VANCOUVER BOARD OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Report Date: November 20, 2026
VanRIMS No.: 08-3000-30
Submit comments to the Board

TO: Park Board Chair and Commissioners
FROM: General Manager, Board of Parks and Recreation
SUBJECT: Co-located Recreation Facility - Report Back

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

A. THAT the Vancouver Park Board receive for information the identification of Kensington Park as a feasible location for a co-located recreation facility, for consideration in future capital planning.

B. THAT the Vancouver Park Board endorse Hastings Community Centre as a priority recreation facility replacement project and direct staff to continue implementation; and

C. FURTHER THAT, subject to approval of Recommendation B, staff submit a funding request through the Capital budget process to advance planning and design of the Hastings Community Centre replacement project.

## PURPOSE

This report responds to the July 13, 2026, Board direction to evaluate Hastings Community Park and Kensington Park as potential sites for a co-located recreation facility. The report identifies Kensington Park as the preferred location for future consideration, confirms Hastings Community Centre as a priority replacement project, and outlines next steps for future planning and design work.

## PREVIOUS DECISIONS

In July 2026 the Board approved the draft 2027-2030 Parks and Recreation Capital Plan, including $496M for Recreation Facilities. Directed feasibility analysis of a co-located recreation facility at Hastings or Kensington and inclusion of 2027 planning/design funding.

VanPlay (2020) & VanSplash (2019) support renewal and expansion of recreation and aquatic infrastructure.

Community Centre Strategy (2022) identifies Kensington (#1) and Hastings (#3) as renewal priorities

No existing policy provides a coordinated framework to align the approved VanSplash, VanPlay, and Community Centre Strategy. More information about previous Board decisions can also be found in Appendix A.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In July 2026, the Board asked staff to evaluate Hastings Community Park and Kensington Park as potential sites for a co-located recreation facility and to report back with a planning pathway. A co-located recreation facility, referred to in the Board's motion as an 'integrated recreation hub', brings a community centre, an aquatic facility (in this instance a 50m pool was directed as a priority), and an ice rink together on one site.

Recreation needs significantly exceed available capital funding. While recreation facilities represent an estimated asset value of $2.1 billion, many require renewal, modernization, or functional upgrades to address aging infrastructure and evolving service needs. The approved 2027-2030 Capital Plan includes $496 million for recreation facility investments, supporting a combination of major facility renewals, renovations, asset replacement, functional improvements, and select new facility development. Given the breadth of needs across the recreation portfolio, careful prioritization of capital investments is required.

Staff completed a high-level comparative feasibility assessment of these two locations, considering renewal needs, approved Board priorities, and long-term capital planning objectives. The assessment found that Kensington Park performs more favourably than Hastings Community Park because it can accommodate all program components, faces fewer site constraints, and provides stronger opportunities for operational integration and future expansion. In the scoring, Kensington Park rated good on four of the eight criteria and poor on none, while Hastings Community Park rated good on two and poor on three. This was a high-level comparative feasibility analysis to determine siting only, and further feasibility work is required to develop cost estimates.

Based on the information presented in this report, staff have provided a recommendation and seek Board direction to inform next steps and actions.

## BACKGROUND

### Strategic and Capital Planning Context

Aging recreation infrastructure and limited long-term funding require rigorous planning and prioritization of major capital investments. In September 2025, the Board endorsed the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) Recreation Facility Asset Management report, which found that 72% of recreation facilities had a Facility Condition Index (FCI) rating in the poor or very poor range. The FCI is an asset management metric that compares deferred maintenance requirements to replacement value and is used to support lifecycle planning and capital investment decisions. The report also highlighted the City's estimated $500 million annual infrastructure funding deficit and emphasized the importance of robust analysis and planning to improve cost certainty, support informed capital investment decisions, and strengthen stewardship of public assets. In May 2026, Council approved a decision to increase the Infrastructure Levy to 2% to accelerate infrastructure renewal and directed staff to prepare a comprehensive asset condition assessment to inform future capital investment decisions.

Recreation infrastructure needs significantly exceed available capital funding, which makes it important for the Board to prioritize investments that deliver the greatest long-term public value. The Board approved 2027-2030 Capital Plan provides $739 million in funding, including $496 million for recreation facility renewal and major capital maintenance and renovation. Within this context, the Board directed staff to evaluate co-located facility opportunities at Hastings Community Park and Kensington Park and report back with a recommended planning pathway and next steps.

