

## South End Community Centre Project Update - 2020-141

### General Correspondence – Revised Agenda

\*\*\*

I was very disappointed to read, in yesterday's article in GuelphToday, that Larry Pearson park and its many amenities (Ball Diamonds, splash pads, playground, tennis courts, etc) will be closed to the public in 2022 and 2023 if construction of the South End Community Centre begins in 2022.

[Cost of proposed South End Community Centre increases by \\$12 million](#)



#### **Cost of proposed South End Community Centre increases by \$12 million**

Read the full story and comment on GuelphToday.

The site for the community centre was identified long ago. It seems to be poor planning to have to shut down one major community recreation location in order to build a long ago needed indoor facility.

I urge the city to look at the possibility of building a temporary gravel road on the other side of Bishop MacDonnell highschool to allow the public access to their park during construction of the new facility.

I also urge the city to release to the public, the proposed long term cost savings of making the community centre environmentally friendly. Our society does need to protect the environment, but a 6+ million increase in cost should also be justified financially to the public. The development fees are actually paid by the taxpayers who bought the houses in the south end; meaning that the whole cost of the community centre is paid for by taxpayers. Will the 15% of the cost paid for directly by taxpayers mean an increase in taxes for the whole city, or is this facility in the long term plan that has already been considered as part of each year's city budget?

I realize that cost refinements are necessary and that inflationary costs are accrued each year, once the planning process starts. I urge the city to consider these added costs sooner in the process, rather than reporting increased costs for projects each year.

Sincerely,

Monica Chamberlain

\*\*\*

Dear Ms. Baker, Mr. Stuart, Mayor Guthrie and Members of Council:

I'm having difficulty finding some key numbers in the SECC staff report.

How much of the anticipated \$69 million in DCs are currently in the bank and how much total debt has to be financed over what period of time until those DCs are collected at a future date?

On p. 3 of the report it says:

*As included in previous debt forecasts, this facility is planned to be debt-financed **(net of any development charges collected to date)** as it is the most appropriate financing to ensure inter-generational equity for long-term facility assets. This debt has been planned for many years and is within the City's debt capacity limit. The debt will be funded by both development charges and tax supported sources as described above.*

<https://pub-guelph.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=9072>

What is the total figure that needs to be debt financed - net of any development charges collected to date? What will be the tax cost of financing that debt? Is that cost reflected within the \$11.2 million tax funding, or will it be an additional amount?

This 2014 Mercury article by Tony Saxon quotes former Councillor Todd Dennis as saying the DC portion would be \$37 million, of a \$59 million total project cost. At that time, only \$7 million of the required DCs had been collected. What is that figure today?

<https://www.guelphmercury.com/news-story/4550701--59-million-cost-estimate-on-proposed-south-end-guelph-community-centre/>

*A huge chunk of the cost – roughly \$37 million – would be covered by development fees paid by those building new homes and commercial developments, **although the cost would have to be financed by the city until all those fees are eventually collected.***

***About \$7 million in development charges already sits in a fund earmarked for the facility, which would be off Poppy Drive, between Bishop Macdonell high school and the Pearson Park baseball complex.***

I am fully in support of staff's assertion on p. 6 of the report.

***The cost of debt has never been as low as in the current market environment and Finance staff are developing a strategy to ensure the current low interest rates are able to be accessed for this future build.***

I agree that this is exactly the time to be investing in major infrastructure in our City. I am cognizant, however, of the Mayor's concerns regarding taking on debt. He has clearly stated he does not want the City to be like "Clark Griswold trying to install his pool without all the funds or information to do it."

Sincerely,

Susan Watson

\*\*\*

Mayor Guthrie and Members of Council:

As far as I can determine, current plans for the South End Community Centre will only see 18% of the required parking constructed as part of the build.

On August 8th, 2019, City Staff went before the Committee of Adjustment to have 1,000 spaces cut from the South End Community Centre plans:

***Decision to Cut Parking by 1000 Spots at Proposed South End Rec Centre the Lesser of Two Evils Says councillor:***

<https://www.guelphtoday.com/local-news/decision-to-cut-parking-by-1000-spots-at-proposed-south-end-rec-centre-the-lesser-of-two-evils-says-councillor-mackinnon-1645937>

The only reference to parking I could find in the current SECC staff report is this rather cryptic statement:

*The design has been through a number of site plan approval stages, including a key milestone for the required parking variance in August 2019.*

The report does not provide any hard numbers as to parking currently required under existing by-laws and what is being provided. Council needs this information in order to be able to make informed decisions about the SECC.

