Purpose of the Strategy

• Support UBC’s delivery of outstanding sport and recreation experiences for students, staff, faculty, and the community at the UBC Point Grey campus.
• Meet current and future student recreational needs.
• Strategically approach needs, opportunities and partnerships in line with the UBC community’s values.
• 20-year framework that will guide UBC’s investments in Athletics & Recreation facilities.
Questions to consider

- **Principles and Criteria**
  - Do you agree? What have we missed?
- **Issues, risks / opportunities**
  - Do you agree? What have we missed?
- **Consultation**
  - Who else should we be talking to?
Strategy Process

PHASE 1: Background & Needs Assessment
- Vision
- Existing facilities Review
- Background research
- Data collection
- Surveys and Interviews

PHASE 2: Criteria & Options Development
- Confirm program needs / findings
- Principles & criteria
- Generate options
- Test and evaluate options
- Shortlist options
- Draft Strategy

PHASE 3: Public Consultation, Review & Adoption
- Consult on Draft Strategy
- Revise Based on consultation
- Finalize Strategy

PHASE 4: Implementation (18 + mo.)
- Capital Plan development
- Land Use Plan amendment
- Draft Neighbourhood Plan

2015

2016

2017
Who’s involved and how?

Technical Analysis

- Athletics, Campus Planning, Facilities Planning, Kinesiology, Properties Trust, Consultants (engineering, architecture, acoustics, heritage)

Steering Committee


Targeted Stakeholder Meetings (Spring, Summer)

- UNA, UEL, AMS, GSS, Deans, Botanical Gdns, Kinesiology, Hospice, Alumni, Athletics Council, Sport and Rec. Committee, Rec. staff and students, Varsity coaches

Public Open Houses and On-Line input (Sept / Oct)

- Broader Campus Community and Public
Principles

1. **Alignment with UBC’s Core Academic Mission**
   - Ensure the Facilities Strategy reflects UBC’s commitments to student learning, research excellence, community engagement, and strategic priorities.

2. **Athletics Excellence**
   - Provide suitable facilities for varsity athletics excellence on the national and world stage.
   - Demonstrate best practice planning models from other North American campuses.

3. **Community Engagement and Fit**
   - Use athletic facilities to build school spirit, engage the campus and surrounding community, and increase excitement about the Thunderbirds.
Principles

4. **Access to Wellness and Sport**
   • Increase and enhance student access to wellness and sport by meeting student recreation and high-performance needs.

5. **Flexibility, Versatility and Resiliency**
   • Design facilities to maximize utility, community engagement and animation, and to be environmentally responsible over their lifecycle.

6. **Fiscally Sound and Deliverable**
   • Ensure the Facilities Strategy is financially sustainable and that each investment decision is supported by a sound business model.
Needs Analysis

• Comprehensive overview of existing UBC Athletics & Recreation facilities.
• Detailed technical evaluation of current conditions
• Analysis of existing UBC Athletics & Recreation schedules, programming and demand to identify opportunities and needs.
• Review of industry best practices with comparison universities.
• Targeted consultation with internal and external stakeholders.
• Broad campus community consultation through more than 8,000 student surveys.
Key Findings

- Recreational fitness space significantly below other campuses
- Aging infrastructure, deferred maintenance of two major facilities: Thunderbird Stadium and War Memorial Gym: need for new varsity / high performance sports venue
- Shortage of support space, offices, studios, multi-purpose space
Key Findings

Fitness Centre Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Fitness Centre size: sq. ft.</th>
<th>Total Student Population</th>
<th>Sq. ft/student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Vancouver</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>51,447</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU (Burnaby)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>26,494</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVIC</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>20,813</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>24,582</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto (St.George Campus)</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>58,294</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>26,909</td>
<td>38,930</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>29,060</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

Gymnasiums

- Existing 3 gyms: 90% of evening drop in programs at capacity
- Over 60 student intramural teams on waitlists
Existing Athletics Facilities
Existing Land Use
Emerging Future Vision – Two Distinct Hubs

RECREATION

HIGH PERFORMANCE
Stadium + Varsity
Facility Options Development

Thunderbird Stadium

War Memorial Gym
Issues

- Outdated / aging systems
- Building envelope failure
- Universal access
- Functionality / athletics space capacity
- Quality of lower level spaces
- Access / staging during construction
- Heritage

War Memorial Gym
Heritage Significance

War Memorial Gym, 1950
Sharp & Diamond, Thompson Berwick Pratt
Issues

- Seismic risk
- Outdated systems
- Functionally inefficient
- Under capacity (seating, change rooms, support facilities)
- Isolated from other athletics facilities
- Heritage

