



DRAFT Minutes of a Meeting of the Peninsula Recreation Commission
Held Thursday, September 18, 2025, in the Panorama Boardroom
1885 Forest Park Drive, North Saanich BC

PRESENT

COMMISSIONERS: N. Paltiel (Chair), P. DiBattista, K. Frost, S. Garnett, V. Kreiser, R. Windsor, C. McNeil-Smith, C. Stock (for P. Jones)

STAFF: S. Meikle, Senior Manager; K. Beck, Manager, Program Services; L. Gregg, Manager, Facilities & Operations; L. Jones, General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Environmental Services; F. Pimental, Deputy Director of Finance, District of Central Saanich; C. Culham, Chief Administrative Officer, District of Central Saanich, A. Bowker, Administrative Secretary (Recorder)

Regrets: Commissioner Jones, Commissioner Murray

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

1. Territorial Acknowledgement

Commissioner Kreiser provided a territorial acknowledgement.

2. Approval of Agenda

MOVED by Commissioner DiBattista, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stock,
That the agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Adoption of Minutes of August 28, 2025

MOVED by Commissioner Stock, **SECONDED** by Commissioner DiBattista,
That the minutes of the August 28, 2025 meeting be adopted.

CARRIED

4. Chair's Remarks

The opening of the Multi-Sport Box took place on September 2. A tour was provided for Commission members, and arrangements can be made for those who missed it. Feedback so far has been great. Thanks to PRC staff and CRD for the smooth opening.

5. Presentations/Delegations: There were none

6. Commission Business

6.1 Arena Improvement Project

Peninsula Recreation Commission Minutes
September 18, 2025

S. Meikle spoke to Item 6.1.

- Start with an opening statement that could be relevant to both projects we are looking at tonight. Over the last 10-15 years issues such as geographic inequity, travel distance barriers and accessibility concerns have been well documented. These issues have been repeatedly affirmed through multiple strategic plans, most recently through the sub-regional facility needs assessment.
- At the April 24, 2025 PRC meeting, staff as well as consultants from HCMA presented two conceptual designs.
- Concept A focused on targeting arena upgrades with change rooms, washrooms, lobby, spectator stands and storage with the hope of improving safety, security, staff presence and accessibility throughout that facility.
- Concept B included all the elements of Concept A plus a focus on creating a space to better link the two buildings and to redevelop some internal spaces on the Panorama Centre side, which included adapting some greater levels of program flexibility, adding social gathering spaces and improving lobby washrooms, etc.
- Given that the facility needs assessment recommended that we conduct a thorough site analysis of the current PRC site to analyze options for future facility development, staff feel that Concept B should be held at this time to allow for further analysis of those site options.
- From the April meeting and as requested by the Commission, the project scope of Concept A has been broken down into staging/phasing options. The overall scope of Concept A has not changed, but each option is now presented as a standalone project. They could be done on their own and phased over time.
- There is one staff report correction notice in the second paragraph on page 5. It currently reads “alternatively, a 30-year amortization would reduce the annual debt servicing cost by \$15 million to approximately \$946,000.” It should read “alternatively, a 30-year amortization would reduce the annual debt servicing cost by \$514,000.”

Discussion ensued regarding:

- Reference to the term “junior hockey dressing room” was noted as it was not felt that this was meant to be designated as only for junior hockey. These changerooms should be available to other user groups if funded fully by the PRC. Staff confirmed that the use of that term was simply as a labelling tool and it can be changed.
- Class D estimate, line 28 shows estimate for dressing room is \$760,000 to build but estimate in Table 2 is \$1.7-\$2.1 million. The reason for those additional costs is that there are the base construction costs shown on the floor plan, but then there are the additional components such as design, etc. Staff to investigate the components of the preliminary costs for October 2 meeting and bring back a stronger analysis.
- There is \$3.3 million allocated in the capital reserve budget for the arena project in 2023/24.
- Request for a list of priorities of the phased components from a staff perspective to be provided for October 2 meeting.
- Looking at the phased approach, specifically at the arena entry, there’s an addition of stairs beside the elevator. As there are already stairs in arena A and arena B, why would there be a need for more stairs? Question for consultants regarding the need for these additional stairs, information to be brought back to the Oct 2 meeting.