This is my stab at the numbers, as best I was able to determine by watching the COA meeting recording and reading media coverage:

**1,505:** Parking spaces required under City By-laws for a recreation centre of this size:

**30:** Dedicated existing staff parking on the Bishop Macdonell School property.

**228:** Existing on-site parking spots which are currently shared by Larry Pearson Community Park and Bishop Macdonell School.

**275:** Number of parking spots to be added as part of construction of the SECC.

**521:** Number of parking spots that will "serve" the SECC. However, this number double-counts the 228 existing shared community park and school spots towards the total for the SECC. The numbers also don't add up: 228 existing plus 275 added is 503 spots, not 521. Does the 521 number also double-count some Bishop Mac staff parking? How is this number constituted?

**18%:** The amount of parking required by the By-law that is being added as part of the SECC construction. (275 out of 1,505 required spots.)

From a citizen perspective, the process leading to this outcome is really questionable. Staff took the request to eliminate 1,000 parking spaces to the Committee of Adjustment on August 8, 2019:

<https://guelph.ca/wp-content/uploads/August-8-2019-CoA-Agenda.pdf#page=9>

The minutes show that no members of the public spoke. How could they have known? The file was simply labelled as 19-25 Poppy Drive West. There was nothing that indicated that this matter would involve the SECC or 1,000 parking spots:

I'm not even clear that many members of Council knew this was happening, or did happen. Who did know? Did the Mayor? Did Ward 6 Councillors?

COA member and former City Councillor, David Kendrick unsuccessfully put forward a motion to reject the application based on the premise that it was not "minor". You can read his quotes in the Guelph Today article.

I would concur. This project is not minor in terms of size, scope, cost, or impact. A lack of adequate parking is something that is going to impact every user from across the City who drives to make use of this amenity, not just neighbours who live within a 30 m notification area required by the COA.

What will happen on a February Saturday night when Bishop Mac is holding their high school musical and there is a hockey tournament going on at the same time on two ice pads?

There is no street parking on Clair Road. Are people going to poach parking spots at the commercial plazas, or are they going to seek parking in the residential neighbourhoods on the north side of Clair Road? How will that neighbourhood feel about that invasion? Are they even aware that this is a possibility?

Parking is a consistently contentious issue which lands regularly at City Hall. Citizens have a right to be consulted on this massive change and provide input on how they want to see it solved. A decision of this magnitude also needs to be debated and determined by City Council in the public eye, not by the COA which is not democratically accountable.

There is a third "evil" which is not identified by Councillor MacKinnon - build the required supporting infrastructure for the Rec Centre. If there is a shortage of land, then the solution is to build up or build under. Based on the Wilson Street parkade, we know that the cost of parking for 500 cars is \$22 million. Using that guideline, the true cost of providing the required parking on this site within the existing land constraints would be at least \$55 million.

I would be interested to know what Ward Six Councillors think of staff's end-run around both the rules and Council itself given their recent admonishments to developers:

***Ward 6 Councillors to Developers: Play By The Rules on Gordon Street Intensification:***

<https://www.guelphtoday.com/local-news/ward-6-councillors-to-developers-play-by-the-rules-on-gordon-street-intensification-2715572>

As Councillor MacKinnon said, *"There's a reason our guidelines exist."*

How can the City expect developers to play by the rules if they give themselves a pass on 82% of the required parking for the SECC? Has City Council EVER approved a development in which the developer has been allowed to cut 82% of the required parking to make a project work?

A long-time local activist made the following observation in an email exchange with me:

*....the modal split between private vehicles, bikes and transit riders has not changed much in the last 10 years. Especially given that our population is aging and 50% will be over 55 in a few years, how many of these people will give up their cars to ride transit or their bikes to the new rec Center?*

The staff report makes reference to reviewing the project in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. Parking is going to be hugely impacted. The pandemic has severely curtailed carpooling. Some organizations, for instance a local rowing club, mandate that members travel to events in separate cars as part of their COVID health and

safety protocols. Because there is less carpooling, the demand for parking will only increase.

One last question: Does Bishop Mac School and the Catholic School Board clearly understand that 1,000 parking spots were cut from the plan? Their access to the 228 "shared" parking spots is going to be severely curtailed.