Thunderbird Stadium
Heritage Significance

Thunderbird Stadium, 1967
Vladimir Plavsic, Bogue Babiki
War Memorial Gym – Options Development

Conceptual Program Assumptions:

Recreation
• 3 gyms (courts)
• 35,000 – 40,000 SF new of fitness space
• 7,000 – 10,000 SF support space

Academic uses (kinesiology, sports med. classrooms)
• 30,000 SF

Total space needs: 72,000 – 80,000 SF (excluding courts)
## War Memorial Gym – Options Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPLE</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aligns with UBC Core Academic Mission</strong></td>
<td>• Optimize academic land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Align with UBC’s core mission, commitments to student learning, research excellence and community engagement, and strategic priorities.</td>
<td>• Align with Place and Promise, Land Use Plan and Vancouver Campus Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletics Facilities Excellence</strong></td>
<td>• Ability to meet 20 year program needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide suitable facilities for varsity athletics excellence on the national and world stage.</td>
<td>• Quality indoor environment (daylight, ventilation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate best practices in athletics facility planning and design.</td>
<td>• Optimize visibility / porosity of facilities to increase access / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Wellness and Sport</strong></td>
<td>• Urban Design / placemaking: potential to connect to other street level uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase and enhance student access to wellness and sport by meeting both student recreation and high-performance needs.</td>
<td>• Retention of heritage value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure facilities are planned and designed thoughtfully to promote wellness and sport throughout the entire athletic pathway and provide an inclusive environment for all community members to participate, spectate and recreate.</td>
<td>• Optimize existing building and infrastructure assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement and Fit</strong></td>
<td>• Ensure replacement facilities to current standards for any displaced non-A&amp;R users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use athletic facilities to build school spirit, engage the campus and surrounding community, and increase excitement about the Thunderbirds.</td>
<td>• Ability to expand post 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility, Versatility and Resiliency</strong></td>
<td>• Financial viability (capital) *ensure financial evaluation includes full replacement costs for displaced users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design for versatility and flexibility in facilities to maximize utility, community engagement and animation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Locate and design facilities to be environmentally responsible over their life-cycle (through building optimization, re-use, operations, and accounting for the full commercial, social and environmental value of facilities).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscally Sound and Deliverable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure Strategy is financially sustainable and that each investment decision is supported by a sound business model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing WMG
Recreational Gym Space

WMG: existing or replaced could accommodate 3 courts *

*assumes displacement / replacement of high performance (spectator) gym
Fitness Space

3 potential locations

1. Old SUB basement
2. WMG basement and partial upper floors
3. Ground floor of GSAB north
Option 1

WMG Basic Retrofit + SUB Basement + GSAB North

Pros
• Retains heritage building
• Cost effective
• Keeps existing academic users
• Good visibility of fitness on ground floor of GSAB north*

Cons / Issues
• Dispersal of rec. program – resulting in inefficient / duplicated spaces
• Only achieves 2 rec. courts
• Poor quality indoor space at basement level

*Contingent on development of GSAB north
Option 2

WMG Renewal + SUB Basement + GSAB

Pros
• Retains heritage building with functional improvements
• Achieves 3 rec. courts
• Provides fitness space in same facility as rec. gyms

Cons / Issues
• More costly
• Fitness space less visible from street / public realm
• Academic displaced *

* Replacement contingent on development of GSAB site
Option 2

2. WMG Renewal + SUB Basement + GSAB

Pros
• Retains heritage building with functional improvements
• Achieves 3 rec. courts
• Provides fitness space in same facility as rec. gyms

Cons / Issues
• More costly
• Fitness space less visible from street / public realm
• Academic displaced *

* Replacement contingent on development of GSAB site

Functional improvements
1. Lower façade opened to daylight
2. Basement floor lowered
3. Gym floor raised
4. Bleachers removed
Option 3

**WMG Rebuild + GSAB**

**Pros**
- Achieves all required recreation program in one space

**Cons**
- Demolishes heritage building
- More costly
- Academic displaced *

* Replacement contingent on development of GSAB site
High Performance / Stadium Options

1. Renovate existing stadium
2. Build new stadium in new location

Conceptual Program Assumptions:

**Stadium:**
- Regulation football field
- 5,000 seats (ideally w/stands facing east)
- Direct access between dressing rooms and field of play
- Full separation of spectators and athletes / performers

