

20. Re: Kensington Arena

Alderman Mercier raised the following questions regarding the Kensington Arena at the Council meeting of May 22, 1973:

1. Why wasn't the area over the lobby used as a mezzanine floor?
2. Was sufficient seating being provided in the arena?
3. A contractor is required to remove the excess excavated material to the back of the building and is it possible that it could be used in the construction of the berm that is anticipated along Curtis Street?

Question 1. The minutes of a meeting of the Capital Development Committee of the Parks and Recreation Commission held Tuesday, July 19, 1972 provides the answer to this question. Prior to the July 1972 meeting, the Commission and its Capital Development Committee had given much consideration to the design of the Kensington Rink, and had met with many citizens and sports groups in the community to see that the design best fulfilled the community needs. During the period of design, consideration had been given to the inclusion of a meeting room cum social lounge type room in the proposed Rink. The capacity of the room had ranged from 100 persons to 400 persons, and its location above the skaters' lobby had been considered. The question was resolved by the Committee and Commission deciding to concentrate the effort toward building a Rink with high quality ice machinery and skating surface, together with ancillary dressing rooms, etc., all housed in a building, attractive in a residential park setting. The design of a low profile Rink building, incorporating a room with 100 persons seating capacity off the upper spectator foyer and overlooking the ice surface was adopted.

Question 2. The minutes of the same Committee meeting held on July 1972 cover this question. During the period of design consideration, spectator seating had ranged from 500 persons to 3,000 persons. The question of spectator accommodation was resolved by the Committee and the Commission concluding that the Rink was to be a participation facility, not a spectator facility. Hence, with this decision taken, the Committee and the Commission members agreed that the 600 seat spectator capacity was ample for a participation Rink. It was felt that the spectator area is really not used that greatly and if a large accommodation was required then there were other rinks in the lower mainland which could provide this type of setting.

Question 3. The Chief Building Inspector, who is acting as Project Co-ordinator for the Parks and Recreation Commission on its construction projects, has had the question of using the excess excavated material on the berm proposed adjacent to the parking lot on Curtis Street under consideration for the last ten days. He has been having discussions with the Parks and Recreation staff in this connection. The company advised us some two weeks ago that if we provided the trucks they would load the units for us so that we could deliver the material to wherever we wanted. Under the contract the company is obliged to remove the material and place it behind the building. This question is well in hand.

This is for the information of Council.