Citizens need to be consulted on this issue and staff, the community and Council need to work together to craft a solution. Could one of the ice pads be delayed to allow money to be invested in parking? Can a paid parking regime be set up to recover the cost of a higher investment in parking? In terms of the City's climate goals, this would incentivize people to walk, bike or take the bus to the centre to save money on parking.

Council needs to stand on principles of transparency and accountability. You all know that parking is a consistently contentious issue at Council. If not one single citizen provided input at the COA, then the process was not transparent. Moreover, you, Council, need to be accountable to citizens for what happens on the SECC site, not punt inevitable future complaints to the COA because "it wasn't your decision."

It IS your decision. With this correspondence, I hereby put it back in your laps and you need to take the reins and lead forward.

Below are two additional pieces of information which are relevant to the file:

- 1) A link to the study used to justify the cut of 1,000 spaces
- 2) The relevant By-law for recreation centre parking

Sincerely,  
Susan Watson

The Parking Study by BA Group is on p. 9 of this link:

<https://guelph.ca/wp-content/uploads/CoA-Comments-August-08-2019.pdf>

Here is the relevant By-law for recreation centre parking and the requested variance.

***BY-LAW REQUIREMENTS:***

*The property is located in the Specialized Commercial Recreation (P.5-6) Zone. A variance from Section 4.13.4.2 of Zoning By-law (1995)-14864, as amended, is being requested. The By-law requires 1 parking space per 10 square metres of gross floor area for a recreation centre [1505 parking spaces], or 1 parking space per 5 seats [283 parking spaces], whichever is greater.*

***REQUEST:***

*The applicant is seeking relief from the By-law requirements to permit a minimum of 521 off-street parking spaces for the proposed recreation centre at 25 Poppy Drive West.*

# Memorandum

**TO:****Lindsay Sulatycki**

Senior Development Planner  
The City of Guelph: Planning Department  
City Hall, 59 Carden Street  
Guelph, ON N1H 3A1

**FROM:**

Ralph Bond

**PROJECT:**

7723.04  
South End Community Centre

**DATE:**

June 12, 2019

**SUBJECT: REVIEW OF PROPOSED PARKING SUPPLY – SOUTH END COMMUNITY CENTRE****BACKGROUND**

This memorandum has been prepared to briefly summarize our review of the proposed parking supply for the new South End Community Centre to be located at 25 Poppy Drive adjacent to the future Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan area.

As we understand it from the material provided by the City, the proposed Community Centre will be located adjacent to the existing Bishop Macdonell Secondary School and South End Community Park. The existing 246 space surface lot that serves the school and the community park would be replaced with a 521 space surface lot to serve all three land uses. We understand that the secondary school is required to provide 246 spaces to meet zoning by-law requirements. The Community Park contains 3 hardball baseball diamonds, 2 tennis courts, 2 basketball half courts and one basketball full court, play equipment, a splash pad and trails.

The new community centre will be approximately 15,050 square metres in gross floor area (GFA) and include a twin rink, twin gymnasium, aquatics centre, five multi-purpose rooms, a walking track and team warm-up track. The combined seating capacity for all of the facilities is estimated at 1414 seats.<sup>1</sup> The current zoning by-law parking supply requirement for a recreational centre/recreational establishment is one space per 10 square metres GFA or one space per five seats, whichever is greater. This requires 1505 parking spaces based on GFA and 304 spaces based on seating capacity. The proposed 521 space supply represents a supply rate of 3.46 spaces per hundred square metres GFA.

---

<sup>1</sup> The seating capacities for twin rinks, aquatics and gym facilities were provided by the City. The maximum seating capacities for the five meeting rooms have been supplied by the project architects MJMA.



In March 2019, the consulting firm HDR included a parking analysis as part of its Traffic Impact Study for the community centre.<sup>2</sup> Based upon some parking utilization surveys at the West End Community Centre (WECC), they estimated the parking demand for the new SECC at 315 spaces for a Saturday, a rate of 2.09 spaces per hundred square metres GFA compared to the zoning by-law requirement of 10.0 spaces per hundred square metres GFA (i.e. one space per 10 square metres GFA) and proposed supply rate of 3.46. The Saturday demand rate reflected a weekend squash tournament taking place on the Twin rinks from 8am to 10pm (i.e. Chuck Miller Classic Tournament), although the attendance or occupancy level was not noted. In addition to the lacrosse tournament, the gym, aquatics facilities, fitness centre and one of the two meeting rooms were also in use at the same time throughout the day. The weekday demand rate ranged from 0.41 to 0.78 spaces per hundred square metres in the morning and afternoon respectively (i.e. 62 to 118 spaces). These parking demand observations were not conducted continuously throughout the days surveyed and it is not clear that the peak occupancy was captured in each case.

