships with the private or not-for-profit sectors for the construction and operation of indoor recreation facilities”. Although the scope of this study did not include discussions with potential partners, it is possible that there may be potential partners interested in becoming involved with a new municipal recreation project. Additionally, there may be other local not-for-profit groups, service clubs or quasi-public agencies that have resources that could be dedicated to the project or expertise that may be leveraged to enhance the services and programs available from the new facility. The City is advised to pursue or address interests from outside organizations utilizing a standard partnership framework.

In order to maximize value to the community, partnerships with local organizations in the funding and operation of the facility may be established (future partners will depend on a number of financial factors, as well as the characteristics and location of the site, the services offered within the complex, etc.). Nurturing these relationships can be
complicated and time-consuming, but is imperative to the long-term success of the facility and recreational offerings in the City. Coordinated, thoughtful, and proactive planning must be the cornerstones upon which the new facilities are built.

6.5 Facility Design Considerations

From our experience, we have found the following to be important factors to consider when beginning the design process for large-scale public recreation facilities. The City may wish to review and supplement these considerations prior to issuing an RFP for architectural services.

The facilities should:

- ensure full barrier-free compliance with facility accessibility design standards and AODA
- be located so that they are accessible by public transit and active transportation choices
- be designed with flexibility in mind so as to increase longevity and responsiveness to changing needs and opportunities
- promote a welcoming atmosphere, including appropriate lighting and use of windows, open and casual front desk, and a lounge/lobby area; entrance(s) should be visible from the approaches to the building and the visibility of the entire exterior is important also for passive safety and security
- have a single point control desk for efficient staffing and ease of maintenance
- be organized with a clear public circulation system with all program rooms visible from a lobby and entrance. Blind corridors should be avoided
- be designed on CPTED principles, with clear visibility from the control and administration directly to a well lit site and parking area
- encourage opportunities for casual interaction, including space for parents waiting for children in programs
- wherever possible, ensure that each “multi-purpose” space has access to the main hallway of the complex, as well as access to a sink for washing/clean-up; the flooring for each “multi-purpose” space should be reflective of the type of activities envisioned for the space
• ensure that public washrooms have view baffles without doors for aural control; washroom entrances should be clearly visible from the public lobby and the control desk

• respond to the site, making connections to adjacent parks, paths, and exterior terraces; seek opportunities to develop complementary outdoor playscapes and facilities

• embrace LEED principles on all environmental levels (it is anticipated that the City will seek to achieve LEED Gold certification); facilities should be oriented to work in harmony with the landforms of the site and take advantage of the 'low-tech' assistance of the site sun and wind angles

• take advantage of balanced natural light for low-glare interior illumination and reduced energy costs

• be based on a clear organization that anticipates future growth and program expansion without disrupting the operation of the facility

• consider mechanical and electrical systems that leverage the benefits of the building type, including heat recovery on the refrigeration system, re-use of low grade recycled heat, and energy efficient LED lighting

• where required, be designed to act as Emergency Evacuation Centres for the area (i.e., provide shelter and food to people affected by significant local or regional emergencies)
7. Next Steps

The following are the major steps recommended to achieve the vision for the Multi-Purpose Sport and Recreation Facility and the Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre, listed in general order of implementation. The two facilities may proceed together or apart (depending on funding, partners, desired timing, etc.), although there is benefit to including both facilities within the same initial public consultation phase at the very least. Not included below are the various stages of review and approval provided by City staff, potential partners, and City Council.

1. Establish Task Force and internal staff teams or working groups (terms of reference, appointments, project charter, communications, etc.)

2. Examine viability of retaining and upgrading the John Dolson Centre and repurposing all or a portion of St. Ambrose School into a Community Recreation Centre to collectively serve the immediate community and Southeast Galt

3. Undertake public consultation program to confirm a cohesive vision for the following:
   - decommissioning and/or re-purposing two of the following three single pad arenas: Karl Homuth, Dickson, and/or Duncan McIntosh Arenas
   - Southeast Galt Community Recreation Centre components, location, model, etc.
   - Multi-Use Sports and Recreation Complex components, location, model, etc.

4. Define partnership arrangement with Cambridge Kips Gymnastics Club and identify preferred site for gymnastics facility

5. Secure land for Multi-Use Sports and Recreation Complex; seek planning approvals if necessary

6. Confirm partner interest in either/both projects and establish memorandum of understanding; establish a partnership framework for unsolicited proposals

7. Conduct tour of comparable facilities and confirm space requirements

8. Confirm management approach (alternate service delivery) and general program plan

9. Prepare preliminary business plan (cost estimates) and develop preliminary concept plans / functional program
10. Secure base funding

11. Initiate RFQ/RFP for architectural services and/or construction manager

12. Refinement of concepts through subsequent public consultation phase; refine cost estimates as necessary

13. Establish user agreements (if applicable)

14. Launch fundraising campaign (if applicable)

15. Design, construction, and commissioning phase

It is expected that this proposed vision for the two facilities will be refined and may include significant changes as the design process and community engagement process unfold. Decisions on specific capital projects will be determined through future study and consultation with stakeholders, potential partners, and the general public.