Peninsula Recreation Commission Minutes
September 18, 2025

- Question re: potential loss of the concession in a phased approach given where the elevator is planned. Response: depends on how the Commission decides to phase projects but staff feel confident that there are options within that lobby space to move the concession either temporarily or permanently.
- Question re: price tag difference from arena A to arena B dressing rooms noting that Arena A is more expensive but is in a more recently built facility. Note in consultant's report about the structure of arena A needing to be altered but no noted structural issues in the older arena B. Staff will pose that question to the consultants and provide information prior to the October 2 meeting.
- Discussion regarding the impact of tax increases on residents in the current economically uncertain times and the concerns of depleting the reserves of Panorama if something unforeseen happens.

C Stock left the meeting at 6:40

- From initial conversations in 2023/24, the original concept was that the change rooms in arena B were going to be reoriented to take over the green space towards the parking lot and now see that we are giving up some mechanical space, staff offices, laundry room, etc. Question as to why the change in plans for re-orienting these dressings rooms? Staff responded that the current concept design eliminates any breaking of the facility envelope which can lead to significant cost increases. This question has been added to the list for staff to return with more information for the Oct. 2 meeting.

C Stock returned to the meeting at 6:50

- No further points were made and discussion moved on to Item 6.2.

This report was received for information.

6.2 Proposed Peninsula Recreation Facility in Central Saanich

S. Meikle spoke to Item 6.2.

- Provided project overview for the proposed peninsula recreation facility in Central Saanich – first floor of a 3-floor building would encompass 10,000 sq. ft for recreation space.
- Based on current participation data along with guidance from recommendations from the 2022-2026 strategic plan, Panorama staff have identified the follow spaces for inclusion at Hovey Road site: weight room and fitness studio, pottery or ceramic studio or other space dedicated to arts programming, multi-purpose spaces for general programming, camps and licensed after school care, reception office, storage and maintenance area.
- Along with offering enhanced service delivery, the Hovey Road site has some further benefits for PRC. As PRC currently oversees booking and maintenance for some of the Centennial Park amenities, the picnic shelters, the field house, and the newly opened sport box, co-locating recreational services at the Hovey Road site would help streamline operations and allow for regular onsite supervision by staff.
- Staff considered other avenues to address the issue of geographic inequity and explored other options on the peninsula. It is important to note that the feasibility of these other options is uncertain. Further analysis at this stage risks delaying delivery

Peninsula Recreation Commission Minutes
September 18, 2025

of this project and could compromise our ability to work with a municipal partner that has a current viable project on the table. Staff provided a summary of the 3 options – rent/lease existing warehouse type space (i.e. large spaces to house a weight room are required), renovating existing community spaces such as the Central Saanich Cultural Centre and/or purchasing land to build a new, standalone recreation centre. All options considered have significant risks and none are recommended by staff at this time.

- Staff provided an overview of the implications of borrowing to finance the capital costs and the operational budget for implementation of a new facility in Central Saanich.
- Following discussion, recommendations will be prepared for the October 2 meeting.

Discussion ensued regarding:

- Discussion re: financing options for CRD, further information on timing and impact of debt servicing to be presented at the October 2 meeting. The loan authorization bylaw is earmarked for the November CRD Board meeting should the Commission decide to move forward.
- Would like to see details on sizes of spaces for the October meeting for fitness, arts, multi-purpose rooms. Staff did go through process of analyzing existing sites and didn't see any suitable existing facilities that are worth pursuing. Renovating often exceeds the cost of a new build.
- Concerned about size. 10,000 sq ft seems small. It would be helpful to know size of current fitness facilities. The two fitness rooms at Greenglade total 1700 sq ft. Fitness studio upstairs at PRC is 1700-1800 sq ft. Given the demand staff would look at dividing up the 10,000 sq ft in such a way that weightroom space would be much larger than both of those spaces. Staff would be calculating all three weight room spaces in assessing how we're meeting needs, so it would be adding additional 2500-3000 sq ft of weight room space to the existing 3500 sq ft we already have.
- Question re: estimating participation rates and concerns due to the high percentage of people reporting in the FNA that they get their recreation outdoors through walking, hiking etc. and thus Commissioner felt staff estimates may be high. Staff noted challenges when estimating participation rates and stated that they utilized current pass and membership sales, and participation rates to estimate future usage.
- Question re: timing around decision making, it is important for Central Saanich to know if the PRC is interested before they take the next step on a preferred option from a municipal standpoint.
- Concern raised of whether Sidney and North Saanich would be paying only for the recreation space in the building and not for DCS Municipal Hall. Response: Central Saanich is responsible for the municipal hall, PRC only responsible for the recreation facility itself.
- Question to Central Saanich re contingency. A 30% contingency is a standard contingency for a Class C estimate. DCS is not imposing a 30% contingency on the CRD. From a CRD perspective, staff reviewed those assumptions and deemed them appropriate. Found other uncertainties which were added. If the project goes ahead, the risks can be managed through the negotiation process.
- Would PRC have to bear any responsibility for costs for any issues with Floors 2 and 3? Response, no, PRC would not bear any responsibility in this case, however,

Peninsula Recreation Commission Minutes September 18, 2025

the details of addressing liabilities such as this would be discussed in the development of an agreement.

- Question re: difference in parking estimates. Staff noted that costs are added when there are uncertainties that we feel we need to mitigate financially. The parking is an uncertainty at this stage of design. The estimate provided assumes underground parking for the Central Saanich project which carries a significantly higher per stall cost than surface level parking.
- Concern raised regarding the delineation of roles and responsibilities, that would be negotiated as part of an agreement with Central Saanich. It will be pivotal to manage risks that we are comfortable with and bring forward an agreement to the Commission that they are comfortable with.
- DCS Staff usage of recreation space may be part of the agreement to be discussed.
- As indicated in the report there are at least 3 options for consent processes for the loan authorization bylaw. Question raised re: timeline for that process? At this time, staff would be recommending an AAP process for this project, and we have a slot reserved for an AAP in a way that occurs before the election should the Commission be ready to proceed. Current timeline with provincial authority is seven months to provide authorization.
- It was noted that Central Saanich will cover all detailed design costs for the shell, regardless of whether PRC is included or not. It is Central Saanich's risk even if it is approved by the PRC on October 2.
- Three things Commission members have asked about: getting a clear perspective from a legal and finance perspective on ownership and debt financing; room dimensions; the inclusion of the capital and operating budget for the October 2 meeting.
- Going into the October 2 meeting, it would be prudent to see further dialogue with Central Saanich on parking issue because it is a \$3 million envelope. That number could be dramatically improved beyond the assumptions.
- Comment re: Operating budget - it was helpful to get the first year of operating, there is likely a modest scaled absorption and increase in user group that could also be forecast within the budget, i.e., over a 5 year horizon from open until fully operating, what is the operating cost and offset of that debt service vs capital projects that we're still paying off, and with the arena project as well.
- Re AAP process, given that that this is not likely to happen until next year, wondering why we wouldn't wait and have this as a referendum at the election so we could reach out to maximum number of people. The options initially explored were the option of consent on behalf of municipal participants, which is the most effective option; the AAP alternative approval process which is the most practiced because of the cost efficiency. The referendum carries costs but can explore that. Ultimately it is a CRD Board decision, there will be a recommendation from this Commission to the CRD Board.

This report was received for information

7. New Business: There was no new business

8. Adjournment

MOVED by Commissioner Windsor, **SECONDED** by Commissioner McNeill-Smith,
That the meeting be adjourned at 7:58 pm.

**Peninsula Recreation Commission Minutes
September 18, 2025**

CARRIED

CHAIR

RECORDER

DRAFT