HDR also surveyed the utilization of the existing parking serving the Bishop Macdonell Secondary School and South End Community Park which reached 151 spaces during the Thursday weekday and 74 spaces during the Saturday, both days in June 2018. As one might expect, the utilization of the high school parking would be higher on a weekday when the school is in operation and substantially lower on a weekend, except for special events. Conversely, one would expect that the use of the community park would be higher on a weekday evening and Saturday. These offset peak parking demands allow for the common parking supply to be shared by both the school and the park, and by the new community centre as well.

Using the results described, HDR noted a combined weekend parking demand of 389 spaces and a weekday demand of 213 to 239 spaces in the morning and afternoon respectively. It is possible that the observed demand at the high school weekday in late June did not represent peak activity. Assuming the entire by-law parking supply requirement of 246 spaces, the weekday combined demand would be 364 spaces. In each case, the parking demands estimated by HDR would be well below the proposed combined supply of 521 spaces.

### ZONING BY-LAW REQUIREMENTS IN OTHER MUNICIPALITIES

The Guelph zoning by-law requirements for the new community centre are clearly excessive based upon a review of other municipal by-laws and the parking supply provided at other similar community centres in the Greater Toronto Area and elsewhere in Ontario.

A review of the zoning requirements in other Ontario municipalities reveals a wide variation in requirements, but they would all require substantially less than 1505 spaces. For example, most of the requirements based upon floor area fall in the 2.0 to 5.0 spaces per hundred square metre range, with the more common being in the 3.0 to 4.5 spaces per hundred square metres GFA range. Most of the requirements based on seats range from 1 per every 4 seats to 1 per every 7 seats. Some of the by-laws have both a GFA and seat calculation, whichever is greater. A summary of these other by-law requirements is provided in Appendix Table A1.

---

<sup>2</sup> Update Report, City of Guelph, South End Community Centre (SECC) Traffic Impact Study, March 8, 2019.



## PARKING SUPPLY RATES PROVIDED AT OTHER COMMUNITY CENTRES

The HDR report included a list of the parking supply (not demand) provided at four large scale community centres in Kingston, Ottawa, Guelph and Brantford as well as the Guelph West End Community Centre (WECC). The supply rates ranged from 3.0 to 5.26 spaces per hundred square metres GFA. The existing WECC in Guelph has a supply rate of 3.15 spaces per hundred square metres GFA. A review BA Group's database for large scale community Centres with rinks indicates a supply rate range of 2.1 to 5.7 spaces per hundred square metres GFA.

The most similar sized facility to the SECC in Guelph, is the Angus Glen Community Centre in Markham that has a supply rate of 2.2 for 16068 square metres of GFA. However, this centre has twin rinks with a combined seating capacity of 450 people, substantially less than what will be available in the new SECC. It also includes a library and seniors centre.

Although we do not have more detailed information, the variation in the supply rates at these locations may be related to the number of rinks and more importantly, the seating capacity provided.

## UTILIZATION SURVEYS AT OTHER COMMUNITY CENTRES

Utilizations surveys conducted by the consulting firm of Poulos & Chung in 2006 at the 16,258 square metre Thornhill Community Centre indicate demand rates of approximately 2.15 and 2.74 spaces per hundred square metres for events without and with the twin rinks in operation, respectively. The Thornhill Community Centre has a seating capacity of 1220 seats and includes a seniors centre and fitness centre.

Utilization surveys conducted by BA Group at large scale community centres without rinks indicate peak demand rates of 2.4 to 2.6 spaces per hundred square metres GFA. A detailed demand estimate prepared by BA Group in 2016 for the new Bessarion Community Centre in Toronto (which does not include rinks) suggest demand rates of 2.7 spaces per hundred square metres for the aquatics/ multi-purpose room and gym portions of a community centre.

