



Motion

Councillor Michael Bondy

Re: Arena Oversight Committee and Feasibility Study

Be it resolved that:

1. Council direct administration to strike an Arena Oversight Committee prior to any further action regarding a new build. Terms of Reference will be provided.
2. Any feasibility study regarding new arena investments provide Council with the following options:
 - a. Take no action
 - b. Refurbish Memorial Arena and add a second ice pad.
 - c. Construct a new twin pad arena with one pad with 2500 seats (to accommodate the Maroons) and a second community ice pad with 200 - 300 seats; and
 - d. Construct a 5000 plus seat area (to accommodate an OHL franchise) with two or three additional ice pads with community-based seating.
3. Any feasibility study regarding new arena investments include a 30 year tax levy estimate for each option.
4. Any feasibility study regarding new arena investments include an impact analysis of the impact on lifecycle budgets for all other arenas.
5. Until a study regarding new arena investments is completed and adopted by Council, that there shall be no service reductions in any arenas across Chatham-Kent.

Administration Response – Notice of Motion

Topic: Arena Feasibility Study and Oversight Committee

Requesting Councillor: Bondy

Name of staff completing this form: Edward Soldo

Council meeting date NOM presented: April 13, 2026




Council meeting date to be voted on: April 27, 2026

1. Has this request come before Council previously? Yes **No**

If so, when and what was the Council decision?

2. Does this request support a Council Term Priority? **Yes** No

If so, the notice of motion would support the following area(s) of strategic focus:

			
Deliver Excellent Service	Promote Safety & Well-Being	Grow Our Community	Ensure Environmental Sustainability
	6.b.		

3. What is the cost/ budget implication (at a high level), if any: Estimated \$400,000

The cost to hire a consultant to complete a feasibility study to determine requirements for each option and recommendations for proceeding. The number of options and breadth of scope will require significantly more consulting resource time.

4. Is it already in the queue with administration? Yes **No**

If yes, date expected to come to Council:

5. Should a report from administration be completed? **Yes** No

Why? To receive Council direction to proceed with one of the following recommendations.

Type of Report? Information Report **Recommendation Report**

6. What is the estimated time to complete this request? Approximately 12 months

The magnitude of new scope and the addition of an Arena Oversight Committee will add significant time to the process. The terms of reference will need to address if this an advisory body or a delegated decision-making body of Council as it will impact project timelines.

Date expected to return to Council: May 2027

7. What items, if any, are needed to be put on hold in order to complete this task?

Other projects may be delayed due to the motion requirements as the additional scope was not part of the current workplan and Administration was proceeding with the recommendations within the Parks and Recreation Master Plan as approved by Council.

8. General or other comments:

Council adopted the Parks and Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) on December 15, 2025. The Plan establishes a long-term framework to guide investment in parks and recreation infrastructure over a 10-year horizon and identifies the development of a multi-use recreation complex with a minimum of two ice pads as a priority capital initiative.

Administration notes that the PRMP did not contemplate the establishment of a formal oversight committee for arena planning, instead relying on a project management led governance model utilizing consultants for major capital initiatives.

If adopted, the motion would introduce an additional governance layer intended to provide advice and input as part of the arena planning process. This will delay the process and it would create a two-layer governance process as all items for decision and information would still be brought to Council for transparency.

Approval of the PRMP authorized Administration to advance early feasibility, due diligence, and concept-level work, supported by external consultants and funded through approved reserves.

The proposed motion directs that no further action be taken on a new arena until a comprehensive, consultant-led feasibility study is completed and reviewed by Council.

If adopted, the motion would expand and refine the approach outlined in the PRMP. While consistent with the Master Plan's data-driven intent, it would require Administration to:

- Broaden the scope and level of detail of feasibility analysis
- Revisit assumptions and timelines established under the PRMP
- Allocate additional consultant resources, including more detailed financial modeling and stakeholder engagement

Motion item #2a and b are contrary to the Council approved direction in approving the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Council approved moving forward with a strategy for replacement of the two Chatham arenas and approved a 10-year implementation plan. The master plan directed staff to replace Memorial Arena with a multi-use arena complex.

For this reason, the Municipal Clerk has advised that a Motion to Reconsider (a motion which proposes to amend or cancel a previous decision of Council) is required for this Motion, as currently drafted. A Motion to Reconsider requires the support of two-thirds of the members present in order for the Motion to Reconsider to be carried. Once achieved, the motion can be brought to the floor. In addition, a Councillor bringing forward the Motion to Reconsider, must have voted on the prevailing side. Councillor Bondy did vote on the prevailing side of the original motion in December.

To develop a rehabilitation plan for Memorial would require significant consulting resources (\$200,000). This option would also require restrict/eliminate use of the arena for years while it is rehabilitated, if even feasible, as it potentially impacts the Memorial Arena parking lot. The Memorial Arena site does not have the capacity to handle a second pad and an expanded Memorial and parking. Therefore 2/3 Council vote would be required on these two items (#2a and b) and the budget would need to be increased to \$400,000.

A valid consideration further to the approved PRMP for Council to consider is concerning motion item #2 c. and #2 d. The PRMP recommended a new multi-use recreation complex with a minimum of 2 (two) pads, an indoor fieldhouse, pool and gymnasium. One of the ice pads was to be around 2,500 seats and the other was a community use pad. Proceeding with a feasibility study on upgrading one of the ice pads from a 2,500 seat community facility to a 5,000 seat OHL sized facility with full cost estimated is of value to future Council to solidify the plan before moving to design stage. It also may suggest the need for a site larger than the 32 hectares identified in the PRMP. In the PRMP it was already identified in the implementation plan to move to feasibility and design in 2027. The direction in #2. c and d would be to ensure that a feasibility study includes two options of approximately 2,500 seat

community facility or a 5,000 seat OHL sized facility. This is not contrary to approved PRMP and would need only a majority of Council to support.

Motion item #5 would prevent the next Council from making any service level changes in the 2027 budget process as the feasibility study would not yet be completed.

As a result, Administration's current arena planning work would need to be realigned to reflect Council's revised direction. In addition, the feasibility study would be required to include 30-year tax levy estimates for each option and an assessment of system-wide lifecycle and operational impacts on all other municipal arenas.

These requirements extend beyond the scope originally contemplated in the development of the PRMP, particularly with respect to large-scale or professional-sport-oriented facilities.

In summary:

- The proposed motion is inconsistent with the intent of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan to conduct feasibility into parks and recreation infrastructure.
- A Terms of Reference related to the scope and governance of the committee would have to be developed for Council approval.
- The motion would expand the scope, level of effort, cost and depth of analysis beyond what was originally envisioned in the PRMP.
- Adoption would require adjustments to current timelines, work plans, and resource allocation.