Co-located recreation facilities maximize the value of major recreation investments by combining multiple services into a single coordinated facility supporting long-term sustainability, operational efficiency, and service delivery objectives. It aligns with the Community Centre Strategy (2022), VanPlay and VanSplash, which identify the need to renew aging facilities and expand recreation capacity, and maximize the value of public investment.

## APPROACH

### Evaluation Framework & Methodology

Hastings Community Park and Kensington Park were assessed using an evaluation framework to determine their suitability for a co-located recreation facility. The assessment was completed in two stages and considered planning, operational, financial, and implementation factors relevant to the Board's July 2026 direction.

Stage one was an initial screening test where staff applied four pass/fail screening categories to determine whether each site could physically and technically accommodate a co-located recreation facility: sole City land ownership, permitted land use (zoned, or approval achievable), no prohibitive site conditions (e.g. soils), and accommodate the full facility program.

After completing the initial screening, staff completed stage two, which was a high-level comparative feasibility analysis where each site was evaluated against eight scoring criteria in the second stage and rated each criterion as good, acceptable, or poor. The evaluation criteria were developed collaboratively by Parks and Recreation and REFM staff and reflect key considerations that influence the long-term success of major recreation facility investments, including strategic alignment, asset renewal objectives, operational effectiveness, implementation feasibility, accessibility, and future adaptability. Further details regarding the site criteria and results can be found in Appendix B.

## DISCUSSION

### Assessment Results

The tables below summarize the results of stage one of the initial screening test and stage two of the comparative feasibility assessment, in which Kensington outperformed Hastings. Additional discussion follows to outline the rationale behind staff's findings.

| # | Stage One: Initial Screening Test Criteria | Kensington Park | Hastings Community Park |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Land Ownership** | | |
| 2 | **Permitted Land Use** | | |
| 3 | **Site Conditions** | | |
| 4 | **Accommodate Full Facility Program** | | |

***Table 1:*** *Screening Test Summary*
**Legend: Green – pass; Yellow – Conditional Pass; Red – Fail*

| # | Stage Two: Comparative Feasibility Analysis Scoring Criteria | Kensington Park | Hastings Community Park |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | **Policy and Planning Context** | | |
| 2. | **Existing Asset Renewal and Consolidation** | | |
| 3. | **Operations Efficiency** | | |
| 4. | **Capital Cost and Constructability** | | |
| 5. | **Equity and Access** | | |
| 6. | **Displacement of Outdoor Recreation** | | |
| 7. | **Future Expansion Potential** | | |
| 8. | **Transit Accessibility** | | |

***Table 2**: Comparative Feasibility Analysis Summary*
**Legend: Green – good; yellow – acceptable; red – poor*

**Kensington Park**
Kensington Park is the preferred site because it can accommodate the full co-located recreation facility program with fewer site constraints and the strongest implementation pathway. It performs well from an operations perspective, supporting a fully integrated facility while allowing the existing community centre and pool to remain operational during construction and enabling the rink to be phased. From a capital cost and constructability standpoint, the site is generally favourable due to its size and capacity to accommodate the proposed development, although steep slopes may require additional site design and grading work. The site also performs well in terms of future expansion potential, with sufficient space to accommodate future growth, including a second ice rink on the existing community centre footprint. Kensington Park is strongly aligned with policy and planning objectives, ranking first for renewal in the Community Centre Strategy, and scores well for asset renewal and consolidation by enabling replacement of both the existing Kensington Community Centre and the 15 m pool, which are high-priority renewal assets. (see Appendix B).

**Hastings Community Park**
Hastings Community Centre is well-positioned to advance as a community centre replacement project; however, was not identified as the preferred site for a co-located recreation hub primarily because the Renfrew Creek riparian corridor limits the site's capacity to accommodate a community centre, aquatic facility, and ice rink together. The riparian area effectively separates major program elements, reducing opportunities for operational integration and efficiency. From a capital cost and constructability perspective, environmental setbacks associated with the creek constrain building placement and site planning flexibility, creating additional design and infrastructure considerations. The site's long, narrow configuration also limits opportunities for

future expansion once the proposed program is accommodated. While the site presents challenges for a co-located recreation hub, it aligns well with policy and planning objectives for replacement, ranking third for renewal in the Community Centre Strategy. (see Appendix B).

## FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Recreation facility renewal needs exceed available capital funding, requiring the Board to make investment trade-offs across the recreation portfolio. The approved 2027-2030 Capital Plan includes $496 million for recreation facility renewal, major capital maintenance and renovation, which must support community centres, aquatic facilities, rinks, and other major renewal and maintenance projects across the city. Capital maintenance projects are prioritized through REFM asset management practices and evaluated though a risk–based lens which considers asset age, risk of failure and other considerations.

Upon receiving the endorsement for the Hastings Community Centre as a renewal project, REFM staff will propose funding to be allocated from the 2027-2030 capital plan into the 2027 Capital Budget for approval consideration.

Receiving Kensington Park as a possible site for a colocation does not commit funding at this time. Advancing a co-located facility project would require further direction from the Board. If the Board gives further direction to proceed on the project, staff will return will additional information as requested. Projects will be delivered according to the City's established project management methodology. Staff will continue to explore senior government funding opportunities to help offset the cost pressures.

## CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

Kensington Park is identified as a possible site for a future co-located recreation facility because it can accommodate a community centre, aquatic facility and rink together on one site, carries lower implementation risk, offers stronger operational integration opportunities, and aligns with long-term asset management objectives. Hastings Community Centre is positioned to proceed as a priority replacement project. This report fulfills the Board's July 2026 direction to evaluate potential co-location opportunities and establish a preferred planning pathway for future consideration.

This was a high-level feasibility analysis to determine siting only, therefore selecting Kensington Park as the preferred planning site does not yet represent a commitment to construct a new facility. The report supports evidence-based planning, responds to Board direction, and enables further evaluation of the suitability of a co-location at Kensington within the context of competing recreation infrastructure priorities and available capital funding. It also allows the Hastings Community Centre replacement, an important community centre renewal, to proceed as plan.

Future decisions regarding these projects occur through separate governance and funding approvals. Funding requests will be made through the Capital Budget and quarterly adjustment process, and project implementation would proceed through REFM's established project delivery framework and would include engagement with community stakeholders and rightsholders.

* * * * *

## APPENDIX A
## AUTHORITY AND REFERENCES

### BOARD AUTHORITY

As per the Vancouver Charter, the Park Board has exclusive jurisdiction and control over all areas designated as permanent and temporary parks in the City of Vancouver, including any structures, programs and activities, fees, and improvements that occur within those parks.

The Board shall have the custody, care and management to the extent prescribed by Council of such other areas belonging to or held by the City as Council may from time to time determine.

### PREVIOUS DECISIONS

#### Motions

- July 2026
    - Approved $496M for Recreation Facilities as part of the draft 2027-2030 Capital Plan for submission to City Council
    - Undertake feasibility analysis of co-located recreation facility at Hastings Community Park or Kensington Park and report back with planning pathway.
    - Include funding in 2027 Annual Capital Budget for design or feasibility analysis of co-located recreation facility.

#### Approved Plans

- VanPlay and VanSplash
    - Support renewal and modernization of recreation facilities, expanded aquatic capacity, and investment in multi-use recreation infrastructure.
    - VanPlay establishes targets to renew two community centres per capital plan and add five new ice sheets by 2040, while VanSplash identifies the need to renew aging aquatic facilities and expand aquatic capacity to meet current and future demand.
- Community Centre Strategy
    - Renewal priorities are identified as Kensington (#1) and Hastings (#3)

## APPENDIX B

## FEASIBILITY SCORING CRITERIA AND ANALYSIS TABLES

| # | Screening Criteria | Details |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | **Land Ownership** | – Sole City land ownership<br>– Permanent Park status |
| 2. | **Permitted Land Use** | – Zoned appropriately, or approval achievable |
| 3. | **Site Conditions** | – No prohibitive site conditions (e.g. soils)<br>– Topography considerations |
| 4. | **Accommodate Full Recreation Program** | – Site can accommodate full program of recreation services including a community centre, pool, and ice rink |