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) provides some guidance on parking requirements for community or recreation centres, all of which are substantially less than the Guelph zoning by-law requirement. The Third Edition of the ITE Parking Generation manual provided an average weekday demand rate for Recreational Community Centres in *suburban* locations equivalent to 4.12 spaces per hundred square metres GFA, based on five samples. The more recent Fifth Edition provides an average demand rate of 2.04 for a weekday based on 10 samples, a rate of 1.9 on a Saturday based on 2 samples and a rate of 4.02 on a Sunday based on one sample. The seating capacity available and the number and type of facilities included in the centres is not available.

The 521 space shared parking supply proposed for the SECC equates to a supply rate of 3.46 spaces per hundred square metres, assuming that there are not any school or community park events occurring at the same time. If 75 to 120 spaces are deducted to accommodate parking demand for the Community Park, the supply rate for the SECC becomes 2.96 or 2.66 spaces per hundred square metres GFA.

Based upon the demand surveys at other community centres in the GTA, it appears that parking demand rates in the 2.75 range could be expected. However, the ITE Parking Generation Manual results suggest parking demand rates of 4.0 spaces per hundred square metres GFA are possible as well.



## PARKING DEMAND ESTIMATE BASED ON SEATING CAPACITIES

In order to better understand the components of the proposed community centre that generate parking demand, Table 1 compares the WECC and SECC facilities in terms of floor space and seating capacity. While the floor space at the SECC will be approximately 31.1% higher, the seating capacities will be 109% higher (i.e. 1414 seats versus 675 seats). This suggests that using a floor space demand rate may significantly underestimate the potential parking demand that might occur when the seating capacities are utilized at the same intensity observed during the June 2018 Chuck Miller Lacrosse Tournament. For example, the demand that HDR observed on Saturday May 26 equates to a rate of 0.35 spaces per available seating capacity.<sup>3</sup> Applying this rate to the 1414 seats available in the SECC yields a parking demand for 495 spaces or 95% of the available 521 space capacity proposed in the parking lots. This compares to a demand estimate of 315 spaces using the floor space rate of 2.09 derived from the same HDR surveys.

**TABLE 1  
COMPARATIVE BUILDING STATISTICS**

Components	Facilities		Floor Areas (SM)			Seating Capacities (Max.)		
	WECC	SECC	WECC	SECC	% Difference	WECC	SECC	% Difference
Library	Yes	No	465	-	-100.00%			
Twin Rinks	Yes -2	Yes-2		5,021		475	852	79.37%
Pools	Yes -3	Yes-2		1,517		40	137	242.50%
Gymnasium	Yes -1	Yes -2		1,463		40	140	250.00%
Multi-purpose rooms	Yes -2	Yes -5	162	525	223.61%	120	285	137.50%
Splash Pad	Yes	Yes						
Team Warm-up Track	No	Yes		406				
Walking Track	No	Yes		552				
<b>Total</b>			<b>11,481</b>	<b>15,050</b>	<b>31.09%</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>1,414</b>	<b>109.48%</b>
Staff		45		45				
Parking Supply			362	521		362	521	
Parking Supply Rate			3.15	3.46	9.79%	1.86	2.71	
Beside A School	No	Yes						
Beside a Sports Park	No	Yes						

The seating capacity based parking demand estimate of 495 spaces could be accommodated at the SECC if there were not any events occurring at the High School or the Community Park. As noted earlier, HDR also surveyed the utilization of the existing parking at the SECC site in June and found a demand of 74 spaces during the Saturday, probably related to the community park. Adding this number to the 495 space SECC demand estimate based on seating capacity results in a total parking space demand of 495 spaces or 48 spaces more than the proposed supply.

It is also possible that the parking demand at the South End Community Park could be higher than observed during the Saturday June 16 HDR survey date. For example, we typically allow for at least 30 spaces per baseball diamond, 4 spaces per tennis court and 10 spaces per basketball court. This suggests that demand for park related facilities might reach 118 spaces. Adding 118 spaces to the 495 space demand estimate for

<sup>3</sup> 240 vehicles parked/675 seats available

the SECC, results in a total demand for 613 spaces or 92 more spaces than the proposed 521 space supply assuming a major event like the Chuck Miller Classic Lacrosse Tournament was held during the spring/summer period and the extra seating capacity provided at the SECC was utilized for that event.

