

2021 01 11

City of Greater Sudbury
PO Box 5000, Station A
200 Brady Street
Sudbury, ON P3A 5P3
CANADA

Attention: Mayor Brian Bigger
Re: projectNOW presentation to council 2020 10 06

Dear Mayor Bigger,

Thank you for the opportunity to present projectNOW to City Council on October 6, 2020. We believe that this is an important direction for the Council to consider, especially in these most challenging of times.

For the record, we would like to briefly correct a number of items that arose during the virtual discussion and were stated publicly by members of Council.

- 1 **The Sudbury Community Arena is not 'floating on logs'.** The existing building has a deep foundation system that utilizes steel piles below concrete piers at all of the steel trusses that span the playing surface and support the vast majority of the roof. Vertical wood piles are used to support exterior walls only. To our knowledge excessive settlement at the exterior wall, where wood piles have been used, has never occurred during the 70 years since installation. *Accordingly, it should be understood that the existing wood piles do not, in and of themselves, pose a negative constraint to projectNOW.*
- 2 **The clearance between the playing surface and the steel trusses is well within industry standards.** At one point the distance was stated to be 32-45 feet. The actual height is between 45 and 55 feet. This distance complies with recommendations in the PwC report issued in 2017; a minimum height of 44 feet. Further, projectNOW's audio-visual budget has anticipated the following:
 - the installation of new rigging points and access systems to these locations at a minimum of 44 feet above finished floor,
 - a new, flexible, retractable / demountable video scoreboard systems that could be easily positioned to accommodate concert and sporting events and a rapid transition between the two,
 - the use of linearray loudspeaker systems, that are now commonly used by touring companies, and permit any venue to be tuned, providing superior acoustics for performers and their audiences.*Accordingly, it should be understood that the steel truss clearances do not, in and of themselves pose a negative constraint to projectNOW"*
- 3 **The economic impact of renewing and rejuvenating the arena, in a part of the city with existing density, existing infrastructure and higher property values is significant.** When compared to locating the facility on the outskirts on an unserved greenfield location, or on a less dense part of the city, the renewal the Sudbury Community Arena will generate a net economic benefit in excess of \$60M over the life of the project. When located in the urban core, the project does not require a casino, a hotel or any other venues to help make it feasible. The entertainment area already exists. From a tax base perspective, the project in core pays for itself.

Timothy James
BES BArch OAA MRAIC

Sergio Cacciotti
PQS CET GSC

Michael Ladyk
BArch OAA

Angèle Dmytruk
MArch BArch Sci OAA

289 Cedar Street
Sudbury, ON P3B 1M8

705-674-2300

www.3rdLine.Studio

- 4 During our presentation there were a number of questions that referenced the 2017 report completed by CBRE and MJMA Architects at the request of the City of Greater Sudbury. We have prepared a matrix comparison for your review that compares projectNOW to this study and the PwC report completed in 2017. I hope it helps to shed light on aspects of the project that came into question during the discussion. A brief summary of the matrix might highlight the following;
- The two schemes share some common elements;
 - The functional program; the list / type and size of key spaces required appears to be similar. The areas of renovation, addition and overall size are similar; projectNow being only slightly larger.
 - Both focus the public on an expanded upper concourse and create a top fed bowl. The 2015 scheme proposes to raise the concourse higher and add more seats whereas projectNOW expands the existing upper concourse level and densifies seating where possible.
 - Both develop more supportive back of house facilities. The 2015 scheme closes Grey Street to get access to the lower level whereas projectNOW uses the existing site to achieve access on the north face of the existing building.
 - Both seek to create a new interface with the public by expanding the entry lobby, ticketing areas. The 2015 scheme created an offset addition at the existing south façade and creates a weak connection to the existing lobby and does little to improve the existing steep stair link to the concourse whereas projectNow create new exterior and interior public spaces and rebuilding a stronger, more direct and accessible link between entry level and the new upper concourse.

One could view projectNOW as a logical next step development of the 2015 study. It would also be logical to consider that the next iteration of the project would further refine, adapt projectNOW. It would reshape the project to better respond to functional and public needs that grew out of a community, user, stakeholder consultation process.'