***Table:*** *Stage One: Initial Screening Test Criteria Details*

| # | Scoring Criteria | Details |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | **Policy and Planning Context** | – Aligns with existing Park Board approved policy and long-range park planning. |
| 2. | **Existing Asset Renewal and Consolidation** | – Co-locates an existing community centre, pool or rink and replaces aging assets beyond end of useful life. |
| 3. | **Operations Efficiency** | – Clear operating and staffing efficiencies, with a credible transition plan and minimal disruption. |
| 4. | **Capital Cost and Constructability** | – Lowest site-specific cost: well-understood conditions, no material site preparation, servicing or phasing work, and minimal approval risk. |
| 5. | **Equity and Access** | – Site relationship to VanPlay Equity Initiative Zones and existing Leisure Access Pass utilization, geographic distribution of recreation in the city. |
| 6. | **Displacement of Outdoor Recreation** | – Built on an existing developed footprint or underused civic land, so no park or outdoor recreation is lost. |
| 7. | **Future Expansion Potential** | – Room for significant future expansion of programming beyond the initial facility. |
| 8. | **Transit Accessibility** | – Rapid transit station entrance within 400m. |

***Table:*** *Stage Two: Comparative Feasibility Analysis Scoring Criteria Details*

| Evaluation Category | Rating | Key Considerations |
|---|---|---|
| **Stage 1 - Pass/Fail Screening** | **Passed** | Land ownership permitted land use, soils, and program fit screening criteria were met. The proposed program can be accommodated on the east playfield. |
| **Policy and Planning Context** | **Good** | Ranked 1st for renewal in Community Centre Strategy, identified as renovation priority in VanSplash, aligns with ice sheet asset target in VanPlay |
| **Existing Asset Renewal & Consolidation** | **Good** | Replaces Kensington Community Centre and the existing 15 m pool, both identified as high-priority recreation assets for renewal. |
| **Operations Efficiency** | **Good** | Supports delivery of a fully co-located recreation facility. Existing community centre and pool facilities can remain operational during construction, reducing service disruption. |
| **Capital Cost & Constructability** | **Acceptable** | Unconstrained site with sufficient area for development. Sloping grades and future demolition of the existing community centre and pool present moderate implementation considerations. |
| **Equity and Access** | **Acceptable** | Favourable geographic distribution, not in equity initiative zone, moderate leisure access pass usage. |
| **Displacement of Outdoor Recreation** | **Acceptable** | Development would occur on portions of the existing playfield and ball diamond. Following redevelopment, the existing community centre site could be restored to park use. |
| **Future Expansion Potential** | **Good** | Large park site provides flexibility for future expansion. The existing community centre footprint could accommodate additional recreation facilities, such as a second ice rink. |
| **Transit Accessibility** | **Acceptable** | Served by the #22 Knight and #33 transit routes within approximately 400 m. The nearest SkyTrain station is approximately 2 km away. |

***Table 3:*** *Kensington Park – Scoring Details*

| Evaluation Category | Rating | Key Considerations |
|---|---|---|
| **Stage 1 - Pass/Fail Screening** | **Passed with condition** | Land ownership, permitted land use, and soils screening criteria were met. Program fit was identified as conditional due to impacts on the Renfrew Creek riparian area. |
| **Policy and Planning Context** | **Good** | Ranked as the 3rd priority site for renewal in the Community Centre Strategy, aligns with ice sheet asset target in VanPlay. |
| **Existing Asset Renewal & Consolidation** | **Good** | Replaces Hastings Community Centre, identified on the Park Board Community Centre Renewal List. No existing pool or arena facilities are available for consolidation. |
| **Operations Efficiency** | **Poor** | Community centre, arena, and aquatic components cannot be co-located. The Renfrew Creek riparian area separates major program elements. |
| **Capital Cost & Constructability** | **Poor** | Development constrained by the Renfrew Creek riparian area and associated creek setbacks. Significant site planning and servicing challenges anticipated. |
| **Equity and Access** | **Acceptable** | Favourable geographic distribution, not in equity initiative zone, low leisure access pass utilization could be due to facility condition. |
| **Displacement of Outdoor Recreation** | **Acceptable** | Community centre can be accommodated within the existing parking area and pool footprint; arena development affects portions of existing open space. |
| **Future Expansion Potential** | **Poor** | Limited site capacity. The long, narrow site configuration provides little opportunity for future expansion once the proposed program is accommodated. |
| **Transit Accessibility** | **Acceptable** | Served by Rapid Bus and Hastings Street transit routes; no rapid transit station within 2 km. |

***Table 4:*** *Hastings Community Park – Scoring Details*

## APPENDIX C

## HASTINGS COMMUNITY PARK SITE MAP




***Figure 1:*** *Aerial view of Hastings Park Site*

**APPENDIX D**

**KENSINGTON PARK SITE MAP**




***Figure 2:*** *Aerial View of Kensington Park Site*