#### DEMAND MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The Parks and Recreation Department has supplied a list of special events that typically take place at all of their community centres in order to gain an understanding of how often very high attendance events occur throughout the year. There are approximately 22 days when very high attendance events occur and 19 of the 22 occur during the winter months when the demand for parking related to the South End Community Park will be very low. The only very large event that occurred during the spring/summer was the Chuck Miller Classic Lacrosse Tournament over three days. There were only 3 days that attracted more attendance than the Chuck Miller Classic Lacrosse Tournament and they occurred in November (i.e. GMHA Power Play Tournament) when there would not be any conflict with events in the South End Community Park.

The special event information supplied by Parks and Recreation suggests that there are only a few days in the year (i.e. about six days or 1.6%) when the demand for parking might exceed the 521 spaces proposed. If extra parking were provided for these limited number of events, it would likely be unused for the remainder of the year.

Given the limited number of times in the year when unrestrained demand for parking might exceed capacity, the City could implement event demand management in order to ensure that sufficient parking capacity would be available. For example, the use of the gymnasiums and multi-use rooms could be reduced or eliminated during peak capacity events in the twin rinks. If the multi-use rooms were limited to the use of approximately 25% of their maximum capacity (i.e. 100 out of 390 maximum seats), then SECC parking demand would be reduced by approximately 100 spaces. The City might also consider the potential for using some of the parking supply at the Clair Road Emergency Services Building approximately 400 metres away. There appears to be 55 to 74 spaces in the rear lot which might be used to accommodate at least employee parking for the Community Centre during peak events.



## **APPENDIX A: Community Centre Parking Supply Requirements in Other Municipalities**

**TABLE A1 REC CENTRE / COMMUNITY CENTRE PARKING SUPPLY STANDARDS**

Municipality (Zoning By-Law)	Rec Centre / Recreational Establishment	Community Centre	Commercial Fitness Centre / Health or Fitness Club	Public Hall	Racquet Courts	Hockey rink / Arena	Sports Field (baseball, soccer, football)	Pool	Commercial Outdoor Recreation / Active Recreational Use
Ajax (95-2003)		1 per 50 s.m. GFA (exception 40)	1 per 20 s.m. GFA			The greater of: 1 per 10 s.m. GFA or 1 per 5 seats of seating capacity			
Ajax – Downtown Central Area and Village Core Mixed Use Zones (95-2003)			Minimum: 3.75 per 100 s.m. GFA Maximum: 4.5 per 100 s.m. GFA						
Barrie (2009-141)		1 per 4 persons	1 per 2 persons			1 per 4 persons			
Burlington (2020)	1 space per 6 persons capacity	1 space per 4 persons capacity							
Cambridge (150-85)			The greater of: 1 per 3 seats (=2m of bench space), or 1 per every 5 persons of building capacity		3 per 2-player court and 6 per 4-player court	The greater of: 1 per 3 seats (=2m of bench space), or 1 per every 5 persons of building capacity		The greater of: 1 per 3 seats (=2m of bench space), or 1 per every 5 persons of building capacity	
Chatham-Kent (216-2009)	One space per 4.64 sq. m of public floor area or one space per five persons maximum capacity, whichever is the greater.			One space per 4.64 sq. m of public floor area or one space per five persons maximum capacity, whichever is the greater.			Twenty spaces per playing field.		
Guelph ((1995) – 14864)	1 per 10 m <sup>2</sup> G.F.A., or 1 per 5 seats whichever is greater, except in the case of: i) a Golf Course which shall provide 6 per hole ii) a miniature golf course or driving range which shall provide 1 per tee or hole. iii) A bowling alley which shall provide 1 per 6 lanes plus 1 for each 23 m <sup>2</sup> of Gross Floor Area Used for an Accessory Use.			Includes an Arena with seats: 1 per 5 seats or 1 per 10 m <sup>2</sup> G.F.A. Used for a hall, auditorium or similar Use involving the assembly of persons, whichever is greater. Where public assembly seating is provided in the form of fixed benches or pews, then 0.5 metres of each such bench or pew length shall be considered as equalling one seat. The number of persons to be accommodated for public assembly activities with movable seating shall be based on 1 person per 1m <sup>2</sup> of movable seating.		Arena (no seats): 1 per 33 m <sup>2</sup> G.F.A.			

