

Indoor Tennis Proposal

Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation | vancouverparks.ca

Outline

- Indoor Tennis Proposals:
 - Vancouver Indoor Public Tennis Project (VIPTP)
 - False Creek Community Centre Association
- Preliminary report back from July 2008 Committee
- Proponent Group presentations.

Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation | vancouverparks.ca

Proposal - VIPTP

- Park Board to build and operate an indoor tennis facility – 5 courts or more
- Advocates programming philosophy in harmony with Vancouver Sport Strategy (Canada Sport For Life model).
- Evolving preference for the development of a tennis centre building (similar to Grant Connell Centre in North Van).

Proposal – False Creek

- Cover 2-3 Courts adjacent to Centre, on Granville Island
- Mixed use (tennis and large gatherings) as an extension of Community Centre programming
- Association is working on partnerships to realize this objective

July 2008 Committee - report back

Committee direction:

- THAT Park Board staff work with this group (VIPTP) to develop a Feasibility Study and report back to the Board in the spring of 2009.
 - Carried Unanimously

Major Questions

- Potential locations with existing support amenities?
- Potential full tennis centre locations?
- Cost benefit comparisons of construction types, number of courts, support amenities?
- Feasibility and scope of Property Endowment Fund to finance on loan basis?
- Deliver a feasibility analysis, including preferred location and construction type, concept and funding plan by Spring 2009.

Potential Locations (questions 1 and 2)

- *Convergence sites*: Outside tennis courts close to existing support amenities (e.g., staffed reception area, wash/change rooms, security, on-site maintenance, etc.)
- *New Tennis Centre sites*: Land requirements for development of a “tennis community centre.”

Convergence Sites

- Sites with existing courts and support capacities, or where such capacity could be expanded or built to serve two or more functions, including indoor tennis.
 - Queen Elizabeth Park (Kersland Reservoir), False Creek, Champlain Park, Memorial South, Memorial West, Trout Lake, Moberly Park, Rupert Park, Kitsilano Community Centre, Killarney, Britannia.

Convergence Sites Preliminary Assessment

- Few tennis court areas can be expanded beyond their current footprint.
- Only 4 sites have potential for 5 or more courts.
- Development scenarios are untested (some need partnership agreements, site preparation, technical feasibility analysis)
- Other park users/neighbourhood groups may oppose covering/enclosing courts.

Tennis Centre Sites - Preliminary Scoping

- Not fully explored - some locations have been advanced for consideration by proponent group
- Footprint: equivalent to a large community centre
- Large buildings on parks are generally controversial, especially in smaller parks and in park deficient neighbourhoods
- Non-Park sites also possible, with added land acquisition cost

Question 3:

- Cost benefit comparison of construction materials, number of courts, support amenities included or not?

Cost Scenarios: *Convergence sites*

Assume 6 court facility (order of magnitude costs):

- Bubble (air supported) cover: \$1.5 M+
 - Additional costs for seasonal set-up and take-down, storage needs. Limited lifespan
 - Sprung structure: \$3 M+
 - Can be left up year round. 40 year lifespan for structure; 20 year for fabric.
 - Rigid steel modular: Approx \$4-5M
 - Permanent structure over existing courts.
- Plus additional costs for support facility depending on what is already in place.

Cost Scenarios: *New Tennis Centre*

Assume 6 court facility with new court surfaces, purpose built reception, wash/change and circulation (order of magnitude costs)

- Rigid Steel modular units up to \$8M
- Custom (architectural) built: \$12 M??

Plus land acquisition (if required): 45,000 ft² site minimum @ \$6 M+ depending upon location/zoning.

Question 4:

- Feasibility and scope of Property Endowment Fund to fund considerable portion of the facility with loan payback?

Funding Strategies

- 6 court complex could self finance up to \$1M of capital costs.
- Balance of funding would have to come from other sources, e.g.:
 - Naming Opportunities (Governed by Board policy)
 - Proponent fundraising: yet to be initiated
 - External funding (e.g., from senior governments, foundations) - sources yet to be identified.
 - Capital Plan: 2012 - 2014

Question 5:

- Deliver a feasibility analysis, including preferred location and construction material, concept and funding plan by Spring 2009.
 - proposed facility can be built within the identified cost range \$1.5 M to \$12 M plus.
 - Can be self-sustaining in terms of operating costs.
 - Detailed planning with respect to siting, construction type, design and funding not yet addressed. Will require considerable staff time and/or consultant support