- 5 **We are not proponents.** We understand the procurement process that the city uses as we have used these procedures numerous times and assisted the city in writing RFPs for over 30 years. We are not on the shortlist for the design build of a new arena. **We are solely interested in helping our city renew and grow.**

As a Rotarian the motto '**service above self**' is a theme I apply to the things I think, say and do. While this is not a Rotary project, there are a number of Rotarians that have been involved in shaping projectNow. I can confirm their efforts support this rotary motto.

To conclude, there is a key idea that is central to our collective efforts to achieve the right outcome with this project. It involves the fundamental parameters that guide the development of the city over many years, beyond the term or two of a councillor or a mayor and extend to the broad and historic development of an urban setting over a hundred years.

The city's Official Plan, along with the Downtown MasterPplan, are the uppermost laws and guiding principles for the city. These documents form a fundamental "community contract" between citizens and the council that leads our community. These documents represent many hours of work by planners, lawyers, community members and politicians. The Official Plan underpins the considered and thoughtful plans for the development of the city, not just for us, but for future generations.

Timothy James
BES BArch OAA MRAIC

Sergio Cacciotti
PQS CET GSC

Michael Ladyk
BArch OAA

Angèle Dmytruk
MARCH BArch Sci OAA

289 Cedar Street
Sudbury, ON P3B 1M8

705-674-2300

www.3rdLine.Studio

Section 4.2.1 of the official plan states;

"Downtown is the heart of Greater Sudbury and a strategic core area in northern Ontario. It forms the historic core of the amalgamated City, retaining its important function as a local and regional centre of government services, business services, retail, **sport and entertainment uses, arts and culture**, and community and institutional uses. The Downtown services a large catchment area that extends beyond Greater Sudbury. It is also a place where people live. Compact, walkable and transit supportive, the Downtown possesses a distinct built form that sets it apart from other urban areas, offering unique opportunities to protect, develop and sustain its role as the vibrant hub of a dynamic city."

By proposing to move the Sudbury Community Area, a key public space focused on **cultural, sport and entertainment**, from the urban core you have broken the covenant that binds us together in this community. You and your council have signaled to those planners, community members, professional consultants that you have sought and paid for and, most importantly, our city citizens, that their historical expertise, technical expertise, best practice knowledge and insightful contributions are of little or no value. You and your council have overlooked this consideration. Your actions will have far reaching consequences for our community.

There is much work to do on this matter. We remain hopeful that your leadership and the common sense of the council will now, more than ever, see the need to consider other options for moving forward.

You have a unique opportunity to alter the future of the community. The recently completed and very successful international design competition; Sudbury2050.ca, has demonstrated the importance of the arena as an integral element in the urban core. It is an essential ingredient in this urban ecosystem.

projectNOW has gathered data and illustrated that there are viable and desirable options to renew the existing historic elements of the old barn. Please use these efforts to shape a strategy that delivers and fulfills on the promise of the city's official plan.

There are many community minded Sudburians that will be your allies in this effort and will respond in kind to your reconsideration.

Yours very truly,



Tim James BES BArch OAA MRAIC
Architect / Partner



Angele Dmytruk BArch Sci MArch OAA
Architect / Partner

copy Councillor Mark Signoretti
Councillor Michael Vagnini
Councillor Gerry Montpellier
Councillor Geoff McCausland
Councillor Robert Kirwan
Councillor Rene Lapierre
Councillor Mike Jakabo
Councillor Deb McIntosh
Councillor Fern Cormier

Timothy James
BES BArch OAA MRAIC

Sergio Cacciotti
PQS CET GSC

Michael Ladyk
BArch OAA

Angèle Dmytruk
MArch BArch Sci OAA

289 Cedar Street
Sudbury, ON P3B 1M8

705-674-2300

www.3rdLine.Studio

3RD LINE STUDIO

Councillor Bill Leduc
Councillor Joscelyne Landry-Altman

Mary Katherine Keown, Sudbury Star, mkkeown@postmedia.com
Ian Campbell, CTV, ian.campbell@bellmedia.ca
Casey Stranges, CBC, casey.stranges@cbc.ca
Mark Gentili, Sudbury.com, mgentili@sudbury.com
lucie.boudreau@levoyageur.ca
levoyageur@levoyageur.ca
matindunord@radio-canada.ca
mcloutier@leloupfm.com
miguel.lachance@radio-canada.ca
patrick.wright@radio-canada.ca
robert.mcmillan@radio-canada.ca
sarah.st-pierre@radio-canada.ca
sophie.houle-drapeau@cbc.ca
zacharie.routhier@radio-canada.ca

e matrix comparison, revised 2021 01 09

O:\1 PROJECTS\2020\2011 - Sudbury Arena\7.0 Drawings\7.1 Design\Dated Archives\2021 01 18 - response to council\letter 2021 01 11.docx