Municipality (Zoning By-Law)	Rec Centre / Recreational Establishment	Community Centre	Commercial Fitness Centre / Health or Fitness Club	Public Hall	Racquet Courts	Hockey rink / Arena	Sports Field (baseball, soccer, football)	Pool	Commercial Outdoor Recreation / Active Recreational Use
Hamilton (05-200)			1 for each 15.0 square metres of gross floor area which accommodates such use.						
Kingston (8499)		1 per 25s.m. of floor area designed or used specifically as a place of assembly			1 per 70 s.m. of ground area	1 per 10 seats (1 seat = 0.5m of bench)			
Kingston (96-259)			1 per 7 seats or 1 per 23 s.m. GFA used for the assembly of persons, whichever is greater			With seats: 1 per 7 seats or 1 per 23 s.m. GFA Without seats: 3 per 100 s.m.			1 per 1000 s.m. GFA
Kingston (97-102)	The greater of: 1 per 14 s.m. GFA or 1 per 4 persons design capacity of the establishment	The greater of: 1 per 6 seats or 1 per 100 s.m. GFA	3.1 per 100 s.m. GFA						
Kingston (76-26)	The greater of: 1 per 14 s.m. GFA or 1 per 4 persons design capacity of the establishment	The greater of: 1 per 6 fixed seats or 10.76 per 100 s.m. GFA	3.1 per 100 s.m. GFA						
Kingston (32-74)	The greater of: 1 per 14 s.m. GFA or 1 per 4 persons design capacity of the establishment								
Kitchener (85-1)		The greater of: 1 per 7 seats or 1 per 23 s.m. GFA				The greater of: 1 per 7 seats or 1 per 23 s.m. GFA			
Kitchener (CRoZBy) [not yet in effect]		UGC Zones: 1 per 100 s.m. GFA MIX Zones: 1 per 23 s.m. GFA All other zones: 1 per 23 s.m. GFA	UGC Zones: 1 per 77 s.m. GFA MIX Zones: 1 per 30 s.m. GFA All other zones: 1 per 20 s.m. GFA						
London (Z.-1)	Parking Standard Area 1: 1 per 45 or 90 m <sup>2</sup>	Parking Standard Area 1: 1 per 45 or 90 m <sup>2</sup> Parking Standard Area 2: 1 per 8 seats or per 1 per 35 m <sup>2</sup> (376 sq ft) whichever is greater Parking Standard Area 3: 1 per 7 seats or per 1 per 25 m <sup>2</sup> (269 sq ft) whichever is greater	Parking Standard Area 1: 1 per 45 or 90 m <sup>2</sup>			Parking Standard Area 1: 1 per 45 or 90 m <sup>2</sup> Parking Standard Area 2 and 3: 1 per 35 m <sup>2</sup> or 1 per 7 or 8 seats (depending on area)	Parking Standard Area 1: 1 per 45 or 90 m <sup>2</sup>		Parking Standard Area 1: 1 per 45 or 90 m <sup>2</sup> Parking Standard Area 2 and 3: 1 per 1,000 m <sup>2</sup>