**Athletics Centre for Excellence:**
- 3 courts that can be combined into a single spectator facility
- High performance strength / conditioning
- Offices / support space
### High Performance / Stadium Options Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPLE</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Aligns with UBC Core Academic Mission** | • Optimize academic land use  
• Align with Place and Promise, Land Use Plan and Vancouver Campus Plan |
| **Athletics Facilities Excellence** | • Ability to meet 20 year program needs  
• Create distinct, identifiable athletic hubs |
| **Access to Wellness and Sport** | • Walking distance from parking and transit  
• Co-location with other supportive athletics facilities |
| **Community Engagement and Fit** | • Urban Design / placemaking: potential to connect to other street level uses  
• Retention of heritage value  
• Optimize compatibility with adjacent academic uses  
• Optimize compatibility with adjacent residential uses  
• Proximity to critical mass of students, users and amenities |
| **Flexibility, Versatility and Resiliency** | • Optimize synergies with other program areas and uses  
• Optimize existing building assets  
• Ensure replacement facilities for any displaced non-A&R users  
• Ability to expand post 20 years |
| **Fiscally Sound and Deliverable** | • Provide opportunity for funding through enhanced development opportunity  
• Minimize cost to replace facilities for displaced users / infrastructure  
• Financial viability (capital) *ensure financial evaluation includes full replacement costs for displaced users. |
High Performance / Stadium Options
Option 1

Retain and Renew

Pros
• Reuse of existing building asset
• Retention of heritage value
• Consistent with Land Use Plan

Cons / Issues
• Consumes large land area
• Seating orientation not ideal
• Integration of Centre for Excellence difficult
• Isolated from other athletics facilities and critical mass of students
• Neighbourhood compatibility
• Walking distance from parking and transit
Option 2

Rebuild on Matthews Field

Pros
• More connected to athletics hub
• Good vehicular access
• Better neighbourhood compatibility
• More land for neighbourhood development and/or other academic uses

Cons/Issues
• Walking distance from parking and transit
• Still isolated from other athletics facilities and critical mass of students
• Demolition of existing building asset and removal of heritage value
• Requires LUP amendment
Option 2b

Rebuild Stadium on Matthews Field + Centre of Excellence on Osborne

Pros
- More connected to athletics hub
- Good vehicular & parking access
- CoE close to transit & parking
- Synergies with athletics-related academic
- More land for neighbourhood development and / or other academic uses

Cons/Issues
- Walking distance of stadium from parking and transit
- Stadium still isolated from other athletics facilities and critical mass of students
- Potential loss in efficiencies with 2 projects
- Demolition of existing building asset and removal of heritage value
- Requires LUP amendment
Option 3

Rebuild on Existing Track

Pros
• More connected to athletic hub
• Good vehicular access
• Good connection to Wesbrook Village
• More land for neighbourhood development and/or other academic uses

Cons/Issues
• Walking distance from parking and transit and critical mass of students
• Neighbourhood compatibility
• Demolition of existing building & infrastructure assets and removal of heritage value
• Requires a LUP amendment
Option 4

Rebuild on Osborne Centre

Pros
• Closely integrated with athletics hub
• Close to parking, transit and critical mass of students
• Renewal of older building stock
• Synergies with athletics-related academic
• Significantly more land for neighbourhood development and / or academic use

Cons/Issues
• Reduction of academic land
• Complex demo / phasing program
• Closure of portion of Thunderbird Boulevard to vehicles
• Demolition of existing building asset and removal of heritage value
• Neighbourhood compatibility
• Requires a LUP amendment
Other Potential Opportunities

• Baseball Stadium Expansion
• Racquet Sports Facility
• Sports Science
Financial Considerations

• A positive business case is required to implement the Strategy

• Financial considerations include:
  • Total cost
  • Funding sources
  • Liquidity
  • Return on investment

• Some stadium options provide net new land and potential for increased development revenue
Strategy Process

PHASE 1: Background & Needs Assessment
- Vision
- Existing facilities Review
- Background research
- Data collection
- Surveys and Interviews

PHASE 2: Criteria & Options Development
- Confirm program needs / findings
- Principles & criteria
- Generate options
- Test and evaluate options
- Shortlist options
- Draft Strategy

PHASE 3: Public Consultation, Review & Adoption
- Consult on Draft Strategy
- Revise Based on consultation
- Finalize Strategy

PHASE 4: Implementation (18 + mo.)
- Capital Plan development
- Land Use Plan amendment
- Draft Neighbourhood Plan

2015
- WE ARE HERE

2016
- Stakeholder Consultation
- Board Review
- Draft Strategy

2017
- Public Consultation
- Board Approve Final Strategy
Questions

- **Principles and Criteria**
  - Do you agree? What have we missed?
- **Issues, risks / opportunities**
  - Do you agree? What have we missed?
- **Consultation**
  - Who else should we be talking to?