Timothy James
BES BArch OAA MRAIC

Sergio Cacciotti
PQS CET GSC

Michael Ladyk
BArch OAA

Angèle Dmytruk
MArch BArch Sci OAA

289 Cedar Street
Sudbury, ON P3B 1M8

705-674-2300

www.3rdLine.Studio

comparison matrix

revised 2020 01 09

aspect	existing sudbury community arena	cbre/mjma 2015 study	projectNOW 2020	pwc 2017 study
1 focus / approach	~	refurbishment - raises upper concourse by 6 feet +/- to create top fed bowl and increase seating capacity - adds support programming and loading spaces on lower level - adds additional suites on new level at west end	renewal - reimages, wraps, existing arena on all sides creating new public spaces at entry - expands existing upper concourse to create top fed bowl - develops new back of house support programming within existing site - expands programming to accept private sector participation at venue: restaurants + retail	new build The study identified key functional requirements for a new facility.
2 constraints	~	Working within the existing building structure, refrigeration, ice slab, roof, seating.	the historic parts of the barn; - cast iron steel trusses, wood decking that forms roof - reinforced concrete bowl structure - historic arch entry - existing site limits	not applicable
3 features - front of house				
3.1 main lobby	Small centrally located lobby characterized by steep stair to upper concourse and dark tunnel to lower concourse.	New main lobby provided with a weak connection to existing lobby and public concourse.	Expanded central lobby provided with rebuilt accessible access systems; stair, escalators, elevators to new public concourse.	Main lobby shall be centrally located, connected to ticketing and public concourse.
3.2 public concourse	Bottom + top fed courses are part of the existing arena.	top fed public concourse, width unidentified	top fed public concourse, 17' width	Top, bottom, intermediate concourses are options with connections to commercial spaces, min width 16'.
3.3 commercial space	A small (less than 500sf) merchandising area is located on the lower concourse.	Merchandising spaces are provide adjacent main lobby and accessible to the street.	Commercial spaces provide for 2 restaurants and merchandising areas accessible to the concourse and adjacent streets.	Commercial spaces required are 1 or 2 - 500sf minimum commercial spaces linked to public concourse.
3.4 concessions	Estimates that there are approximately 30-40 points of sale in the existing upper and lower concourses.	Points of sales not identified - assumed to meeting minimum requirements.	50 points of sales provided at new upper concourse.	Recommended 'point of sales' is in the range of 33-40.
3.5 washrooms	Existing washrooms are aged and generally inadequate	Washroom counts are not identified - assumed to meet minimum requirements.	52 wc fixtures minimum required to support seating bowl only. Additional fixture provided to suit dressing rooms, green room, restaurants, other commercial spaces.	Meet OBC minimum requirements and assume 60% male and 60% female attendees to account for different event types.
3.6 administration	Minimal administration spaces provided.	provided	provided	Office environments required to accommodate staff.
3.7 ticketing	Minimal ticket spaces provided.	provided	provided	Ticketing spaces to be located at / main public
3.8 features - house				
3.9 general seating	unknown	6,000 seats identified in study - no detail regarding breakdown provided.	4,780 seats provided.	Minimum capacity of 5,020 recommended.
3.10 club seating	unknown	see above	511 seats provided.	Minimum capacity of 500 recommended.
3.11 private suites	18 suites provided	29 suites provided, seating detail not provided.	24 private boxes with 240 seats provided.	24 private boxes recommended with minimum capacity of 240 recommended.
3.12 loge boxes	none	see above	10 loge boxes with 40 seats provided.	10 loge recommended with minimum capacity of 40 recommended.
3.13 event floor / field of play	Existing venue utilizes portable basketball court / convention floor coverings. Hockey boards / glass systems are not removed for events.	Flexibility concepts not in scope of work.	Retractable seating concepts developed for east and west ends of seating bowl.	Key features and flexibility; removable board systems, retractable seating concepts.
3.14 media booth	Two (2) existing media booths are limited in size and access.	not in scope	Expanded media box elevated above the public concourse provided with accessible access.	Continuous 60' desk spaces with direct / unobstructed view to the play surface required.