Municipality (Zoning By-Law)	Rec Centre / Recreational Establishment	Community Centre	Commercial Fitness Centre / Health or Fitness Club	Public Hall	Racquet Courts	Hockey rink / Arena	Sports Field (baseball, soccer, football)	Pool	Commercial Outdoor Recreation / Active Recreational Use
Milton (144-2003) (online for interim reference)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 parking space per 30m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area for all buildings, structures and pavilions; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 30 parking spaces per baseball field;</li> <li>▪ 30 parking spaces per soccer field;</li> <li>▪ 15 parking spaces for general park visitors;</li> <li>▪ 4 parking spaces per tennis court</li> </ul> Notwithstanding the requirements above, where a Public Park is 2.0ha or less in area, no off-street parking is required. Notwithstanding the requirements above, where any sports field or tennis court located within a Public Park having an area greater than 2.0ha and at least one lot line abutting a school property, no additional parking is required within the Public Park provided that the required parking for the school has direct access to the sports field or tennis court or tennis court.								
Milton (016-2014 (HUSP Urban Area))	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 parking spaces for general park visitors; PLUS <input type="checkbox"/> 1 parking space per 30m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area for all buildings, structures and pavilions; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 30 parking spaces per baseball field;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 30 parking spaces per soccer field;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 4 parking spaces per tennis court</li> </ul> Notwithstanding the requirements above, where a Public Park is 2.0ha or less in area no off-street parking is required Notwithstanding the requirements above, where any sports field or tennis court located within a Public Park having an area greater than 2.0ha and at least one lot line abutting a school property, no additional parking is required within the Public Park provided that the required parking for the school has direct access to the sports field or tennis court.								
Mississauga (0225-2007)	4.5 spaces per 100 m2 GFA - non-residential, except for an arena					1.0 space per 4 seats of permanent fixed seating			4.5 spaces per 100 m2 GFA - non-residential, except for an arena or a marina
Oakville (2009-189)		1 parking space per 30 square metres of leasable floor area minimum; and, 1 parking space per 20 square metres of leasable floor area maximum		1 parking space per 10 square metres of leasable floor area minimum; and, 1 parking space per 5.5 square metres of leasable floor area maximum		1 parking space per 6 or 7 seats minimum (depending on zones)			
Oakville (2014-014)		1.0 per 22.0 m2 net floor area							
Oshawa (60-94)	1 parking space per 6 fixed seats or 4.0m of bench space, or 1 parking space for each 6m <sup>2</sup> of assembly floor area whichever is the greater	1 per 20m2 provided, however, that where more than fifty percent (50%) of the gross floor area of a Club or community centre is designed or used for assembly purposes, the parking requirement for an assembly hall shall apply	1 parking space per 6 fixed seats or 4.0m of bench space, or 1 parking space for each 6m <sup>2</sup> of assembly floor area whichever is the greater			1 parking space per 6 fixed seats or 4.0m of bench space, or 1 parking space for each 6m <sup>2</sup> of assembly floor area whichever is the greater			
St. Catharines (2013-283)	1 per 20 s.m. GFA				2 per court		20 per playing field	3 per 100 s.m. GFA	
Sudbury (2010-100Z)	1/6 persons of capacity, plus 1/20m <sup>2</sup> net floor area of any accessory use	1/6 persons of capacity	1/6 persons capacity			1/6 persons of capacity			



Municipality (Zoning By-Law)	Rec Centre / Recreational Establishment	Community Centre	Commercial Fitness Centre / Health or Fitness Club	Public Hall	Racquet Courts	Hockey rink / Arena	Sports Field (baseball, soccer, football)	Pool	Commercial Outdoor Recreation / Active Recreational Use
Thunder Bay (100-2010)		the greater of: (a) 1 PARKING SPACE for every 6 fixed seats and/or 1 PARKING SPACE for every 10.0m <sup>2</sup> of assembly area where there are no fixed seats; or (b) 1 PARKING SPACE for every 25.0m <sup>2</sup> of the GFA of the BUILDING.	one PARKING SPACE for every 25.0m <sup>2</sup> of GFA	the greater of: (a) 1 PARKING SPACE for every 6 fixed seats and/or 1 PARKING SPACE for every 10.0m <sup>2</sup> of assembly area where there are no fixed seats; or (b) 1 PARKING SPACE for every 25.0m <sup>2</sup> of the GFA of the BUILDING.		the greater of: (a) 1 PARKING SPACE for every 6 fixed seats and/or 1 PARKING SPACE for every 10.0m <sup>2</sup> of assembly area where there are no fixed seats; or (b) 1 PARKING SPACE for every 25.0m <sup>2</sup> of the GFA of the BUILDING.			
Waterloo (878A)		1 per 4 seats or 1 per 80" of bench space				1 per 4 seats or 1 per 80" of bench space			
Waterloo (1108)	1 per 5 seats	1 per 5 seats				1 per 5 seats		1 per 5 seats	
Waterloo (1418)		3 per 100 s.m. GFA				1 per 5 seats		1 per 5 seats	
Whitby (5581-05)		1 per 6 fixed seats or 1 per 5.5 s.m. GFA							
Whitby (1784)		1 per 4 persons of permitted capacity			4 per court				
Whitby (2585)		1 per 4 persons of permitted capacity			4 per court				
Windsor (8600)	1 for each 36 m <sup>2</sup> GFA								

#### Community Centre / Recreation Centre

- 15,000 sm GFA (~160,000 SF GFA) building
- Multiple ice pads (i.e. hockey rinks)
- Aquatic centre
- Gym
- Multi-purpose rooms
- Multiple baseball fields
- Tennis courts
- Park space
- Soccer/football field with track shared with adjacent high school