3.15 features - back of house				
3.16 home team dressing room		scope unclear - assume at least one home / visitor suite are provided.	Two (2) large home team dressing room suites are provided - one for the 'wolves' and one for the 'S'. One visiting team suite is provided.	Home team dressing rooms provide a number of traditional change room spaces and include other support spaces for team uses. One visiting team dressing room suite is required
3.17 community dressing rooms		four community dressing room suites have been provided.	Six community dressing room suites have been provided.	Community dressing rooms support 24 users each with showers, washrooms, dressing areas. Six (6) dressing rooms are recommended.
3.18 officials / multi purpose dressing rooms		provided	Two (2) multi purpose dressing room suites have been provided.	Multi purpose dressing rooms support 6+/- users each with showers, washrooms, dressing areas.
3.19 multipurpose room / green room		unknown	A green room and support washroom / shower has been provided.	A multipurpose room for special events and as support to event performers and promoters.
3.20 kitchen / commissary storage		provided	provided	A commercial kitchen to support banqueting and catering functions.
3.21 control centre		provided	provided	The control centre includes office spaces, first aid, secure rooms for use by facility management
3.22 ice resurfacing room / workshop		provided	provided	Workshop and zamboni storage / maintenance areas.
3.23 marshalling / open storage		provided	provided	Open storage areas required to support events.
3.24 secure storage		provided	provided	Secure storage spaces to support events.
3.25 mechanical rooms		provided	provided	Spaces required to accommodate mechanical and electrical building systems and equipment.
3.26 back of house vehicle entry		provided	provided	loading bays required to provide vehicle access to the floor level of the playing surface - 4 bays required.
4 gross floor area (gsf)	116,000gsf	171,000 gsf	185,000 gsf	130,000 - 190,000gsf
5 area of addition (gsf)	~	68,500 gsf	64,900 gsf	~
6 area of renovation (gsf)	~	46,000 gsf	56,600 gsf	~
7 seating capacity	4,470	6,000 - An additional 1500 seats were added by raising concourse level by 6 feet +/-.	varies with venue type; hockey - 5,583, basketball 5,895, concerts 5,611	Targeted seating capacity is 5,800 seats.
8 approach to artificial ice systems	~	No change to existing systems.	Upgrade components of the existing system where required to suit the renewal project	~
9 approach to existing mechanical + electrical systems		Provide new mechanical + electrical systems throughout including dehumidification systems.	Provide new mechanical + electrical systems throughout including dehumidification systems.	~
10 approach to seating	~	Reuse existing and provide additional seating where required.	Reuse existing and provide additional seating where required.	~
11 clearance heights strategy	46'-55' at existing trusses, 30' to score clock	This issues is not addressed as part of the 2015 study.	New rigging point and access to rigging points provided. New flexible, retractable and demountable video scoreboard included in scope. New infrastructure will support linearray loudspeakers that provide superior acoustics to venue.	Minimum 44' clearance required to rigging points.
12 street closures	none	yes - Grey Street is closed between Brady and Elgin Streets.	none - All of the program is contained on the existing city owned property.	~
13 phased construction duration (months)	~	32	30	~
14 cost	~	\$44.3-\$50.0M with 4% contingency (2015) + escalation	\$55.0M (2020)	\$80.0M (2017) + escalation
15 data source	Sudbury Community Arena Options Study dated 2015, 02 11 prepared by CBRE / MJMA Architects + Proposed Sports and Entertainment Centre Feasibility and Business Case Assessment prepared by PwC, dated 2017 02 21	Arena Renewal Strategy + Sudbury Community Arena - Renewal Options prepared by Rob Blackwell, reviewed by Real Carre + Doug Nadorozny, including Sudbury Community Arena Options Study dated 2015, 02 11 prepared by CBRE / MJMA Architects presented to council 2015 03 31	projectNOW data archives	Arena Presentation, prepared by Ron Henderson / review by Ed Archer, including 'Proposed Sports and Entertainment Centre Feasibility and Business Case Assessment prepared by PwC, dated 2017 02 21, presented to council 2017 03 07